Appendix B: Background and Concept Note on Evaluation in the CGIAR

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

Abbreviations and Acronyms Used in the Text

AfricaRice - CGIAR supported inter-governmental research organization for rice in West Africa
Bioversity International - CGIAR supported Center for agro-biodiversity
CB - Consortium Board (of the CGIAR)
CCER – Center Commissioned External Review
CG - abbreviation of CGIAR
CGIAR - Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT – CGIAR supported International Center for Tropical Agriculture
CIFOR - CGIAR supported Center for International Forestry Research
CIMMYT - CGIAR supported International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center
CIP - CGIAR supported International Potato Center
CRP - CGIAR Research Program
EPMR – External Programme and Management Review (of a CGIAR Supported Center
FAO - Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN
FC – CGIAR Fund Council
GCARD - Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development
GEF – Global Environment Facility
GFAR - Global Forum on Agricultural Research
GIS – Geographic Information Systems
Global Fund – Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
ICARDA - CGIAR supported International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
ICRAF - CGIAR supported World Agroforestry Center
ICRISAT - CGIAR supported International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IEA - Independent Evaluation Arrangement
IFAD – International fund for Agricultural Development
IFI – International Financing Institution
IFPRI - CGIAR supported International Food Policy Research Institute
IITA - CGIAR supported International Institute on Tropical Agriculture
ILAC – CGIAR Cross-Center Institutional Learning and Change Initiative
ILRI - CGIAR supported International Livestock Research Institute
IRRI - CGIAR supported International Rice Research Institute
ISPC – CGIAR Independent Science and Partnerships Council
IT – Information Technology
IWMI - CGIAR supported International Water Management Institute
MDGs - Millennium Development Goals
M&E – Monitoring and Evaluation
OECD-DAC - Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
SPIA – Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (part of ISPC)
SRF - Strategy and Results Framework
UNDP - United Nations Development Program
WFP – United Nations World Food Programme
WORLDFISH - CGIAR supported Research Center for fisheries

1. Context

1) The new CGIAR has a complex and unique architecture of partnerships with multiple components, which has no equivalent in the constellation of international development organizations. This architecture includes a new Consortium aimed at coherence, alignment and collective strategic effort by 14 fully autonomous research centers and one inter-governmental research organization dispersed throughout the world; a new Fund which, responding to the intents of the Paris and Accra declarations, aims to achieve strategic alignment in the financing by international donors for international agricultural research; and a number of institutional structures intended to facilitate and support efficiency and effectiveness across all partnerships, including the proposed Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) and the reconstituted Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC).

2) It was against this background that the CGIAR Business Meeting in 2009 agreed an M&E Framework for the new CGIAR. At the time of discussion of the framework a large number of questions arose and it was decided that the Fund Council would commission this consultant team to further develop the concepts. At the same time the future architecture and responsibilities within the CGIAR have started to become clearer with the establishment of the Consortium Board, development of a Strategy and Results Framework and the first CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs).

3) The discussions by the consultants have found that there is a common perspective that the CGIAR system has been heavily, but not always effectively, reviewed, including many individual donor reviews (a summary of information on evaluation load collected to date is included as Annex 3). There is also a widespread fear that the requirements of a new evaluation and monitoring framework for the CGIAR could lead to further duplication and inefficiency. There was thus a request to this consultant team to take a broad look at evaluation policy and institutional arrangements to ensure that evaluation will meet international best practice standards while being:

- responsive to clear needs of all parties;
- efficient and effective with the minimum of duplication and overlaps; and
- coherent and comprehensive serving the system as a whole.

4) In further developing this report to the Fund Council the consultant team is heavily indebted to all those who provided information and points of view and the many in the CGIAR and beyond who have given freely and very positively of their time in commenting on previous versions of this document.

2. Some Fundamental Considerations in Policy and Strategy for Evaluation and Performance Management

2.1 Evaluation Target Audiences and Meeting the Needs of the CGIAR System

5) The work of the CGIAR is ultimately intended to serve four system level outcomes elaborated in the Strategic Results Framework and contributing to: the reduction of poverty;

improving food security; improving nutrition and health; and the sustainable management of natural resources. It is thus ultimately to the peoples of developing countries, in particular its agricultural producers, food insecure, malnourished and environment threatened that the CGIAR is accountable. Evaluation has to play its part in this ultimate accountability. Ways of ensuring that this focus is maintained in assessing the relevance, usefulness and potential for ultimate benefits from the CGIAR as a system and its individual components are discussed in the subsequent sections of this report. Further work is necessary to suggest workable modalities for evaluating and ensuring the input into evaluation of partners and users. Some options are discussed in Section 5.

6) Evaluation has a function in accountability, learning and support to decision making at each level of the CGIAR system. It should seek to support a results-based culture[1]. Evaluation needs to reinforce coherence, efficiency and transparency in the CGIAR.

7) Independent evaluation is of lower quality and may even be counter-productive if it does not have buy-in from all concerned parties. Many evaluations lack clarity on the target audience and this should not be the case with those in the CGIAR. Evaluations must be differentiated in the levels of decision makers they serve. Evaluation outputs should also be packaged in a way which can be of most use to target audiences and this may include written and verbal outputs, more suitable to the media as well as outputs for senior managers with very scarce time. The evaluation needs to be met are primarily those of:

a) The Fund Council and the Consortium Board;
b) Center Directors-General, senior management and Boards;
c) Research managers;
d) Research partners;
e) Donors and partner country governments; and
f) The immediate national and international users and partners in delivery of CGIAR research outputs and representatives of end users (farmers, etc.).

2.2 The Concept of Mutual Accountability

8) In the spirit of **mutual accountability**, each entity within the system becomes accountable to the others and to the global poor, hungry and malnourished for the effective performance of their roles. The performance of all entities within the system will be subject to evaluation within a reasonable cycle, including the Consortium Board, the Fund Council, ISPC, and the Independent Evaluation Arrangement itself. But mutual accountability goes beyond this, not only holding the Centers/CRPs and Consortium responsible for their efficiency, results orientation and impacts but also the other partners of the system. This includes the behaviour of donors in delivering on the spirit as well as the letter of the Paris and Accra Declarations. Donors and other partners in the CGIAR become 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 have a major responsibility to take the CGIAR intermediate research outputs and translate these into development impacts for beneficiaries at national level. While there needs to be realism on how much donors can 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

[1] A culture in which the outputs to impacts pathways are thought through and drive the research

evaluations and monitoring. The Fund Council needs to be held accountable for its behaviour in duplicating any functions of the Consortium in executive management, etc.

2.3 Comprehensive, Coherent and Efficient Evaluation

9) Evaluation has a cost in time and money to the CRPs and Centers and to partners and users of research results. The gains from evaluation must justify these costs. Much of the subsequent discussion is concentrated on how quality evaluation can be assured in a system which is comprehensive in its coverage, coherent at all levels of the CGIAR system and is efficient, without unnecessary duplications, costs or redundancy.

10) Evaluation draws on, but should not substitute for, or significantly overlap with, results-based performance monitoring and reporting, which is a responsibility of management. Such a system designed with the needs of evaluation in mind is however, an important prerequisite for effective evaluation. It has become evident to the consultants that there has often been a confusion of thinking in the CGIAR between independent evaluation, performance-based monitoring of results, donor monitoring and scientific review and reference panels, sometimes contributing to superficiality, inefficiencies and overlaps. The respective roles of monitoring and management information systems on the one hand and evaluation on the other and the extent to which cost-efficient integration is desirable, or possible thus need to be clearly defined for the CGIAR. It is evident that the present lack of definition, together with the demands of some donors has led to repetitive review and evaluation without necessarily meeting needs and contributing little to learning above the project level.

Some Definitions[2]: Annex 1 provides a list of definitions of terms used in the text. As an aid to the reader, three key terms are defined below:

Evaluation: The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision–making process of both recipients and donors.

Review: An assessment of the performance of an intervention, periodically or on an ad hoc basis. Frequently "evaluation" is used for a more comprehensive and/or more in-depth assessment than "review". Reviews tend to emphasize operational aspects (in the case of the CGIAR including the science).

Performance monitoring: A continuous process of collecting and analyzing data to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results.

[2] Glossary of the OECD- Development Assistance Committee Evaluation Network
http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf

2.4 Special Features in Evaluation of Agricultural Research for Development

11) Agricultural research for development poses particular challenges for evaluation, as distinct from evaluation of technical cooperation, investment and emergency assistance. Research is often very specialised, so its evaluation may also demand specialist skills.

12) Among development endeavours, the possibility of failure is at its highest in research, even higher than in pilot programmes and negative results also yield valuable information. **Poorly-designed** and overly complicated **performance management or evaluation systems and criteria can discourage innovation, creativity and risk-taking**. Evaluation questions need to include the appropriate management of risk, including changes in research direction and partnerships as appropriate.

