

Annexes
Report for Decision by the Fifth Fund Council Meeting
6-8 July 2011 Follow-up to the Discussion
at the April 2011 CGIAR-FC Meeting of the Inception Report
Establishment of a CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA)

Contents

Annex 1: Summary Note on Results of Teleconferences on Draft Follow-up Note to the Discussion at the April 2011 CGIAR-FC Meeting.....	1
Annex 2: Conclusions of Expert Reference Group at its Meetings Held on 6 and 20 June 2011	4
Annex 3: Modalities for Consultation and Responsiveness to the Consortium, Centers and other Stakeholders under Option 1: Single Independent Evaluation Office (IEAO) for the CGIAR.....	7
Annex 4: The Contribution of Evaluation to Knowledge Management and Learning in the CGIAR	9
Annex 5: Evaluation Quality Management and its Relationship to the Independence of the Evaluation Function	12
Annex 6 Base Data for Costs of Staff and Office Space – FAO Rome and World Bank - Washington.....	13
Annex 7: Prospective Coverage of Guidance Materials on Evaluation Standards, Methods and Tools	13

**Annex 1: Summary Note on Results of Teleconferences on
Draft Follow-up Note to the Discussion at the April 2011 CGIAR-FC Meeting**

Introduction

Teleconferences took place as follows, and were chaired by the FC Office with the participation of Iftikhar Mostafa and Maria Iskandarani and attended by the IEA consultants, John Markie and Julia Compton:

1 June 2011	CIDA: Catherine Coleman EIARD (Europe): Carmen Thonnissen (Switzerland and Chair) Philippe Petithuguenin, Secretary; Armand Evers (Netherlands); Consortium: Anne - Marie Izac (Representing Carlos Perez del Castillo - Chair)
2 June	USAID: Rob Bertram and Allegra da Silva Consortium: Daniela Alfaro (Representing Carlos Perez del Castillo - Chair) Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation – Comments of Prabhu Pingali conveyed verbally by Fund Council Office
7 June	World Bank: Eija Pehu

IDRC and India provided extensive written feedback following the FC in April but did not participate in the discussions.

Reports for the July Fund Council Meeting

The consultants are taking account of the views expressed and requests for further clarification in a revision of the Follow-up Note and an elaboration of the Inception Report to be available for decision at the Fund Council in July. This will also take into account the feedback which the consultants have received from the Reference Group, which held its first meeting on the 6 June (summaries of the discussions of the Reference Group will be made available as public documents).

Views Expressed in the Teleconferences and Specific Follow-up

Most of the participants expressed their appreciation for the Inception Report and the Draft Follow-up note which they considered provided a clear basis for definitive decision making by the Fund Council. The observations of the participants are discussed below, recommendation by recommendation.

Recommendation 1: The FC is recommended to adopt Option 1, in which the evaluation function for the CGIAR as a whole is centred in a unified independent evaluation office (IEAO), reporting to the Fund Council, and required to consult closely with the Consortium, without prejudice to the office's independence or the final authority of the Fund Council.

All the participants, except the World Bank which reserved its position, supported the adoption of Recommendation 1, referring to Figure 1 in the note and emphasising that this would be more efficient and effective than Option 2 both for evaluation itself and for the CGIAR system coherence and interfaces as a whole. The Consortium noted that as indicated in the inception report, the Consortium Board would like to be able to request the IEA to commission external evaluations of CRPs if they found this necessary.

- The World Bank requested the consultants to elaborate alternatives on the modalities of the support function for evaluation of CRP components, including planning, capacity building, knowledge management and quality management and assurance. The consultants pointed out that until basic questions of the architecture for the IEA were decided it was not efficient to develop the detailed standards and guidance. This having been said they would prepare brief annexes on quality management and how this related to the independence of the evaluation function (see also Recommendation 5) and on knowledge management (see also Recommendation 2) and extend the discussion on workplanning (see also Recommendation 4 and the Inception Report).

Recommendation 2: Evaluation Staffing should be in line with functions and all evaluation will be commissioned to independent consultants. The evaluation work plan and budget will be fixed by the FC and in order to avoid any tendency for the evaluation office to expand at the expense of the actual conduct of evaluation work, the evaluation office fixed costs, including staff, should at no stage exceed a fixed percentage of total costs.

There was general agreement with this recommendation but some questioned if the minimum staffing for an evaluation office as specified in paragraph 8 was adequate even at the outset of the work (e.g. Netherlands) and most agreed with the Consortium when later discussing the budget that the staffing would grow as the programme of evaluation increased and overall resources flowing to the CRPs through Windows 1 & 2 increased. There was general agreement with CIDA's point that some consultancy resources would be needed from the outset to assist in evaluation policy, guidelines and methods development.

