

CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary					
Table of Contents	Panel Lead	Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)	March 31	April 30 [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	May 17 [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
<b>1. Introduction</b>	Chair/ Secretaries				
<b>2. Context</b>					
2.1. Challenges in 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Gopal Chadha	Analysis of major recent studies and reports on Agriculture and Development.	Research complete and paper is being written.		
2.2 International Institutional Architecture for Development and Agriculture.	Keith Bezanson	Analysis of Monterrey and Paris Declarations, IFAD, WFP and FAO evaluations and other key documents on the international aid architecture and international agriculture policy and institutions such as the IAASTD and Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. <sup>i</sup>	Research under way.  Summary for Inception Report Final Section		
2.3 Role of Public Goods In Agriculture	Keith Bezanson	The panel member will rely on his own publications and recent work on agriculture and development institutions to complete this section and will draw Dr. Sagasti and Vanessa Timmins as consultants. TORS. <sup>ii</sup>	In concept review phase. Sagasti/Timmer Report in final draft stage.		
2.4 The Role of Civil Society in Scientific Research	John Mugabe		Short section to set the stage for the partnership discussion.		

<b>CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary</b>					
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Panel Lead</b>	<b>Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)</b>	<b>March 31</b>	<b>April 30</b> [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	<b>May 17</b> [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
<b>3. CGIAR and the Centers</b>					
3.1 Mission	Karin Perkins	History of the Evolution of the Mission	Done		
3.2 The CGIAR System	Karin Perkins	Description of the CG	Final Draft		
3.3 The Centers	Karin Perkins	Descriptive	4 of 6 sections done		
3.3.1 Center Governance	Karin Perkins	Descriptive			
3.3.2 Centers and Regional Offices	Karin Perkins	Descriptive	Table of regional offices being cleared with Centres. Will include field offices as well in final draft .		
3.3.3 Scientists	Karin Perkins	Descriptive data by national and international recruits.	Data collected		
3.3.4 Partners	John Mugabe with Karin Perkins	Descriptive			
3.3.5 Centre Research and Research Agenda	Jeff Waage with Karin Perkins	Descriptive			

CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary					
Table of Contents	Panel Lead	Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)	March 31	April 30 [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	May 17 [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
3.3.6 Challenge Programs	Jeff Waage with Karin Perkins	Descriptive	Data Collected		
3.4 Financing the CGIAR	Karin Perkins	<b>Consultant : Joan Barclay</b> ( see section 7)	Examination of Donor and non donor funding 2001-2007		
<b>4. Partnerships</b>	John Mugabe				
4.1 Why Partnerships Matter			Research and interviews with NARS and other Partners underway. Presented early outline in London Panel meeting		
4.2 Typology of CGIAR Partnerships			Under development: building on Bezanson Study on CG Partnerships.		
4.3 The Donor Partnership		EMcAllister interview with CIDA, IDRC, USAID. Watson interview with USAID. Cosponsors interviews with UNDP (McAllister), Panel Interview with FAO and IFAD. Panel has met with EAIRD management committee,			

CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary					
Table of Contents	Panel Lead	Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)	March 31	April 30 [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	May 17 [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
4.4 CGIAR Global Partners		<i>Consultant – Inge Kaul</i> TORS <sup>iii</sup>	Consultant directed to rethink draft to provide evidence and case studies to defend governance recommendations.		
4.5 CG NARS and ARIs Partnerships (ISNAR Case Study)			Telephone interviews have been held.		
4.6 CGIAR NGO Partnerships		<i>Consultant: Godber Tumushabe</i> TORS. <sup>iv</sup>	Consultant hired and Outline has been prepared.		
4.7 CG Private Sector Partnerships	John Mugabe				
4.8 CG Inter-Center Partnerships	John Mugabe				
4.9 Emerging Issues and Conclusions	John Mugabe				
5. Achievements of the Centers					
5.1 Quality, Relevance and Impact of the Science	Gopal Chadha	See Joshi TORS Endnote 111			