13) Impact Pathways are an important planning tool but should not be treated as a blueprint and their validity is also the subject of evaluation. The cause and effect chain from research output to its application by users and eventual development impact is longer than for most other forms of development assistance and support. Biological research, for example, often requires long lead times to development outcomes (in excess of ten years). The exigencies of climate and soils mean that outputs such as new varieties frequently need further development for specific agro-ecologies. Agricultural systems innovation is zone and culture specific. The relevance and effectiveness of agricultural policy research requires it to link macro factors to vastly differing micro and place-specific realities.

14) Judging the relevance of research in contributing to development impacts thus requires a complex set of judgements on the size of the potential development impacts, how critical the research output is to the desired impact and the other ongoing and completed research in the proposed area of investigation.

2.5 Evaluation Independence and Ethics

15) An undisputed principle of evaluation is that it should be independent but the characteristics of independence vary between institutions. True independence is closely related to the confidence of all parties that evaluation will be objective, unafraid to raise critical issues and professional and ethical in its approach and depth of analysis. This is normally translated into:

- Evaluation teams being external;
- Terms of reference and conduct of evaluations conforming to internationally defined best practice standards and ethics[3];
- In evaluation teams, identification of conflicts of interest, balancing perspectives and backgrounds in the team and not using people on evaluation teams directly associated with any aspect of the program under evaluation;
- At organization-wide levels, evaluation offices being headed by independently appointed fixed-term senior professionals; and

[3] Such as those of the OECD-DAC evaluation network and the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG)

- Institutional arrangements which shield all those commissioning or undertaking evaluation from pressures from management, governing bodies or other interested parties such as donors.

16) There are important trade-offs, and misconceived concepts of independence can lead to:

- Little possibility for managers or governing bodies to identify issues that they wish to be examined by evaluation, either at the level of the evaluation program of work or in evaluation terms of reference, thus limiting the usefulness of evaluation to its target audiences;
- Evaluators being selected who have forceful personal views or limited knowledge of the subject under evaluation (in this case including the science) or its institutional and development context, leading to distrust of the evaluators by those responsible for programs under evaluation and thus resistance and little learning during the process, as well as reducing the data base for the evaluation itself[4]; and
- Limited possibility for comments and input by those responsible for programs under evaluation with similar results to the above, i.e. limiting the information base and thus quality of the evaluation, reducing buy-in and learning for those working on the program.

17) Ways of ensuring the benefits of independence and ethics, while reducing the trade-offs in the context of the CGIAR are discussed in the context of institutional arrangements below.

2.6 Closing the Evaluation Follow-up and Learning Loops

18) Evaluation should directly serve learning and decision making. If it is only in practice serving an accountability function, there is a major problem. All those consulted consider that there has been limited use made of evaluations in the CGIAR. Some Centers have found individual Center reviews (EPMRs) useful and some stress that rather than evaluation, repeated monitoring visits with constant follow-up by one individual have created a useful continuing dialogue on the project. One important factor for follow-up is the extent of the consultation of managers and partners in the evaluation process itself which leads them to be convinced of issues. The main international agencies generally have evaluation follow-up mechanisms in place, as did the CGIAR for EPMRs. Most of these require a management response to the evaluation and some require these to be very specific in response to evaluation recommendations, and require reporting on the implementation of agreed follow-up. They may also have institutionalised learning loops, to new programming and processes to ensure full consideration of evaluation findings by Governing Bodies as well as management. In the CGIAR the mechanisms in place for consideration of evaluations in Center Boards, the Consortium Board and Fund Council will be important, as will the feedback into ISPC ex ante appraisal. The feed back to users and partners are essential issues addressed further below.

2.7 A Responsive Evaluation Policy Concentrated on Principles

19) **Evaluation needs will evolve with the CGIAR and evaluation must flexibly respond**. Evaluation practice and tools are also constantly developing and new technology offers new opportunities. Evaluation should thus also constantly develop both in its methods and institutional relationships.

[4] It is thus sometimes desirable to complement evaluation teams with wider panels on specific topics

20) Concentration of evaluation policy on principles and best international evaluation practice is reflected in the policies approved most recently by a number of international organizations' governing bodies[5]. Some of the authors of the evaluation policies have later noted that they allowed them to become too prescriptive in such matters as types of evaluation to be performed and frequency of evaluation, and that policies should concentrate on basic principles. Proposals for the CGIAR evaluation policy will take account of these policies, those of other development research organizations and information that can be gathered on experience with their application. Full account will also be taken of the special characteristics of agricultural research for development and of the CGIAR itself with its complex networked architecture and distinct organizational culture and history, which has no parallel elsewhere, although some organizations' policies allow for more decentralized evaluation than others.

3. Proposed Forms of Evaluation and Review

3.1 Evaluation

21) Criteria which need to be applied in deciding on the coverage and frequency of evaluation include: usefulness of the evaluation for accountability, decision making and learning/improvement at that point in time and efficiency and avoidance of duplication. Agreement on a periodic evaluation workplan is an important tool for ensuring these.

System-wide evaluation

22) There is a need for a periodic comprehensive system-wide evaluation. In the international agencies where this is a standard requirement, it is normally linked to the overall funding or replenishment cycle[6]. This is a major expenditure (the 2009 CGIAR review cost US$ 2.2 million) and in the absence of such a cycle, a minimum of once every six years would be a period allowing for findings and recommendations to be applied, significant results to be achieved by the system and the demands on the CGIAR system to be balanced with usefulness of the evaluation.

23) To the maximum extent possible, as with all other agencies, system-wide evaluation should be meta-evaluation (i.e. drawing for its analysis primarily on the more detailed levels of evaluation specified below).

24) System-wide evaluation should be comprehensive and will examine the coherence and relevance of the Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) and the CRPs as well as the institutional efficiency and perceived overall usefulness of the CGIAR to users and partners and the potential for impacts. It should help to drive system relevance and efficiency and satisfy the overall needs for: accountability on the performance of the system; an input for decisions on levels of funding; and findings and recommendations for improving system effectiveness. It is at this level that the mutual accountability of all elements of the system, including how donors and partners exercise their responsibilities will be thoroughly analysed, as will the relationships to partners and users of CGIAR research results.

[5] Iincluding UNDP, FAO, WFP and the GEF, as well as several of the international financing institutions
[6] Often four years

25) It will also be focused taking up current major issues for the CGIAR identified through widespread consultation on the terms of reference. It may be expected that the main issue for the next such evaluation will be the workings of the new CGIAR institutional framework and the SRF.

Ensuring the Building Blocks for System-Wide Evaluation

26) **Evaluation of CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs)**: The most useful timing for evaluation of a CRP is immediately prior to the end of a cycle to inform decisions on future expansion, cancellation, extension, adjustment, restructuring, consolidation with other CRPs, funding etc. The evaluation will be used by managers at all levels, the Consortium Board, and the Fund Council. Although the main determinant of when such decisions take place cannot be evaluation requirements, the workload at all levels of the system, including the Fund Council, for considering evaluations and CRPs needs to be reasonable and staggered. This argues for a variable duration of the first set of CRPs, allowing 2-3 to be evaluated each year. As with system-wide evaluation, evaluations will be: comprehensive of the CRP but based on principles of adequate (not total) coverage; permit a focus on any current major issues or questions, identified through consultation with the various parties to the CRP; and will be primarily based on meta evaluation with any gap filling required on coverage or specific issues (the question of assuring quality and coverage is addressed below).

27) **Evaluation of Components of CRPs:** A key element the proposed evaluation system is the decentralized evaluation of CRP Components and sub-components commissioned by the CRP management. This will not only serve lesson learning needs at the level of researchers, research managers and partners, but crucially, these evaluations will form essential **building blocks** for higher level evaluations, in particular those of the CRPs. They will be essential to managers in deciding on future CRP orientation. They may also serve the needs of any donors who continue to require evaluation of their specific project contributions (see below Section 6.3, paragraph 63). The policy is to ensure adequacy of coverage, usefulness to managers and non duplication in such evaluations.

28) **Evaluation of Other Components of the CGIAR System (FC, Consortium, ISPC-SPIA, IEA):** For periodic system-wide evaluation, the main building blocks of the effectiveness of research for development will be addressed through the evaluation of the CRPs. However, this is not the case for evaluation of the institutions of the system, which do not directly provide research for development services. The question of Centers is discussed below, but the other institutions of the system will be evaluated in a series of small systems-operations evaluations. These will bring in management consultancy expertise as well as that of evaluation and will address their efficiency and the adequacy of the services they provide, including their incremental value and consideration of alternative means of provision. The evaluation of the IEA would be undertaken by an international evaluation office or by the OECD-DAC evaluation network commissioned in agreement between the Fund Council and Consortium. Other evaluations would be the responsibility of the IEA. These evaluations undertaken over a period leading up to the System-wide evaluation would be among the essential building-blocks for that evaluation.