There was also emphasis on the development of evaluation capacity in the Centers/CRPs and the function of knowledge management.

- The consultants agreed to develop an Annex on knowledge management.
- USAID requested the consultants to consider the option of a part-time Director or Chair for the IEA, arguing it could be possible to attract someone of greater prestige and calibre in this way. The consultants agreed to elaborate this as an option with the pros and cons.
- The follow-up note for the Fund Council in July will also include a draft procedure, job description and competency requirements for a Director of the IEA to enable timely advertisement and recruitment, if considered appropriate by the FC.

Recommendation 3: It is recommended that the IEAO be sited at FAO in Rome.

All the participants, with the exception of the World Bank, supported this recommendation, emphasising in particular the neutrality and independence of Rome as a location and the potential for positive interface with the ISPC and SPIA. The World Bank considered that the arguments in favour of Washington, including cost of the office, which is to some extent exchange rate dependent, reporting relationships with the FC Chair and interface with the FC Office had been inadequately considered.

- The consultants agreed to further elaborate the pros and cons on Rome or Washington.

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that there be a unified rolling evaluation workplan for the CGIAR (with a four year time frame) and approved each one or two years by the Fund Council, following consultation by the IEAO with the Consortium.

There was general support for this recommendation.

- The consultants were asked to further elaborate how the evaluation needs of individual donors to CRPs would be facilitated and integrated, while not precluding the rights of individual donors to carry out their own evaluations where they considered this essential.

Recommendation 5: The decentralized evaluation of CRP components, in line with the agreed work plan, should be 50% funded from the central evaluation budget as matching grants.

There was some unqualified support for this recommendation but others considered that it needed to be examined further, in part in the light of its implications for the overall size of the evaluation budget. The question was also raised as to whether there were implications for the independence of evaluation which the consultants agreed they would elaborate further with pros and cons (see discussion of Recommendation 1 above).

Recommendation 6: The central evaluation budget should start at US\$3 million in 2012 and rise to \$4.6 million at 2011 constant prices from 2014 and be fixed at 2 percent of total Windows 1 and 2. A higher budget would be needed for the split evaluation option. The workings of the evaluation budget system in its entirety should be subject to review after 4-5 years of operations.

There was considerable discussion of this recommendation and the supporting text (paragraphs 16-19). The principles of adequate resources to support the evaluation function and ensuring that those resources were kept in line with the overall size of the CGIAR budget were fully supported but questions were raised as to:

- Whether the evaluation budget should be a clearly identifiable and separate item as argued by the consultants or should be part of an administrative budget or the System Costs (it is presently envisaged in the Operations Manual that IEA be covered under System Costs but FC can always change this). Some participants insisted on the full transparency of evaluation costs and that it was useful to look at ratios to total CGIAR expenditure;
- Whether part of evaluation costs should be in the program budgets, especially for the CRP component evaluations which could be in the CRP budgets and how this might relate to the proposal of 50% of CRP component evaluation from central funding.
- The consultants noted that there were diverse practices in international organizations for evaluation funding and agreed to further develop the budget recommendation with pros and cons for the different sources and methods of funding where appropriate.

Modalities for Consultation on the IEAO workplan, budget and evaluations, including role of the Fund Council and Consortium

The modalities for consultation in Annex 1 were found fully acceptable and it was noted that these would be further elaborated in the guidance, once the FC had taken decisions on the fundamental IEA architecture.

Annex 2: Conclusions of Expert Reference Group at its Meetings Held on 6 and 20 June 2011

Attendance (see following attachment for details of experts):

- Rob van den Berg
- Winston Allen
- Elizabeth McAllister
- Bob Moore
- Julia Compton
- John Markie
- Geoff Hawtin

Input by correspondence: • Zenda Orfir

The group was very satisfied with the scope, quality and relevance of the work undertaken to date and captured in the Inception Report in which the Group identified no significant areas of omission. The Group fully endorsed the Report for Decision - Follow-up to the Discussion at the April 2011 CGIAR-FC Meeting of the Inception Report. The following major points were stressed by the Group:

- **The absolute imperative of a single evaluation office as described in option 1, rather than a split function with the Consortium.**
- **The necessity of a complete firewall** with other institutions of the CGIAR and the stature to ensure the IEAO's total independence. The independence of the IEA in selecting staff, consultants, undertaking travel, etc., needs to be reflected in the agreement with the host organization.
- **Size and functions of the proposed IEA office:** Members were concerned that the proposed initial office had too few staff and would become totally absorbed in contracting. It could develop a project mentality, without the time to consider overall institutional issues and carry out its other envisaged functions, in particular developing evaluation strategy and overall evaluation planning, as well as performing the knowledge management and learning functions. There was a danger of loss of institutional memory. It was also emphasised that staff of evaluation offices in most of the international organizations participated in evaluations and did not just commission. This, as noted in the inception report, contributed to overall learning and knowledge of the context as well as strengthening the

substantive capacity of the evaluation office. It was hoped that a good balance could quickly be achieved between staff and the use of consultants.

- **Mutual accountability:** There was a need to further develop and insist on the concept that donors and other partners in the CGIAR were not just responsible for assuring funding in the case of donors, or providing advice to the CGIAR, in the case of other stakeholders. They also had a major responsibility to take the CGIAR intermediate research outputs and translate these into development impacts for beneficiaries at national level. While there needed to be realism on how much donors could facilitate this process, they should be held accountable for their behaviour in this regard through evaluation. Donors also needed to be held accountable for the efficiency of their behaviour in seeking additional bilateral evaluations and monitoring. The Fund Council needed to be held accountable for its behaviour in duplicating any functions of the Consortium in executive management.
- **Values of evaluation:** Norms could usefully include a statement of evaluation values and the guidance notes should address standards of excellence for evaluation.
- **Knowledge management, learning and evaluation follow-up:** The importance of developing this further in guidance beyond the existing Annex 4.
- **Quality management and assurance for CRP (research program) component evaluations commissioned by the CRP management:** The concept of total quality management as described in the report was fully subscribed to as the use of an external quality review panel with public reporting would ensure independence together with the fact that independent evaluation teams would verify the contributing evaluations of CRP components.
- **Standing panel on impact assessment SPIA:** The panel considered that there would be major gains in efficiency and the pertinence of SPIA's work if it were quickly consolidated with the IEAO.
- **Evaluation of the evaluation system:** The envisaged peer review and evaluation of the evaluation system itself was considered important.
- **Other significant points touched on during the discussion:**
 - Assessing the resilience of the impact chain to country level: The importance of involving country level partners in this assessment was emphasised;
 - Importance of the relationship with internal audit and assessing institutional management, financial viability, etc.;
 - Matching evaluation cycles to program cycles, including the cycle for the review of the Strategy and Results Framework; and
 - Developing standards for procurement of evaluation consultants.

Attachment to Annex 2 – Composition of the Expert Reference Group

Elizabeth McAllister recently chaired the Independent Review of the (CGIAR) and although this could be considered a conflict of interest she brings valuable insights from that work to the reference panel. She has held leadership positions in international development for over 25 years. She served in a number of senior positions at the World Bank including Director of the Operations Evaluation Department. Ms. McAllister led OED through a change process that linked its work plan to the Bank's policy agenda and scaled up its products to country, thematic/sector, and global reviews, from a previous focus on project evaluation. Prior to joining the World Bank, Ms. McAllister held executive positions in the Canadian International Development Agency in operations and policy including Director General, Performance Review (covering evaluation, internal audit and results based management). She has worked with a wide variety of international organizations on strategy, managing for results and evaluation including the UN FAO, the

Caribbean Development Bank, the World Bank, CIDA, DIFD and the International Federation of the Red Cross-Red Crescent.

Bob Moore brings a long and comprehensive experience of the evaluation of agriculture and rural development to the panel. He is the Director of the FAO Office of Evaluation responsible for the evaluation of the totality of the Organization's work, including its public goods functions, governance and management. He has extensive knowledge of evaluation methodologies and practical experience in the management of large, complex evaluations as well as the development of evaluation policy. Bob has worked in the United Nations system throughout his 36 year career and in evaluation for 33 of those years, including in UNEP. He is familiar with the broad range of issues relating to international agricultural development, including institutional ones and has worked in all regions of the world, some 70 countries in total.

Zenda Ofir brings the evaluation perspective of the developing countries to the panel. She is a former president of the African Evaluation Association and former vice-president of the International Organisation for Cooperation in Evaluation. She has advised on evaluation policies and strategies for a large number of international agencies and has considerable experience of the development of monitoring and evaluation systems and the conduct of evaluations for government agencies, NGOs, bilateral donors and international agencies. She is a previous member of SPIA. She annually teaches a course on aid effectiveness at the United Nations University and is a frequent guest lecturer in evaluation and learning. Zenda has a PhD in Chemistry and was national program manager in a South African science council (now the National Research Foundation) as well as Director of Research at the University of Pretoria.