<b>CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary</b>					
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Panel Lead</b>	<b>Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)</b>	<b>March 31</b>	<b>April 30</b> [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	<b>May 17</b> [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
5.1.1 Analysis of the Relevance of the Science	Jeff Waage with Karin Perkins		See Endnote on Approach and Progress by Jeffv		
5.1.2. Analysis of the Quality of the CG Outputs	Jeff Wagge	Consultant :Chris Gibbs. TORS.vi	See Endnote on Gibbs Progressvii A paper of approximately 25-30 pages addressing the seven questions and contributing as appropriate to the TORs questions.		
5.1.3 Analysis of Impact	Gopal Chadha	Consultant :Dr. Joshi TORS See full TORS in endnoteviii: i) Direct Positive Impact; ii) Indirect Positive Impact: e.g. iii) Unintended Impact; iv) Addressing the Newer Problems			

<b>CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary</b>					
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Panel Lead</b>	<b>Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)</b>	<b>March 31</b>	<b>April 30</b> [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	<b>May 17</b> [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
5.2 CGIAR Science Management Reforms	Jeff Waage	See Jeff Waage Endnote on Approach. Consultant John Lynam. TORS. <sup>ix</sup>	Analysis of reforms underway. Further meeting with Science Council In Nairobi.  First Draft Circulated for Discussion		
5.2.1 Science Council	Jeff Waage	See Jeff Waage Endnote			
5.2 .2 Challenge Programs	Jeff Waage	See Jeff Waage Endnote			

<b>CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary</b>					
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Panel Lead</b>	<b>Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)</b>	<b>March 31</b>	<b>April 30</b> [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	<b>May 17</b> [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
5.3 Integration of Gender in the Science Agenda	Elizabeth McAllister	Panel Member will look at institutional incentives present in CG System for ensuring accountability for addressing gender issues in research, development and policy mandates of the Centers. In conjunction with IFRI a self assessment of the Centers' adoption of gender assessment in the science has been undertaken. A survey of DGs and DDGs has been undertaken on Center action on gender. Follow up interviews are completed and a report is being written up by IFPRI Taskforce on Gender. The Review Survey included a number of questions on gender and is being analyzed. Results from the 2007 Participatory Research and Gender Analysis Evaluation have been analysed. EPMRs have been analyzed for coverage of gender. (Very little coverage).	Analysis of these instruments and reports and the results of questions posed to Centers during the center visits will be synthesized for the reports coverage of gender. The WDR and other literature on women and agriculture will be consulted.		
6. Governance					

CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary					
Table of Contents	Panel Lead	Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)	March 31	April 30 [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	May 17 [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
Governance Reforms 6.1.1 to 6.1.8	Ken Watson Meyer Burstein	Review and analyse history of reform proposals in the CGIAR. Review and analyse models of governance for international networks of science/innovation based centers.	History of reforms in first draft	History of reforms in 2 <sup>nd</sup> . draft. Science-based networks governance models in 1 <sup>st</sup> . draft.	
6.1.9 Governance Scenarios	Panel				
6.2 Management					
6.2.1 Executive Management	Keith Bezanson	Francisco Sagasti			
6.2.2 Central Admin and Services (Secretariat and Systems Office)	Keith Bezanson	Franciso Sagasti			
6.2.3 The Alliance	Keith Bezanson and Elizabeth McAllister	Panel interviews of the Alliance office; McAllister interviewed the Alliance (title/) Anne-Marie Izac. Documents review on meetings of the Alliance, history and positions of the Alliance.	Interviews complete		
6.3 Role and Performance of the World Bank	Elizabeth McAllister with Ken Watson		Interviews complete with Sector Board, CGIAR Chair and with OED (IED) Staff.		
6.4 Center Governance					