29) **Central Scientific Services and Gene Banks:** All Centers operate some central services for analyses, genotyping, biometrics, GIS, etc., etc. and some of these services provide services to external users, partners and other CGIAR supported Centers. Such services need to be funded and thus evaluated separately. Similar considerations apply to gene banks. Some elements of these services and certainly gene banks provide direct development benefits as well as internal services.

The consultants will explore options for this evaluation, bearing in mind costs, who will be the main users of the evaluation findings and enhanced coherence in the CGIAR system. Options which may be explored further include:

- System-wide comparative evaluation commissioned by the IEA. This could provide valuable insights for efficiency savings and system improvements; and
- Linking this to the Center management reviews discussed below.

30) **Demand driven evaluations on specific issues:** The CGIAR has had a program of reviews of cross-cutting issues and although many of these have addressed important topics, such as the recent stripe review of social sciences in the CGIAR, such reviews have had an unclear target audience, and thus readership and potential for follow-up. No follow-up system has been in place. It also appears that some duplication has occurred between Center commissioned work and the Stripe Reviews. **There is an important place for demand driven evaluation of specific issues** but these should be agreed through a process of evaluation agenda setting which has input from the Fund Council and through the Consortium, reflects the demands of CRPs, Centers and their Boards**. Such demand driven evaluations should cover any issue which is considered of importance to the system and may include institutional or managerial or process issues as well as thematic questions in research, workings of partnerships, etc.etc.** A division of work and areas for collaboration will be developed between the IEA and the independent audit unit for evaluation of institutional, managerial and process areas.

Impact Assessment

31) Impact assessment is an important input for evaluation. However, especially in agriculture, sustainable development impact cannot generally be assessed until many years after an intervention is completed. The time horizon of impact assessment means that it cannot usually be utilised for immediate decision making on programs and it may become an evaluation of yesterday's program. This not withstanding **ex post impact assessment can be valuable for learning what categories of action, under what conditions have the greatest impact potential**. If the same types of action are being continued in a CRP and in the CGIAR as a whole, there may be valuable lessons on the likelihoods and modalities of impact. Nevertheless even in this time frame, evaluation will be at its most useful for managers if its concentration is on outcomes and verifying the probability of eventual contribution to impact (the impact pathway).

32) There are major methodological issues of impact assessment to which the CGIAR Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) and others have given attention. For example, the Global Fund has often been concerned with the immediate cost-impact returns of types of intervention, rather than their institutional sustainability. GEF evaluations on the other hand have generally not addressed ultimate impact directly but have aimed to balance potential for impact at project completion with the longer term impact on environmental trends and have given considerable attention to whether the enabling environment is in place which would allow impact to be sustainably realised.

33) Impact assessment in the CGIAR will need to concentrate on major types of work being continued in the CGIAR today and be balanced and representative in its coverage, representing the System Level Outcomes of the Strategy and Results Framework and the new structure of CRPs. The

institutional arrangements must thus be put in place to ensure that the impact assessment work through SPIA is complementary to and integrated with that for evaluation (see below).

3.2 Performance Monitoring and Reviews

Center Reviews

34) An important performance improvement tool of the CGIAR in the past was the Center Reviews, both those commissioned directly by the Center Boards and undertaken through the Science Council (EPMRs). The future of such reviews has proved controversial. As discussed above, CRPs will be evaluated, including their research management. Centers have argued that it is unrealistic to consider that most funding will flow centrally and some, but not all, further consider that most funding provided individually by donors will not form part of the CRPs, they thus argue that there is a continuing need for the review of Centers as a whole. They also emphasise that Centers' management and administrative services cannot be reviewed without also reviewing, the Scientific programs. This is also true with respect to research management and scientific services for CRPs and the consultant team argues, and some Centers agree, that in the present matrix structure for research based on the CRPs, in which many Centers have placed most of their work regardless of source of funding, **a total review Center by Center would be duplicative. It would also refocus accountability on Centers rather the CRPs and undermine the reform**. (How separate donor funding can be evaluated in the context of CRPs is discussed below – section 6.3, paragraph 63).

35) Whether a Center continues overall reviews or not, there is a need for periodic management review covering such aspects as financial, human resource and physical asset management and the overall performance of management and Governance (Center Boards).The Consortium would ensure that these take place to certain minimum standards. Such reviews require a different skill-set to evaluation of research and can best be undertaken by management consultants. The potential role of the Independent Audit Unit in this will be further explored as they have undertaken some of this type of work in the past[7]. There is also a need for evaluation of common scientific services and gene banks as discussed above. The product of such reviews and evaluations will be a valuable input for the comprehensive system-wide evaluation.

Performance Information Systems and Reporting

36) Performance monitoring information needs to be coordinated with future evaluation information requirements so that systems can complement each other and, where it is most cost-efficient and effective, monitoring can collect data and build an ongoing evidence base. There is space for common performance indicators which will allow some communality of reporting across the system but the CRPs are extremely heterogeneous, as is the types of research performed, and many indicators also need to be case specific[8].

37) The incentives in performance monitoring need to be carefully examined. Automatic links to funding do not take account of complexities or shifting priorities and will lead to gaming the system. A lack of attention to managers' immediate needs can cause systems to be regarded merely as a

[7] e.g. Strategic human resource audit for CIFOR

[8] For example for new varieties, the potential of a break-through in disease resistance or nutritional value, could be much more important than a small yield increment for an individual agro-ecology.

chore. Experience has now indisputably shown that overly complex performance monitoring systems fail and some monitoring of immediate and longer term outcomes and impacts[9] has suffered from an expectation that it will monitor at all levels and be at frequent intervals. This is not only costly, but unlikely to yield meaningful information for current research programs. It has also been found that there are often an excessive number of targets and indicators, set without real attention as to how they are to be cost-efficiently verified (although there is also a danger in relying excessively on what is easy to measure).

38) The 2008 Independent Review found that there was a lack of clarity on the timely arrival and on the expenditure of funds for mega programs and implied that fungibility could mean that resources were substantially diverted from their purposes as specified in the Medium-Term Plans. This can occur for many very well founded reasons but it is important to have an approximate (not financial accounting) picture of funds actually devoted to each CRP component and, sometimes, sub-component[10]. Otherwise it is impossible to examine the cost-effectiveness of the research activity against resources deployed or to understand the influence of temporary shortfalls and arbitrary – spend by- targets. This should thus form an element in monitoring.

39) Monitoring at higher levels of the output-impact chain and at the level of ultimate impacts (MDGs, production, etc) is extremely expensive, generally has weak lines of attribution to immediate outcomes, is unlikely to be in the time-frame of the CRP and should be left to impact assessment. At lower levels of the output to impact pathway, one-off sample surveys during, or preparatory to, evaluation may be more cost-effective than periodic performance monitoring on intermediate or even immediate outcomes. Monitoring should be restricted to outputs, immediate outcomes and verification of the plausibility of the impact pathway including its risks and assumptions.

40) The CGIAR Fund Council and Consortium Board need a periodic **system wide performance report** on the Strategic Results Framework and its constituent CRPs. Making such a report annual would impose an excessive burden on all levels of the system and a biennial or triennial report would be appropriate but should not be enshrined in policy until such time as working experience is gained after several rounds of performance reporting. The Consortium, the Fund Office, ISPC and its secretariat, and the IEA should also be subject to performance reporting. Public reporting on financial performance and research outputs by the CRPs and Centers should probably continue to be annual and the primary recipient for these is the Consortium.

41) **Capacity for performance monitoring** in the CGIAR is currently inadequate and an evaluation plan, as well as management information, and performance targets and indicators need to be specified for the CGIAR system and at the start of a program with, in long running programs, periodic revision. The institutional arrangements, funding supporting IT systems and incentives need to be in place. There is a big potential for common platforms and back office support. This requires consultation between managers and evaluators and for the CGIAR, the Independent Evaluation Arrangement could have an initial advisory and capacity strengthening role for performance monitoring (see also decentralized evaluation capacity below).

[9] See Annex 1 for definitions of terms

[10] This includes support from common research, administrative services and infrastructural services (overheads)

42) **Scientific Reference or Review Panels** are an important and normal part of good science management and essential to the CGIAR. It has sometimes been suggested that these form part of the evaluation workload and this is not the case, but their findings provide an important input for evaluation and review panels may on occasion be integrated into an evaluation process.