Geoff Hawtin brings a management perspective and a historical and institutional overview of the CGIAR to the panel. He has served as: Interim Director General of the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT); Director General of Bioversity International; Deputy Director General for International Cooperation at ICARDA: Programme Leader, Food Legume Improvement at ICARDA; Director of the Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences Division of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC); and Founding CEO of the Global Crop Diversity Trust. He currently serves as: Senior Adviser at the Global Crop Diversity Trust; Chair of the Board of Directors of CATIE, Costa Rica; and is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew. Geoff has a Ph.D in plant sciences. Although Geoff is also currently a member of the CIAT Board of Trustees, it is not believed that this would compromise his role on the reference panel.

Rob D. van den Berg is currently Director of Evaluation at the Global Environment Facility in Washington, DC. He brings a large and varied experience of evaluation at senior levels to the panel. Rob has over 30 years of experience in international cooperation in a variety of positions at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the European Commission and the Global Environment Facility. In the early nineties he was the Dutch representative in the CGIAR. He was involved in the first efforts of IFPRI to develop impact evaluations and was a member of the impact evaluation task force of IFPRI until 2005. From 1999 to 2004 he was Director of Evaluation in the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He was Chairman of the OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation from 2002 to 2004 and involved in various joint international evaluations. He has co-edited several books and published numerous articles on various aspects of policy formulation, research, evaluation, history and development cooperation. He holds an M.A. in contemporary history.

Winston J. Allen, originally from Sierra Leone, is currently a Senior Evaluation Specialist in the USAID Bureau for Policy, Planning and Research, where he provides technical support for the design and conduct of impact evaluations across the Feed-the-Future Presidential Initiative, Winston Allen brings an OECD-DAC perspective to the work of the panel. He has over 20 years experience in international development program monitoring and evaluation, socio-economic research, strategic and program planning, design and management. His skills and experience cut across several sectors including health, agriculture, education, and development economics. He has worked with NGOs, private foundations, the US Federal Government, and private corporations. He has extensive field experience working in countries in Africa, Asia, Middle East, and the Caribbean and prior to joining USAID focused his work on building the capacity for monitoring and evaluation, and use of data for decision-making and program management among regional organizations in Africa. Winston has a Ph.D in urban and regional planning and international development.

Annex 3: Modalities for Consultation and Responsiveness to the Consortium, Centers and other Stakeholders under Option 1: Single Independent Evaluation Office (IEAO) for the CGIAR

The April FC Meeting asked the IEA Consultants to explain how the principle of consultation and responsiveness would work in practice under Option 1: Unified Independent Evaluation Office. This principle is illustrated below and will be elaborated further in guidance notes to be developed during the consultancy. The examples below cover:

- Formulation of the Rolling Evaluation Workplan
- Consultation with Donors on their evaluation requirements for funding outside Windows 1 and 2;
- Modification of Evaluation Policy and Norms;
- Evaluations;
- Selection of the Director of the IEA independent evaluation office (IEAO).

1. **Formulation of the Rolling Evaluation Workplan:** The IEAO has responsibility for formulation of the evaluation workplan within the evaluation budget. The workplan is subject to final approval and/or modification by the Fund Council. In formulating the workplan, the IEAO will:
 - Step 1:
 - Formally and informally consult the Consortium and Centers on major evaluations they wish to be included (CRPs, special issues, etc);
 - Incorporate through formal and informal interaction with Centers and Donors the evaluations of CRP components and sub-components, and separate donor evaluations;
 - Take into account views expressed by the Fund Council on any special issues it wishes to be addressed by evaluation and any views expressed by the ISPC;
 - Consult representatives of partners, users and end-beneficiaries;
 - Step 2: Submit a draft of the Work plan to the Consortium for comment and then the IEAO will incorporate any changes it considers justified;
 - Step 3: Present the rolling workplan, together with any further observations of the Consortium, to the Fund Council for its approval.