Figure 1: Forms and Purposes of Evaluation and Review

(for a clarification of the reasoning behind the Evaluation Responsibilities in Columns 2 & 3 refer to Section 6: CGIAR Institutional Architecture for Evaluation)

Purpose and Level of Evaluation	Requested by	Commissioned and Managed By	When	Coverage and main data sources
CGIAR system as a whole for - mutual accountability, decision on the SRF, performance improvement and learning, system adjustment – international confidence in CGIAR	Fund Council and Consortium Board	Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA)	Not more frequent than every 6 years	Always comprehensive in coverage but focusing on selected issues. Based insofar as possible on meta-evaluation of lower level evaluations and impact assessments with special studies as necessary.
CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs)-for mutual accountability, program redesign, performance improvement and as one input into decisions on future funding	Fund Council and Consortium Board And/or CRP management or a major donor to CRP	Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA)	Complete coverage of all CRPs over a cycle of 6-7 years, Evaluation Normally before major funding or reorientation decision. Staggered cycle to even out work load of all parties	A key building block for CGIAR System Evaluation. Always comprehensive in coverage but focusing on selected issues. Based insofar as possible on meta-evaluation of lower level evaluations.
CRP Components and sub-components-for mutual accountability, program redesign, performance improvement and as one input into decisions on future funding	Normally by CRP management but Consortium, IEA or Donor may request if problems of evaluation not being done or quality issues	CRP management or if requested IEA	A representative sample in each CRP must be evaluated at least once in every CRP cycle	The key building block for CRP evaluations and used in all evaluations. Always comprehensive in coverage but focusing on selected issues. Undertake primary data collection and draw on performance management, relevant impact assessments and any separate donor evaluations (which are not encouraged see below).

Purpose and Level of Evaluation	Requested by	Commissioned and Managed By	When	Coverage and main data sources
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	FC and Consortium Board as part of IEA work program	IEA (except for evaluation of IEA itself)	Total coverage at least once in every cycle of System-wide review	This is not resource heavy and will draw on existing data sources, undertake surveys, etc.
Central Scientific Services and Gene Banks for performance improvement and as one input into decisions on future funding	FC and Consortium Board as part of IEA work program, or Centers on demand	Options being further studied	Sample coverage at least once in every cycle of System-wide review	This is not resource heavy and will draw on existing data sources, undertake surveys, etc.
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	Request can come from any level in system but must have broad level of support in the system	IEA and for single CRP specific issues possibly CRP management with IEA support	On demand, but normally not to exceed 1 per year	As appropriate to the issue under evaluation
Donor project reviews and evaluations	Donor	Subsumed into, or combined with CRP subcomponent reviews or information required generated from Performance Management Monitoring System	Not applicable	Donors satisfied with and will finance CRP-subcomponent evaluation, where not possible, joint evaluation of sub-component by several partners or a lead donor
Impact assessments for overall accountability and learning on impact becoming more integrated with other evaluation and to answering questions relevant to ongoing CRPs		SPIA or individual CRPs	Process and criteria for prioritisation, to ensure representative coverage & link to evaluation program	Impact assessment needs integrated into CRPs with data requirements planned in CRP design, where possible

Purpose and Level of Evaluation	Requested by	Commissioned and Managed By	When	Coverage and main data sources
Center management reviews to address management and administrative issues cutting across the Center and CRPs. There is not expected to be a need for evaluations of Centers as in CCERS or EPMRs but the issue will be studied further	Center Board or Management, or if necessary Consortium Board	Generally commissioned by Centers - Consortium to ensure they take place. Possible role of the Independent Audit Unit to be further explored	Issue oriented – need for any regular schedule to be determined	Scope of review decided by initiators in consultation with IEA and the Center
Performance Management Monitoring For regular performance verification at all levels of the system	Fund Council Consortium and Managers at all levels of system	Managers at each level of system with leadership from the Consortium Board for the CRPs and Centers and advisory support possibly provided by the IEA Central IT platform maintained for key indicators by Consortium	Overall system performance report every two or three years. Monitoring of indicators at intervals appropriate to the question and changes in the data (e.g. financial monthly; research outputs annually; outcome every 2 years for further R&D or policy application by others. Every season for production, once outcomes start to occur)	Comprehensive with targets and indicators at all levels which take account of the special characteristics of Research for Development: • Resources and expenditures, • Risks and assumptions • Outputs, • Immediate Outcomes

4. Communality of Indicators and Evaluation Tools & Methods

4.1 Communality of Indicators

43) The CGIAR requires targets, indicators and means of verification which are specific to different CRPs' intended outcomes and types of research but there are some communalities in these across the system and a pragmatic and realistic degree of standardisation facilitates some comparability and thus consolidation of evaluation, at least qualitatively. Experience elsewhere in the international system working on global and regional public goods has shown that there is a tendency to inadequately define or verify lines of contribution to high level impacts or to risks and uncertainties, including those of the science itself. Lack of attention to such factors and defining indicators and means of verification helps determine whether something is really evaluable.

44) Because of their diversity, there are practical difficulties in applying standard indicators across all CRPs below the level of end users. **Some donors currently have a requirement for evaluation reporting against results or impact indicators**, which differ from donor to donor

(although there is a group working towards harmonisation in the CGIAR, and the Global Donor Platform has proposed some harmonised indicators for agriculture[11]). As these were generally developed with large scale development programs in mind, rather than research, there is difficulty in applying them in any verifiable way along an extended cause and effect chain from outputs and immediate outcomes to impacts defined at the level of MDGs. It is important that the pressure from donors to individually verify their indicators in the CGIAR be reduced. The emphasis will be on verifying the potential for impact through verification of the continuing viability of the results chain.

4.2 Use of Evaluation Tools

45) The tools employed in evaluation are becoming steadily more extensive. They range from documentation of success stories, to participatory appraisal and perception survey, internal rate of return, use of control groups, counter-factual econometric modelling and use of expert opinion (importantly in this context scientific expert opinion). None of these tools are applicable in isolation and some have no application in evaluating a particular research intervention (it depends on the nature and goals of the research).

5. Partners in Research and Delivery and Perspective from the National Level

5.1 The Role of Partners in Evaluation

46) Partners are now becoming more important to the CGIAR in developing its research outputs and have always been essential to the CGIAR in further developing its research products, rendering them situation specific and delivering them to end users (frequently farmers). Emphasis is placed on developing these relationships further. Just as with donors **partners are important clients of evaluation**. The role of partnership will thus be an important area for evaluation and **each evaluation should normally cover the role and effectiveness of partnerships** in the conception and undertaking of research and in delivering outcomes and impacts. Depending on the strength and significance of the partnership, **partners will also be important in identifying issues for evaluation, in advising on modalities to gain information and as providers of information**. Just as funding partners (donors) may wish to have voice in terms of reference, etc. without compromising the independence of the evaluation, so may implementing partners and partners in innovation and delivery on the ground. As these partners are likely to be closer to end users they can be important connectors in the evaluation process.

5.2 Ensuring Evaluation and Programming Take Full Account of the Perspective from the National Level

47) While the Global Conference on International Agricultural Research for Development plays a valuable role in critiquing CGIAR priorities and the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) provides some on-going feedback through the Fund Council, a more structured and detailed level mechanism to supplement this feedback is probably desirable. It would be inefficient and would lose the holistic dimension to envisage such mechanisms CRP by CRP or Center by Center. Most

[11] http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0380e/i0380e00.htm

international organizations have some arrangement, often through national offices and governments to obtain holistic feedback but this is not an option for the CGIAR. The final report of this consultancy will explore whether some combination or single mechanism could be employed by the CGIAR as a whole to maintain periodic monitoring on a series of general questions and provide specific answers for evaluations and for programme design. Such mechanism could be coordinated through the Consortium, but at least initially would probably be organized by lead Centers. **The outputs would be public goods in their own right, as they would provide insights, not only for the CGIAR, but the agricultural research community as a whole.**

48) Mechanisms which may be explored further for possible use in combination, or singly, in priority agro-ecological/policy zones for the CGIAR, as distinct from individual CRP or Center zones are indicated below:

- standing reference panels in a sample of countries, appointed by the CGIAR and representative of interest groups, researchers and extensionists;
- drawing together indicator data using GIS and statistical techniques including: remote sensing data on crop coverage, land use, population and climate, etc; and price data, survey data on agriculture and nutrition, etc., etc;
- CGIAR reference sites; and
- sample surveys.

6. CGIAR Institutional Architecture for Evaluation

6.1 Alternative Suggestions for the IEA Architecture Examined and Rejected by the Team In addition to those Discussed in Detail in the Decision Document to which this is an Appendix

It is clear that the above functions and independence would be difficult to ensure without a small evaluation unit dedicated to the CGIAR. Nevertheless the consultant team did examine alternatives put to it and rejected them for the following reasons:

- **Combining evaluation with internal audit:** Audit and evaluation have different skill sets. Although there is some convergence of competencies on value-for-money and management audit. However, the orientation of audit is generally, if by no means always, compliance and financial, leading to a different relationship with managers and scientists. There is thus limited synergy and where there has been combination of the two functions, elsewhere in the international system, audit functions have almost invariably overshadowed and absorbed resources from evaluation. The existing internal audit arrangements in the CGIAR are responsible primarily to the Centers and would also have to have their institutional model changed if there were to be a combination of the two functions. Nevertheless the examination of relationships and possibilities for efficiency gains from collaboration between the oversight functions of evaluation and audit are being further examined for the evaluation policy, including questions of value for money and data audit.