2. **Consultation with Donors on Evaluation Requirements for Funding Outside Windows 1 and 2** – While recognising the full prerogative of donors to independently evaluate their funding of CGIAR programs outside Windows 1 and 2, in the interests of efficiency and the maximum usefulness of evaluations, it is desirable in so far as possible to integrate donor evaluation with that of CRP components and sub-components. The modalities for this will vary from consultation on terms of reference to full integration. To facilitate this three stages of consultation are envisaged:
- Step 1: At the time of negotiating a project with a donor the responsible Center will with the benefit of the IEA Guidance notes discuss with the donor how to best meet their requirements and the requirements of the Center/CRP and the CGIAR system;
 - Step 2: At least annually the IEA Office (or Consortium Office under Option 2) will discuss with the Centers and where possible the donors any evaluations the donors may require and how these might be best integrated;
 - Step 3: When formulating the rolling Workplan, the formal dialogue will include key donors to CRPs and CRP Components and sub-components, under discussion for evaluation;
 - Step 4: When formulating terms of reference for evaluation of CRPs, CRP components and sub-components the main donors will be fully consulted as well as partners and immediate users of CGIAR outputs.
3. **Modification of Evaluation Policy and Norms:** Very similar process to that above for the Rolling Workplan with final approval with the Fund Council.
4. **Evaluations** – for all evaluations, the independent evaluation teams have full responsibility for their reports, including findings and recommendations (subject to conformity to quality standards):
- **CRP evaluation terms of reference and commissioning of consultants:** The IEAO has final responsibility for all CRP evaluation terms of reference, commissioning of consultants and management of the evaluation. It will consult formally and informally, particularly on issues to be focused on in the terms of reference, with:
 - The participating Centers, CRP management and the Consortium;
 - FC members;
 - Major donors and partners to the CRP;
 - Representatives of users and beneficiaries.
 - **Evaluation of the CGIAR System:** The Fund Council has final clearance of the evaluation terms of reference. The IEAO will manage the evaluation following a sequence along the following lines:
 - Step 1: A preliminary round of consultation with all stakeholders, including the FC and Consortium, on potential areas of focus for the evaluation;
 - Step 2: Draft an initial inception paper including the proposed main elements of the terms of reference and team composition and selection criteria for circulation and comment by all major stakeholders, prior to a redraft and request for formal comment to the Consortium with the final inception paper being presented for clearance to the FC, together with the Consortium comments, including any changes made as a result of those comments;
 - Step 3: Final terms of reference presented to Consortium for comments, changes made by the IEAO and submitted with the Consortium comments to the Fund Council for approval;
 - Step 4: IEAO selects and appoints the evaluation team, in accordance with the criteria and selection process agreed in the terms of reference (FC and other stakeholder involvement in selection would compromise independence).

5. **Selection of the Director of the IEA independent evaluation office (IEAO)** – based on functions, competencies and a process to be agreed, with recommendations from the current consultants (see Annex 2):
- Step 1: Appointment by the FC of a panel with a chair from the FC and representation from the Consortium (including the Centers) and from representatives of users (NARS). The secretary to the panel should be an independently appointed high level evaluation expert;
 - Step 2: Issue and wide distribution of vacancy announcement;
 - Step 3: Panel consideration of applicants against the competencies and criteria defined under the present consultancy;
 - Step 4 Recommendation to the FC for the individual to be appointed, together with any comment from the Consortium.

Annex 4: The Contribution of Evaluation to Knowledge Management and Learning in the CGIAR

- 1) The CGIAR system is a knowledge system and evaluation must contribute strongly to that system, indeed evaluation's *raison d'être* is accountability and learning. A basic question in all evaluations will be – Is the knowledge generated by the program under evaluation going to reach those intended, in a form in which they can and will use it? However it has to be acknowledged that a generic issue in evaluation is the extent to which evaluation contributes to longer term knowledge and learning as distinct from immediate accountability and decision making.
- 2) Learning and knowledge management are complex process and evaluation needs to address both the demand and supply side of learning to be effective¹. On the demand side, strong institutional leadership is critical to promote a CGIAR-wide culture of learning through evaluation, avoid a doer-learner split, give the message that evaluations are a key and intrinsic responsibility of management and merit investment of staff time and mental energy, and ensure that sufficient resources are allocated for this. Managers can also be given formal incentives to focus on evaluation findings and recommendations through a follow-up process for recommendations (see point b) and through formal processes for ensuring that evaluation findings have been considered when making key decisions (such as new funding for a CRP).
- 3) On the supply side, it is critical that evaluations be planned and designed in consultation with target audiences (CGIAR staff, partners and users), to ensure that evaluations focus on audiences' priority questions. The process of evaluation must also closely involve target audiences, for example through evaluation reference groups, workshops and other forms of communication. Skills in communicating and facilitating lesson learning must be valued as highly as technical evaluation skills when choosing and promoting evaluators and evaluation management staff. Where there is a culture of evaluators being seen primarily as policemen this culture change is particularly important. The use of independent consultants to conduct evaluations also needs to be carefully managed to ensure that consultants both learn from and impart their learning to stakeholders and overcome the gap in institutional memory.

¹ This annex draws on very useful papers by a variety of authors on learning from evaluations, including Douglas Horton, Viviana Galleno, and Ronald Mackay (2003) *Evaluation, Learning and Change in Research and Development Organizations: Concepts, Experiences, and Implications for the CGIAR*, which is recommended for a far richer analysis than can be presented here. This thinking will be incorporated into guidance notes on evaluation.

- 4) The contribution of evaluation is in two quite separate areas of which the first is clearly the most important:
- a) CGIAR systemic learning, including:
 - o Immediate decisions in follow-up to evaluation;
 - o Generalised learning of lessons for the CGIAR and its partners on science and innovation, on programming and planning, organization and management and working with partners;
 - b) Learning for the improvement of evaluation itself.
- 5) **Systemic learning:** Contribution to systemic learning occurs throughout the evaluation process:
- a) Without any implication for the fully independent responsibility of the IEA and evaluation teams; -the management, financiers, implementation partners and intended users of research should be consulted before and during, the evaluation process. This contributes to ownership, identification of the most important issues for evaluation and to understanding and thus to follow-up. For larger evaluations and for evaluation of innovative science, it is justified to hold a formal entry workshop, a workshop on the draft report and an action workshop on the implication of findings and implementation of recommendations. All these steps contribute not only to learning but to the quality and relevance of the evaluation:
 - i) During preparation of the rolling evaluation plan, consultation will contribute to thinking on what are the most important CRP component and sub-components for evaluation, either because of problems, opportunities for learning, or opportunities to demonstrate success;
 - ii) During the preparation of terms of reference and inception reports for evaluations, learning is contributed to in identifying the issues for focus during the evaluation;
 - iii) An open and transparent style by evaluators during evaluation and in discussion of the draft evaluation report leads managers, scientists and partners to become convinced of the veracity of the evaluation findings and to act upon them, while at the same time improving the quality of findings and recommendations. Thus evaluation recommendations should focus on strategic issues and be discussed with those who will be responsible for their implementation. This helps improve recommendations, weeding out impractical or out of date suggestions and those based on misunderstanding. To ensure that this process does not affect evaluators' independence, evaluators have absolute discretion as to whether they accept comments or not.
 - b) **Evaluation Follow-up process:** If an evaluation is well-managed, many changes will take place during the evaluation process in response to new information and lessons generated and through the communication and lesson-learning process. However, international experience has shown that a formal follow-up process for evaluation recommendations is useful to unblock more systemic and complex changes, especially those to which there is resistance at senior level. As, in much of the international system, the formal Evaluation Follow-up process should consist of:
 - i) A requirement for a management response on each evaluation which systematically states those findings which management accepts in whole or in part and those it rejects and why;
 - ii) For those recommendations accepted in whole or in part and any additional actions, management proposes a time-bound implementation plan (this may be developed through a post evaluation action workshop);
 - iii) Consideration of the management response and the action plan by the Lead Center and Consortium Boards for CRP components and by the Consortium Board and FC for CRPs, together with the comments of partners, users and key donors to the CRP; and

iv) After one or two years, as appropriate, a review of a progress report on the implementation of the action plan by the appropriate Boards.

c) **The drawing and dissemination of major and general lessons from evaluation:** Under Option 1, the IEA will have the responsibility for providing easy to use summaries of major evaluations and synthesising more general lessons across evaluations. These will be disseminated first and foremost through the learning/knowledge portal of the Consortium and through the CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change Initiative (ILAC). The IEA will also:

- i) Maintain a web based data base and search system with all CGIAR evaluation materials;
- ii) Incorporate in its biennial report to the FC and CB evaluation summaries and syntheses of lessons;
- iii) Provide to the ISPC lessons considered important for consideration in the appraisal of CRPs and the Strategy and Results Framework;
- iv) Maintain an electronic notice board for others to post their view on main lessons emerging from evaluations;
- v) To the extent resources permit:
 - (1) Directly disseminate short summaries and syntheses;
 - (2) Publicise its findings in appropriate seminars and journals.

6) **Learning on how to do evaluation and the evaluation Community of Practice:** Evaluation of agricultural research and innovation is still a developing area and there is expected to be a significant need for development and improvement of methodology. The improvement of evaluation overall in the CGIAR will result from confidence in the system and a willingness to develop in line with proven best practice, without getting lost in every fad which arises (steady development – with, not ahead of the curve). The capacity for evaluation both in the IEA and in the Centers and the development of evaluation/results based culture among managers and scientists will all be key. Allowing those people (including the young) who keep up with innovation a hearing for their ideas will be important and learning from experience will be fundamental.