- **A part-time evaluation reference panel contracting a consultancy firm on a short or long term basis to undertake the evaluation work:** This model has not been used in the

6.1 Alternative Suggestions for the IEA Architecture Examined and Rejected by the Team In addition to those Discussed in Detail in the Decision Document to which this is an Appendix

international system and would be untried. Reasons why it has not been used, include, in the absence of a small staff: the lack of institutional memory; difficulty in maintaining evolution and continuity in systems; and the problems of assuring quality with this extreme of outsourcing. All evaluation units make heavy use of independent consultants to carry out evaluations and the CGIAR evaluation unit would be no exception in this regard;

- **Contracting an existing evaluation office:** In an existing evaluation office such as that of the GEF, World Bank or one of the Rome based agencies, evaluation of the CGIAR would always take second place to that of the organization's own programmes. The offices are not primarily, or at all, concerned with the evaluation of research. Recruitment, lines of reporting, etc. would almost certainly be subject to the organization's own policies. There would be some gains in close contact with evaluation colleagues but a certain distance from the CGIAR. Physically hosting the CGIAR evaluation unit in another organization with a strong evaluation office would allow some opportunity for interchange; or

- **A Virtual Evaluation Unit** with full and part-time staff distributed throughout the CGIAR system. Such a model could not ensure critical mass for interaction and efficiently and flexibly handling work in a small evaluation unit. There would be a difficulty maintaining institutional memory. If staff were placed in the Centers, there would be questions of independence. Many of the advantages of such a model can be secured by developing a strong network of evaluation consultants.

6.2 Clarification of ISPC Role in Evaluation

49) The Consultants consider that the decision to separate the ISPC from the evaluation function was the correct one. It ensures a clear separation from evaluation of the ISPC's role in appraising ex ante and advising from the science perspective on priorities, the Strategic Results Framework and CRPs. There has however, been a lack of clarity in perceptions of the ISPC's current role, partly because of nomenclature. The ISPC refers to ex ante program appraisal as evaluation and there is a button on its website for program evaluation which has lead to misunderstandings.

50) The ISPC secretariat has an important institutional memory of evaluation and review in the CGIAR to date. It should have the opportunity, from the science perspective and its appraisal of CRPs and the Strategic Results Framework (SRF), to suggest important issues for the evaluation work programme, comment to the Independent Evaluation Arrangement on evaluation terms of reference for major evaluations and make any comments it has on evaluation reports to the Consortium Board and the Fund. This inclusiveness of the ISPC will assist the feedback loop for ex-ante appraisal of CRPs and the SRF.

51) SPIA reports to the Fund Council on its impact assessment work through the ISPC and the ISPC secretariat provides the secretariat also for SPIA. There is a need to put in place institutional

arrangements to ensure coherence between the program of impact assessment, where the lead is with SPIA, and evaluation.

6.3 A Decentralized System (the Basic Building Blocks for CRP Evaluation)

52) **Evaluating CRP components:** CRP management will normally commission evaluation of CRP components. Evaluation at the level of entire CRPs and the system undertaken by the IEA will need to draw on lower levels of performance reporting, evaluation and review, which very few international organizations centralise in their entirety. Senior managers and governing boards at all levels of the CGIAR system require evaluation at an appropriate level of detail, responding directly to their needs but these do need to have sufficient coverage and quality to feed into a centrally coordinated program of evaluation. If there is to be buy-in and thus quality in evaluation, all those involved must see a potential for benefit to them, in terms of program improvement and verification of their worth. At any level, a requirement to undertake work from another level of the system is not only expensive, it is liable to be duplicative and, given time and resource constraints, probably superficial. It does however need to draw on evaluation which is adequately comprehensive and representative in its coverage and to have confidence in the results.

53) **Decentralized Evaluation Capacity:** This will require building a culture of evaluation across the CGIAR, as well as fostering the capacity to manage high-quality monitoring and evaluation. Measures to assure good coverage and quality of this decentralised system are also essential to foster universal confidence in the data and analysis. Evaluation responsibility is best placed centrally in all Organizations and CRPs are no exception in this regard, with the function having sufficient level of authority. Economies of scale, especially in smaller CRPs, may require that the evaluation function be shared with another function, which will often be that of programming and performance monitoring where there is a heavy overlap in the competencies required. It may also be combined with impact assessment but the skill overlap is less and impact assessment may also be placed together with socio-economic research. There is no necessity for uniform practice in this regard and lessons can be learned from different models used around the CGIAR and elsewhere.

54) **Budgeting needs of evaluation and performance assessment of CRPs** must be built in at the time of CRP design, but at the moment it appears that not all CRPs have made adequate budget provision for this and it may be seen as something of an add-on. It is considered important that a financial incentive be offered to the CRPs to properly carry out both performance monitoring and evaluation of components and sub-components as well as soft-incentives in terms of internal capacity building and outputs of evaluation of strong relevance to managers.

55) **Evaluation Capacity and Community of Practice:** At present there are many individuals with good knowledge of evaluation and of monitoring and the requirements of good research program design and/or impact assessment which all share several of the same skill-sets. There is not however, as far as the consultants have as yet determined, any real institutionalisation of evaluation capacity in CGIAR supported Centers[12] or CRPs. One effect of this may be for evaluation and

[12] A minority of Centers have an M&E unit and several Centers are now advertising an M&E post. IFPRI has an outside contractor responsible for impact assessment

performance monitoring responsibilities to be pushed to individual scientists with no time to carry them out and a loss of efficiency. For the building blocks of successful evaluation to be put in place, it is essential that the CRPs have this capacity. This requires not only good common standards and guidance notes, but also a community of practice, defining evaluation and evaluation management competencies, access to training, facilitated discussion fora, etc. and an interface with the rest of the international system to provide for knowledge exchange and also career opportunities. Capacity building for evaluation must be closely coordinated with that of SPIA for impact assessment and any learning initiatives. This community of practice can also aid the feedback and learning loop (see above).

56) **Bringing together donor requirements for evaluation with those of the CGIAR System:** The CGIAR is currently in a stage of transition and it appears that for the immediate future, half of funding to research programmes will come directly from donors, rather than through the CGIAR central funding windows 1 and 2. Much of the work undertaken with this funding is included in the CRPs, but some is not. In the spirit of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action, donors have already committed themselves to harmonising and reducing their requirements for separate reporting in the CGIAR (Voices for Change, paragraph 1Civ). Practical progress has also been evidenced in the UN system and the International Financing Institutions (IFIs). For evaluation, as well as the question of principle, much of this progress has been a gradual **acceptance that evaluation coverage, standards and independence can meet donors' individual needs while addressing a wider institutional requirement**. This is evident in organizations where there are independent evaluation offices. A system of public donor performance monitoring reported to the Fund Council could be helpful. How this principle can be further developed in the CGIAR requires discussion in the Fund Council, in order to gain firmer commitment from individual donor agencies as a whole and not just the parts of those agencies dealing with the funding of multilaterals or research funding.

57) However, there is also a need for realism and for maximum fund mobilisation in the framework of the CRPs. Much additional donor funding for individual sub-components of CRPs is coming, not from bilateral donor multilateral arms but bilateral funding windows and this additional funding should be welcomed. At the same time as donor funding is negotiated by the CRP managers, there is a need to negotiate the integration of their evaluation and other reporting requirements into the framework of the CRP as a whole. There is also a need to build on any separate evaluations donors continue to undertake, not repeating work in CRP evaluation. **If a donor makes input to a particular CRP sub-component the aim should be to satisfy its needs for evaluation through the evaluation of the sub-component as a whole providing an essential building block for CRP level evaluation.** Donors may include an independent representative in an evaluation or joint evaluation of sub-component could be undertaken by several partners, or a donor could take the lead in commissioning a sub-component evaluation, but in each case there needs to be care to preserve the independence of the evaluation and ensure it meets minimum CGIAR evaluation standards.

6.4 Scheduling of IEA Establishment

58) Proposals for scheduling of IEA establishment and the initial evaluation programme will take realistic account of the needs of the work program and the time taken to recruit, set-up offices, etc. Although subject to further study, it is envisaged that the IEA would begin work in 2012 and that the first CRP evaluations would not be initiated until 2014, following which they would be conducted at

the rate of 2-3 per year, allowing all CRPs to be covered in 6-7 years, in line with revision of the CRPs. The period until 2014 would concentrate on getting decentralised evaluation better established and supporting the conduct of such evaluations as well as starting the evaluation of CGIAR central institutions (which will not be resource heavy). On demand evaluation may also be undertaken, including of emerging operational issues and support provided to the Consortium and Lead Centers in establishing CRP performance monitoring. The first system wide evaluation is envisaged as also beginning work in 2014 for completion in 2015.

Annex 1: Glossary of Selected Evaluation Terms

Except where otherwise stated, these terms have been taken from the Glossary of the OECD-Development Assistance Committee Evaluation Network http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf It is recognised that some terms may need to be modified for specific use by the CGIAR, and this will be done as part of the development of standards and guidance.

Appraisal: An overall assessment of the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of a development intervention prior to a decision of funding.

Attribution: The ascription of a causal link between observed (or expected to be observed) changes and a specific intervention.

Base-line study: An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made.

Beneficiaries: The individuals, groups, or organizations, whether targeted or not, that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention.

Best practice: Methods and techniques that have consistently shown results superior to those those achieved with other means and which are used as benchmarks to strive for. There is, however, no practice that is best for everyone or in every situation, and no best practice remains best for very long as people keep on finding better ways of doing things (Business dictionary.com). Best practice in evaluation refers to benchmarks for evaluation practices (often considered aspirational) and the overall practices of individual evaluation regimes certified as of good standard by their peers, generally through a peer review (jm).

Counterfactual: The situation or condition which hypothetically may prevail for individuals, organizations, or groups were there no development intervention.

Effectiveness: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

Evaluation: The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision–making process of both recipients and donors.

Impacts: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Inputs: The financial, human, and material resources used for the development intervention.

Meta-evaluation: The term is used for evaluations designed to aggregate findings from a series of evaluation. It can also be used to denote the evaluation of an evaluation to judge its quality and/or assess the performance of the evaluators (but is not used in this latter way in this report).

Outcome: The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs.

Outputs: The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes (but not used in this latter way in this report. Also note that the term deliverables is sometimes considered synonymous with outputs).

Partners: The individuals and/or organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives.

Peer review is a generic term for a process of self-regulation by a profession or a process of evaluation involving qualified individuals within the relevant field. Peer review methods are employed to maintain standards, improve performance and provide credibility. In academia the term is often used to denote a prepublication review of academic papers. (Wikipedia)

Performance monitoring: A continuous process of collecting and analyzing data to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results.

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.

Results: The output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a development intervention.

Results chain: The causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts, and feedback. In some agencies, reach is part of the results chain.

Results framework: The program logic that explains how the development objective is to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions.

Results-Based Management (RBM): A management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts.

Results framework: The program logic that explains how the development objective is to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions.

Review: An assessment of the performance of an intervention, periodically or on an ad hoc basis. Frequently "evaluation" is used for a more comprehensive and/or more indepth assessment than "review". Reviews tend to emphasize operational aspects (in the case of the CGIAR including the science).

Stakeholders: Agencies, organisations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation.

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

Target group: The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit the development intervention is undertaken.

User (Client): Research produces an output which may be released into the results chain at varying degrees of adaptation to final application. The immediate user is generally a partner in the chain such as scientists in a national research system or government policy advisor. The end user is the final user of the product fit to the local situation (as in farmers, policy implementers, forest dependent people). This is not the equivalent of ultimate beneficiary that may be for example hungry or poor people (jm).

Value-for Money (VFM): Utility derived from every purchase or every sum of money spent. (VFM). The relationship between economy, efficiency and effectiveness, sometimes known as the 'value chain'. VFM is high when there is an optimum balance between all three – relatively low costs, high productivity and successful outcomes (UK Audit Commission).

Annex 2: Persons Consulted and Providing Support During the Inception Phase

ADMINISTRATIVE AND LOGISTIC SUPPORT

Manuel Lantin	Science Adviser, Fund Council Office
Maria Iskandarani	Technical Specialist, Fund Council Office
Su Ching Tan	Administrator, WorldFish

CONSULTATIONS

FUND COUNCIL

Fund Council Members

David Radcliffe	Europe - European Commission
Carmen Thoennissen	Europe -Switzerland
Jonathan Wadsworth	Europe – DFID, UK
Hakan Mastorp	Europe – SDA, Sweden
Luciano Nass	LAC – EMBRAPA, Brazil
Catherine Coleman	North America – ACDI/CIDA, Canada
Rob Bertram	North America – USAID, USA
Nick Austin	Pacific – ACIAR, Australia
Raghunath Ghodake	Pacfic - Papua New Guinea
Jean Lebel	Representing Foundations – IDRC, Canada
Prabhu Pingali	Representing Foundations – Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, USA
Juergen Voegele	World Bank
Shantanu Mathur	IFAD

Fund Council Office

Fionna Douglas	Acting Executive Secretary
Iftikhar Mostafa	Adviser (Governance)
Manuel Lantin	Science Adviser
Maria Iskandarani	Technical Specialist

CONSORTIUM

Consortium Board Members (presentation and discussion)

Carlos Perez del Castillo	Chair
Lynn Haight	
Tom Arnold	
Ganeshan Blachander	
Agnes Mwang'ombe	
Ian Goldin	
Mohamed Ait Kadi	
Matin Quaim	

Consortium Office

Lloyd Le Page	Executive Director
Anne-Marie Izac	Chief Scientific Officer
Jennifer Cramer	Consultant
Martin Pineiro	Consultant, Lead on CGIAR Strategic Results Framework

CGIAR CENTERS Directors-General and Board Chairs (presentation and discussion)

BIOVERSITY	Emile Frison, Director General
	Paul Zuckerman, Board Chair
CIAT	Ruben Echeverria, Director General
	Juan Lucas Restrepo, Board Chair
CIFOR	Frances Seymour, Director General
	Hosny el-Lakany, Board Chair
CIMMYT	Thomas Lumpkin, Director General
CIP	Pamela Anderson, Director General (separate communication)
ICARDA	Mahmoud Solh, Director General
	Henri Carsalade, Board Chair
ICRISAT	William Dar,Director General
	Nigel Poole, Board Chair
IFPRI	Shenggen Fan, Director General
	Fawzi al-Sultan, Board Chair
IITA	Hartmann, Director-General (separate communication)
	Bryan Harvey, Board Chair
ILRI	Carlos Seré, Director General
IRRI	Robert Zeigler, Director General
IWMI	Colin Chartres, Director General
ICRAF	Dennis Garrity Director General
Eric Tollens	Board Chair
WorldFish	Stephen Hall, Director General
	Remo Gautschi, Board Chair

INDEPENDENT SCIENCE AND PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL (ISPC) - Board Members (presentation and discussion)

Kenneth Cassman, Chair
Vibha Dhawan
Rashid Hassan

Marcio de Miranda Santos
Jeffrey Sayer

STANDING PANEL ON IMPACT ASSESSMENT (SPIA)

Derek Byerlee	Chair
Mywish Maredia	Impact Assessment specialist (Associate professor, Michigan State University)

Secretariat ISPC and SPIA

Peter Gardiner	Executive Secretary
Tim Kelley	Senior Agricultural Research Officer
Sirkka Immonen	Senior Agricultural Research Officer (SPIA)
James Stevenson	Agricultural Research Officer (SPIA)

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING SPECIALISTS

Uma Lele	Consultant: Leader – 2003 global CIAR review
Elizabeth McAllister	Consultant: Leader – 2008 global CIAR review
Keith Bezanson	Consultant: senior member 2008 CGIAR review team
Rob Van Den Berg	Director, Evaluation office, Global Environment Facility
Aaron Azueta	Senior Evaluation Officer, Global Environment Facility
Cheryl Gray	Director, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank
Martha Ainsworth	Adviser to the Director, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank
Christopher Gerrard	Lead Evaluation Officer, Corporate and Global Methods, IEG, World Bank
Fred Carden	Head of Evaluation, Canadian International Development Research Center (IDRC)
Goberdhan Singh	Director General, Evaluation Directorate, ACDI/CIDA Canada
Bob Moore	Director, Office of Evaluation FAO
Javier Ekbois	Director – ILAC Cross-Center Institutional Learning and Change Initiative, CGIAR
Cristina Sette	Programme Specialist, ILAC
Debbie Templeton	Research Project Manager for Impact Assessment, ACIAR Australia
Yvonne Pinto	Director, ALINe (Agriculture Learning and Impacts Network)
David Bonbright	Chief Executive, Keystone Accountability
Andy Hall	Head of the Central Research team, Research into Use Programme

SENIOR STAFF AND EVALUATION AND IMPACT SPECIALISTS IN CGIAR Centers who have been interviewed and/or provided information (in addition to DGs Listed Above)