7) The community of practice will draw together those engaged in evaluation, including impact assessment in the Centers together with SPIA and the IEA (and Consortium if this retains an evaluation function – Option 2). Under Option 1, the IEA will, working as appropriate with SPIA develop an evaluation community of practice network in the CGIAR, and:

- a) Revise as frequently as necessary but not usually more than every four or five years, its proposals for the CGIAR evaluation policy and basic norms;
- b) Update, maintain and extend the guidance and resource materials for evaluation in attractive easy to use format available on a website;
- c) Participate in international evaluation fora for its own learning and where appropriate facilitate the participation of the representatives of the network from the Centers in such fora;
- d) Release on the website short notes on lessons for evaluation from recent evaluations;
- e) Publish independent scores and comments on the quality of both its own evaluations and those commissioned by CRP management (using an external panel);
- f) Maintain an electronic billboard for discussion of evaluation in the CGIAR;
- g) Encourage independent evaluation and impact assessment research by members of the network; and

- h) Resources permitting, organise seminars for members of the community of practice network.

Annex 5: Evaluation Quality Management and its Relationship to the Independence of the Evaluation Function

8) An essential function of the IEA (shared with the Consortium if Option 2 is selected), is the total quality management for evaluation. This includes quality management of processes and evaluations undertaken by the IEA itself and those commissioned by the Center/CRP managements and, to the extent possible, any separate donor evaluation. In this context it is important to consider that the CGIAR system is made up of independent Centers and it is not possible to adopt a command structure for evaluation totally from the top. The basic tools of quality management are the:

- a) Agreed evaluation policy and norms and the supporting guidelines;
- b) Support to capacity development through the community of practice, evaluation competencies and evaluation knowledge management;
- c) Development of the rolling evaluation plan in order to serve the needs of management, governance and other stakeholders at all levels and the needs of coherence and efficiency within the evaluation system, including where possible the full or partial integration of donor evaluation. Evaluation coverage will be facilitated by the leverage applied through the matching grants system if recommendation 5 of this report is accepted;
- d) Discussion by the Centers and the IEAO and agreement of the terms of reference and commissioning of evaluations of CRP components, facilitated by the leverage applied through the matching grants system to assure the application of quality standards if recommendation X of this report is accepted;
- e) Review of all IEA evaluations ex post against standard criteria by a standing independent external panel and the CRP component and donor evaluations by the IAE, or if meeting certain criteria (for example large size, major involvement of IEA at design stage), by the external panel;
- f) Publication of the evaluation quality scores and comments in the biennial IEA report;
- g) Verification, if and where necessary, of CRP component evaluation findings by the independent evaluation team commissioned to evaluate the CRP;
- h) As a feed into the evaluation of the CGIAR as a whole, the periodic peer review of the conformity of CGIAR evaluation to best prevailing processes and practices and an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the CGIAR evaluation function.

9) Thus a different model of quality management more suited to a system composed of independent Centers is proposed for the CGIAR than the ex post quality control and reporting on decentralised evaluation, as practised in the World Bank, other IFIs and the GEF. It has been questioned if this does not reduce the independence of the IEA as it has some involvement in the approval of CRP component evaluation terms of reference, etc. The answer is that the aim is to achieve the highest appropriateness, independence and quality of evaluation as a whole rather than an *ex post* reporting on quality.

10) This can be best achieved if there is leverage from the IEA office to promote adherence to an overall evaluation plan and quality and independence in the evaluations themselves, especially at this stage of evaluation capacity in the Centers, which is patchy. Ex post checking on quality would continue to take place through a scoring and comment system undertaken for larger evaluations by an independent external panel. Unlike the IFIs, but like many bilaterals and some UN organizations, the evaluations undertaken by

the IEA would also be scored in this way. In addition the independent teams evaluating CRPs as a whole will be quite separate from those that looked at components and they can undertake independent verification.