Maya Rajasekharan	Program Officer, Office of the Director General, CIAT
Andrew Taber	Deputy Director General (Research) CIFOR
Marianne Bänzinger	Deputy Director General (Research and Partnership), CIMMYT
Bekele Shiferaw	Director, Socioeconomics Program, CIMMYT
Maria Luz C. George	Head, Project Management Unit, CIMMYT
Graham Thiele	Leader of Social and Health Sciences Division, CIP
Guy Hareau	Head of Impact Assessment, CIP
Aden Aw Hassan	Director of Social, Economic and Policy Research Program, ICARDA
Dave Hoisington	Deputy Director General – Research, ICRISAT
Cynthia Bantilan	Global Theme Leader Markets, Policy and Impact, ICRISAT
Stacy Roberts	Head of Donor Relations, IFPRI
Peter Hazell	Head of Independent Impact Assessment, IFPRI
Victor Manyong	Director, Research for Development Directorate, IITA
John McDermott	Deputy Director General – Research, ILRI
Nancy Johnson	Agricultural Economist – Impact assessment, ILRI

David Raitzer	Impact Assessment and Strategic Planning, IRRI
Mark Giordiano	Head, Institutions and Policies, IWMI
Tony Simons	Deputy Director General, ICRAF
Frank Place	Head of Impact Assessment, ICRAF
Charles Crissman	Director of Policy Economics and Social Science, WorldFish
Elisabetta Gotor	Impact Assessment Specialist, WorldFish

DONOR AGENCY STAFF (in addition to Fund Council Members and Evaluation Specialists)

ACDI/CIDA – Canada	Iain Macgillivray, DG, Multilateral Development Institutions
DFID – UK	Rachel Lambert, Senior Agriculture Research Adviser, DFID Research
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation: David Bergvinson, Senior Program Officer, Agricultural Dev	
Netherlands	Armand Evers, Senior Policy Adviser/CGIAR liason Officer on behlaf of the Netherlands Government/Clustercoordinator Higher Education and Research
USAID – USA	Meredith Soule, Agricultural and Natural Resources Economist?
Emily Hogue, Jane Gore, Eric Whittey: Evaluation, monitoring and learning Specialists, rural development research and development	
World Bank	Jock Anderson, Consultant, Agriculture and Rural Development Dept
Eija Pehu	Agriculture and Rural Development Department

CGIAR TRUSTEE – World Bank

Ulrich Hess	CGIAR Fund Trustee (Multilateral Trusteeship and Innovative Financing)
Neil Ashar	Counsel, Legal Vice Presidency

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL HOSTING ARRANGEMENTS

Manoj Juneja	FAO Assistant DG- Administration and Finance

GLOBAL FORUM ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Mark Holderness	Executive Secretary

Annex 3: The Current Evaluation Work Load of the Centers

Numbers of Externally Commissioned Reviews and Evaluations						
Center	Period for which reported	Average Number Reviews & Evaluations per year	External Reviews Commissioned By:			
			ISPC/CGIAR	Challenge Fund	Center Board (CCERs)	Individual donor
CIMMYT	mid 2008-2010	10	1	1	1	12
CIP	2007-11	3			4	8
CIAT	2006-11	1.8	2	1		6
ICARDA	2006-10	3	2		6	8
ILRI	2008-9	5	n/s		4	5
Bioversity	2007-10	2.3	1		3	5
CIFOR	2007-9	2.0	1		1	4+
Average 7 Centers		**3.8**				
Percentage by number of evaluations			9%	3%	25%	63%
Average number of external reviewers per evaluation/review was 2.6 with a median range of 1-3						
Average duration of missions was 12 days with the great majority being 1-2 weeks but the EPMR reported being one month						
Source: Center responses to consultant team						

Annex 4: Documents and Publications Consulted by the Consultants During the Inception Phase

We are grateful to staff and partners of CGIAR institutions for sharing many of these documents with us. We encourage people to point out any important documents we have missed. As well as those listed, we have also looked at the draft CRPs and a number of individual reviews CCERs and EPMRs that have been sent in by Centers as examples of useful evaluations and reviews.

Arivananthan, Meena, Peter Ballantyne, and Enrica M. Porcari. 2010. Benchmarking CGIAR research outputs for availability and accessibility [Article and Abstract]. *Agricultural Information Worldwide* 3, no. 1 (January 30): 17-22.

Bantilan, Cynthia, P. Mehta, S. Chandra, and J. Keatinge. 2008. Dealing with diversity in scientific outputs: implications for international research evaluation. *Research Evaluation* 13, no. 2: 87.

Byerlee, Derek, James Stevenson, Tim Kelley, Mywish Maredia, and Ross Connor. 2010. *Assessing the impacts of research-led agricultural technologies on poverty and hunger: Plans for a major new initiative by the CGIAR Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)*. SPIA Briefing Note, 3rd May 2010. http://impact.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/images/Povertybriefing.pdf.

CGIAR. 2009. *Voices for Change, the New CGIAR*, December 8 2009

CGIAR Consortium. 2011. *A Strategy and Results Framework for the CGIAR: For submission to the CGIAR Funders Forum, February 20, 2011*. http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/srf_feb20_2011.pdf.

CGIAR Fund Council. 2010. *Summary of inaugural meeting, February 23, 2010, Brussels*. http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/FC01_sop_march31_2010.pdf.

CGIAR Fund Office. n.d. *Principles and Options for an Independent Evaluation Arrangement for the CGIAR Fund. Summary*. Document for First Fund Council meeting in Brussels, 23 Feb 2010. http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc1_cgiar_iea_options.pdf.

———. 2010. *Exploring Options for an Independent Evaluation Arrangement for the CGIAR: Report on a Workshop held on January 20, 2010 in Washington DC*.

CGIAR Independent Review Panel. 2008. *Bringing together the best of science and the best of development: Independent Review of the CGIAR System Synthesis Report*. Independent Review of the CGIAR System. Report to the Executive Council. Also full technical report, at http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CBYQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.cgiar.org%2Fpdf%2Fagm08%2Fagm08_cgiar-technical-report.pdf&rct=j&q=bringing%20together%20the%20best%20of%20science%20and%20the%20best%20of%20development%20cgiar&ei=5Y2GTfSQB42LhQevyf3LBA&usg=AFQjCNGAIh2bFmx3tusBBxCUA_9kDpUHrA&cad=rja. http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/agm08/agm08_independent_review_synthesis_report.pdf.

Cooksy, Leslie. 2008. *Enhancing the Use of Ex post Evaluation of Outcomes and Impacts in the CGIAR: Summary of Key Issues*. Science Council, CGIAR. http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Impact_Assessment/epIA_Learning_Summary_Report_FINAL.pdf.

Douthwaite, Boru, Robert Delve, Javier Ekboir, and Steve Twomlow. 2003. Contending with Complexity: The Role of Evaluation in Implementing Sustainable Natural Resource Management. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 1, no. 1: 51-66.

Ekboir, Javier. 2003. Why impact analysis should not be used for research evaluation and what the alternatives are. *Agricultural Systems* 78, no. 2. Agricultural Systems: 166-184.

———. 2004. *Can Impact Analysis be Used for Research Evaluation?* CMMYT. http://infoagro.net/shared/docs/a2/ekboir.pdf.

GLOBAL DONOR PLATFORM FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT (GDPRD), FAO, and World Bank. 2008. *Tracking results in agriculture and rural development in less-than-ideal conditions: A sourcebook of indicators for monitoring and evaluation*. http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0380e/i0380e00.htm.

Görgens, Marelize, and Jody Zall Kusek. 2009. *Making Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Work: A Capacity Development Toolkit*. World Bank. http://intresources.worldbank.org/INTINFRES/Resources/2780429-1173474961747/Making_Monitoring_and_Evaluation_Systems_Work_2009.pdf.

Gormley, Wilma. 2001. *Selecting Partners: Practical Considerations for Forming Partnerships*. Tips and Tools Series #2. Organizational Change Program for the CGIAR-Supported International Agricultural Research Centers. http://www.trg-inc.com/resources/electronic_partnerships.pdf.

Haddad, Lawrence, Lindstrom Johanna, Pintoi Yvonne (2010): The Sorry State of M&E in Agriculture: Can People-Centred Approaches Help?

Hall, Andrew, V. Rasheed Sulaiman, Norman Clark, and B. Yoganand. 2003. From measuring impact to learning institutional lessons: an innovation systems perspective on improving the management of international agricultural research. *Agricultural Systems* 78, no. 2 (November): 213-241. doi:10.1016/S0308-521X(03)00127-6.

Hall, Andrew, and V. Rasheed Sulaiman. 2005. 11 - Innovation Systems Perspective: From Measuring Impact to Learning Institutional Lessons. http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-85054-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.

Horton, Douglas, Gordon Prain, and Gordon Prain. 2010. *Perspectives on Partnership:*

Highlights of a Literature Review. CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative. http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/briefs/ILAC_Brief25_Partnership.pdf.

IDL/TANGO. 2010. *Evaluation of Innovation Systems and Agricultural Research Programmes: Literature Review*. DFID, Research Into Use Programme. http://www.researchintouse.com/resources/riu10innovsys-litreviewdrft.pdf.

IDS Various authors. 2010. IDS Bulletin - Volume 41, Issue 6 - *People-centred M&E: Aligning Incentives So Agriculture Does More to Reduce Hunger* - Wiley Online Library. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezproxy.webfeat.lib.ed.ac.uk/doi/10.1111/idsb.2010.41.issue-6/issuetoc.

Jobin, Denis. 2008. A Transaction Cost-Based Approach to Partnership Performance Evaluation. *Evaluation* 14, no. 4 (October 1): 437 -465. doi:10.1177/1356389008095487.

Kelley, Timothy, Jim Ryan, and Hans Gregersen. 2008. Enhancing ex post impact assessment of agricultural research: the CGIAR experience. *Research Evaluation* 17, no. 3: 201-212.

Lahey, Robert. 2010. *The Canadian M&E System: Lessons Learned from 30 Years of Development*. World Bank Independent Evaluation Group. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEVACAPDEV/Resources/ecd_wp_23.pdf.

Lele, Uma, and Javier Ekboir. 2004. Technology Generation, Adaptation, Adoption and Impact: Towards a Framework for Understanding and Increasing Research Impact. In *A paper prepared for a reader on Food Security, edited by Dr. Manfred Shulz of Freie Universität Berlin*. World Bank. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2005/04/08/000090341_20050408113908/Rendered/PDF/319640TGAAI.pdf.

Lele, Uma, and Arthur A. Goldsmith. 1989. The Development of National Agricultural Research Capacity: India's Experience with the Rockefeller Foundation and Its Significance for Africa. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 37, no. 2 (January 1): 305-343.

Lele, Uma, Jules Pretty, Eugene Terry, and Eduardo Trigo. 2010. *Transforming Agricultural Research for Development*. The Global Forum for Agricultural Research (GFAR) Report for the Global Conference on Agricultural Research (GCARD) 2010. http://www.fao.org/docs/eims/upload//282426/GAT_Report_GCARD_2010_complete.pdf.

Lindstrom, Johanna. 2009. *What is the state of M&E in Agriculture? Findings of the ALINe online consultation survey*. ALINe. http://www.aline.org.uk/pool/what-is-the-state-of-mande-in-agriculture.pdf.

Louis Lengrand & Associés, PREST University of Manchester, ANRT (Association nationale de la recherche technique), and Reidev Ltd. 2006. *Smart innovation: A Practical Guide to Evaluating Innovation Programmes*. Brussels-Luxembourg: European Commisison: DG Enterprise and Industry. ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/innovation-policy/studies/sar1_smartinnovation_master2.pdf.

Mackay, Ronald, and Douglas Horton. 2003. Expanding the use of impact assessment and evaluation in agricultural research and development. *Agricultural Systems* 78, no. 2 (November): 143-165. doi:10.1016/S0308-521X(03)00124-0.

Maredia, Mywish, Derek Byerlee, and Jock Anderson. Ex Post Evaluation of Economic Impacts of Agricultural Research Programs: A Tour of Good Practice. In . nd. http://xsei.centrogeo.org.mx/vedet/biblioteca/val_eco_deg/ExpostEconoImpacAgri.pdf.

Maredia, Mywish K. 2009. *Improving the Proof: Evolution of and Emerging Trends in Impact Assessment Methods and Approaches in Agricultural Development*. IFPRI Discussion Paper 00929. Washington DC: IFPRI. http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/ifpridp00929.pdf.

Mayne, John. 2008. *Building an Evaluative Culture for Effective Evaluation and Results Management*. CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative. http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/52535/2/ILAC_WorkingPaper_No8_EvaluativeCulture_Mayne.pdf.

Melamed, Claire. 2011. *Does development give poor people what they want?* Background Note.

London: Overseas Development Institute, February. http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/5360.pdf.

OECD. 1997. *The Evaluation of Scientific Research: Selected Experiences*. Paris: ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT. http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/9/26/2754549.pdf.

———. 2006. *Government R&D Funding and Company Behaviour: Measuring Behavioural Additionality*. OECD Publishing.

Okubo, Yoshiko. 1997. *Bibliometric Indicators and Analysis of Research Systems: Methods and Examples*. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers. OECD Publishing. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/fulltext/5lgsjhvj7ng0.pdf?expires=1297356346&id=0000&accname=guest&checksum=1CAD780919BF25E4B515D610B40B710F.

Perrin, Burt. 2000. How to — and How Not to — Evaluate Innovation. Paper presented at the UK Evaluation Society Conference http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/perrin.htm.

Raitzer, David A., and Timothy G. Kelley. 2008. Assessing the contribution of impact assessment to donor decisions for international agricultural research. *Research Evaluation* 17, no. 3: 187-199.

Renkow, Mitch, and Derek Byerlee. 2010. The impacts of CGIAR research: A review of recent evidence. *Food Policy* 35, no. 5 (October): 391-402. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.04.006.

Rovere, Roberto La, and John Dixon. 2007. *CIMMYT. Operational guidelines for assessing the impact of agricultural research on livelihoods. Good practices from CIMMYT*. CIMMYT. http://apps.cimmyt.org/english/docs/manual/ia/contents.htm.

Sagasti, Francisco, and Vanessa Timmer. 2008. *An Approach to the CGIAR as a Provider of International Public Goods*. Background report to the 2008 System-Wide Review of the CGIAR System. http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/ir_sagasti_timmer.pdf.

Smith, Gordon C S, and Jill P Pell. 2003. Parachute use to prevent death and major trauma related to gravitational challenge: systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 327, no. 7429 (December 20): 1459 -1461. doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7429.1459.

Spencer, Dunstan, Stein W Bie, Ursula Blackshaw, and Anne Thomson. 2005. *Evaluation of DFID's Renewable Natural Resources Research Strategy (RNRRS)*. Evaluation Report EVD659. UK Department for International Development. http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/performance/files/ev659.asp.

Surr, Martin, Andrew Barnett, Alex Duncan, Melanie Speight, David Bradley, Alan Rew, and John Toye. 2002. *Research For Poverty Reduction: DFID Research Policy Paper.* London: UK Department for International Development. http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/0708/DOC10654.pdf.

The Boston Consulting Group. 2009. *Design and Establishment of the Consortium of CGIAR Centers: Final report*. Report submitted to the CGIAR Alliance. October. http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/cgiar/Documents/final_report_design_of_consortium_of_cgiar_centers_6oct09.pdf.

UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group) (2005) *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*

UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group) (2005) *Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*

UN OIOS. 2008. *Review of results-based management (RBM) at the United Nations Secretariat* United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services. http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N08/458/06/PDF/N0845806.pdf?OpenElement.

Various authors. 2000. Special issue on data and strategies in evaluating public R&D. *Research Evaluation* 9, no. 2. http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/beech/rev/2000/00000009/00000002;jsessionid=tr4zhh1b9uqh.alexandra.

Walker, T., M. Maredia, T. Kelley, R. La Rovere, D. Templeton, G. Thiele, and B. Douthwaite. 2008. *Strategic Guidance for Ex Post Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research*. Prepared for the

Standing Panel on Impact Assessment, CGIAR Science Council. Science Council Secretariat: Rome, Italy. http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Impact_Assessment/SC_epIA_low-res_for_web.pdf.

Watts, Jamie, Douglas Horton, Boru Douthwaite, Roberto La Rovere, Graham Thiele, Shambu Prasad, And Charles Staver. 2008. Transforming Impact Assessment: Beginning the Quiet Revolution of Institutional Learning and Change. *Experimental Agriculture* 44, no. 01: 21-35. doi:10.1017/S0014479707005960.

Whitty, Brendan. 2010. *An accountability framework for technological innovation*. ILAC Briefing 24. CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative. http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/briefs/ILAC_Brief24_Accountability.pdf.

World Bank ARDD. 2006. *Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: How to Go Beyond the Strengthening of Research Systems*. Washington DC: World Bank Agriculture and Rural Development Department. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/Enhancing_Ag_Innovation.pdf.

World Bank OED. 2004. *The CGIAR at 31: An Independent Meta-Evaluation of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research*. World Bank Operations Evaluation Department. http://wwwwds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2004/03/16/000090341_20040316114317/Rendered/PDF/281310PAPER0CGIAR0at0310see0also025926.pdf