Annex 6 Base Data for Costs of Staff and Office Space – FAO Rome and World Bank - Washington

Estimated Unit Annual Costs of Staffing Rome on UN Scales Washington on WB Scales (US\$)	Rome UN Scale	Washington WB Scale*
Staff		
Evaluation Director	274,800	286,650
Senior Evaluation Officer	232,900	207,600
Evaluation Officer	202,000	154,050
Senior Support or junior professional staff - data base and research assistance	130,000	116,400
Support staff administration	100,700	76,350
Office space per square meter	248	404

Source FAO trust fund budgeting tables (2011) and for World Bank

http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTSTAFFMANUAL/Resources/StaffManual_WB_web.pdf

*Based on salary scales of the World Bank (as of July, 1 2010). For the calculation of the final cost figure for each position the Market Reference Point for the professional grade plus 50% benefits was applied.

Annex 7: Prospective Coverage of Guidance Materials on Evaluation Standards, Methods and Tools

(lead responsibility JC, except where otherwise stated)

- 1) Definition of the Rolling Evaluation Work plan, including requirements for consultation with the FC, Consortium, Centers, SPIA and users of CGIAR outputs (main responsibility JM);
- 2) Means-ends analysis and the basic questions for evaluation and standard definitions, in the evaluation of research programs including: Relevance (including comparative advantage, direct adherence to the goals of the CGIAR and non-duplication of work of others), quality of program design and coherence (including institutional arrangements and treatment of risk), availability of funding in line with plans and commitments; quality of work and outputs (including maximising on previous work, scientific quality, new knowledge generation and adaptation to changing internal and external circumstances), efficiency (including efficiency in the use of human resources, funds, infrastructure and partnerships), effectiveness (particularly in translating outputs into immediate and secondary level effects), viability of the results-impact chain of causality including the viability of partnerships and actual and potential contribution to impacts at the level of ultimate beneficiaries and potential for sustainability.
- 3) Glossary of evaluation.
- 4) References to evaluation sources of information, methodologies, tools and guidance on their situation specific applicability.

- 5) Values and ethics of the IEA, including of evaluation staff and evaluators.
- 6) The contribution of evaluation to knowledge management and learning in the CGIAR.
- 7) Pointers for the development of an evaluation Community of Practice.
- 8) Taking account of the perspective from the national level (possibly JM).
- 9) Donor involvement in evaluation including consolidation and unification of donor requirements for evaluation (the emphasis will on verifying the potential for impact through the continuing viability of the impact chain and examples of types of research work though impact assessment after an adequate time.)
- 10) Guidance for conduct of evaluations:
 - a) For all types of evaluations – standards of excellence for:
 - Responsibilities at each stage of the evaluation with clear identification of who is responsible for what at each stage;
 - Basics to be covered in all terms of reference;
 - Consultation with stakeholders and identification of key concentration areas for the terms of reference;
 - Competencies of evaluators, including scientific competencies;
 - Constitution of an evaluation team, recruitment and procurement practices and criteria for the independent evaluation team, including the prime criteria for selection being evaluation and scientific competence but also including geographical and gender balance; Specific requirements of a team leader;
 - Values and ethics to be applied in evaluation including consultation during the evaluation;
 - Minimum coverage of an evaluation report and requirements that :must be met for
 - Findings including evidence base and precision;
 - Recommendations, including being grounded in findings, actionable and by whom;
 - Identification of any potential general or higher level points for learning from the evaluation;
 - The evaluation follow-up requirements, including any workshops, requirements for management response and reporting on the management implementation of follow-up (main responsibility JM).
 - b) Specific requirements and guidance for the evaluation of:
 - CGIAR system as a whole for - mutual accountability, decision on the SRF, performance improvement and learning, system adjustment – international confidence in CGIAR (main responsibility JM);
 - CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs)-for mutual accountability, program redesign, performance improvement and as one input into decisions on future funding;
 - CRP Components and sub-components-as samples for evaluation of CRPs and for for mutual accountability, program redesign, immediate performance improvement and as one input into decisions on future funding, including:

- Dialogue to include evaluation requirements in the detailed design and work plan of CRPs with the aim of cost-effectively satisfying the immediate management needs and the sampling requirements of overall CRP evaluation, within the timeframe of that evaluation, including:
 - Definition of what constitutes a CRP component or sub-component for the purposes of evaluation
 - Involvement of management, partners, donors, SPIA and users of CGIAR outputs and definition of any specific requirements, including for donors;
- Evaluation of Other Components of the CGIAR System (FC, Consortium, ISPC-SPIA, IEA) for mutual accountability, performance improvement and efficiency gains and as one input into decisions on future funding;
- Central Scientific Services and Gene Banks for performance improvement and as one input into decisions on future funding;
- Demand driven evaluations, including thematics and examination of institutional issues to provide accountability, but usually more importantly learning on particular issues – must have a clear target audience;
- Donor project reviews and evaluations.