<b>CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary</b>					
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Panel Lead</b>	<b>Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)</b>	<b>March 31</b>	<b>April 30</b> [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	<b>May 17</b> [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
6.5 Managing for Results	Elizabeth McAllister	Uses of performance management and measurement systems will be examined for their coherence with CGIAR System policy and strategy.			
6.5.2 Results Based Framework	Elizabeth McAllister	Will add more before Friday.			
6.5.2 Evaluation in the CGIAR: PMS, EPMRs, Reviews and Studies	Ken Watson				
6.6 Knowledge Management and IPRs	John Mugabe				
6.7 Gender and Diversity	Elizabeth McAllister	IA basic review of institutional practices for eliminating institutional barriers will be reviewed to establish a base for reviewing the quality of the review and the tracking progress on the results.	This section will be a meta review of the 2003 Evaluation on the Gender and Diversity Program and the Management Response. Progress on the recommendations will be analysed.		

CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary					
Table of Contents	Panel Lead	Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)	March 31	April 30 [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	May 17 [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
<b>7. Financial MGT</b>	Ken Watson	Consultant :Joan Barclay Related Questions: (A) Costs. What are the CGIAR System and Centers' costs in total and by activity? What are the "core activity" and "overhead" costs of the CGIAR? How do costs vary by Center? What are the driving factors? Are reforms needed? What are the costs of the administrative superstructure?			
7.1 Funding of the Centers	Karin Perkins		An analysis of donor and non donor restricted and non restricted funds over 10 years has been completed,		
7.2 Costs of the CG	Ken Watson Karin Perkins	Consultant :Joan Barclay (A) Costs What are the CGIAR System and Centers' costs in total and by activity?	Annual Reports and financial reports of all centers are being analyzed. Sources and uses of funds are analyzed relative to research institutions benchmarks.		

<b>CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary</b>					
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Panel Lead</b>	<b>Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)</b>	<b>March 31</b>	<b>April 30</b> [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	<b>May 17</b> [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
7.3 Resource Allocations	Ken Watson		Discussion draft circulated to Secretariat in March.		
7.4 Financial Risk Mgt. (including EC funding case and CIAT case)	Ken Watson	Consultant :Joan Barclay (B) Financial Management. 1.Do the Centers manage their finances well? 2.Are the internal and external audits adequate? 3.Do the Centers keep sufficient reserves? 4. What is the appropriate role of the System Office in financial management and what has its performance been?			
<b>8. Findings and Recommendations</b>	Chair with Panel				
<b>Appendices</b>					
<b>1. Questions Asked of the Panel and Panel Answers</b>	All Panel Members				
<b>2. Commentaries on this Report</b>	Karin Perkins	Consolidated Commentaries collated from point of Circulation Report to closure of the Stakeholder's workshop			

<b>CGIAR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL Work Plan Summary</b>					
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Panel Lead</b>	<b>Description of Work (Contracts and TORs where applicable)</b>	<b>March 31</b>	<b>April 30</b> [General target = first draft material for Panel consideration in mid-May]	<b>May 17</b> [Completion of Panel Meeting in Ottawa]
<b>3. Survey of Key Participants</b>	Ken Watson	275 individuals surveyed representing Donor Representatives, Science Council Members, Directors General of Centers, Deputy Directors General of a Center, Chairs of Center Boards and System Office professional staff . Questionnaires sought views on the quality of the Science and Challenge Programs, funding issues, governance issues, gender and diversity, and the CG's capacity to reform. Scaled questions test the importance and effectiveness of the System components in these areas, and opened ended questions seek respondents reactions and invite open feedback.	Target response rate = 70%  Analysis of the scaled and qualitative data now underway.		
<b>4. Bibliography</b>	Karin Perkins with Joan Bell				
<b>Endnotes</b>					
<b>Annexes ( Separate Cover)</b>					

---

<sup>i</sup> The **IAASTD** is a multinational and multi-institutional exercise meant to evaluate the relevance, quality and effectiveness of agricultural knowledge, science, and technology (AKST); and effectiveness of public and private sector policies as well as institutional arrangements in relation to AKST. It is meant to be **multi-thematic**, addresses nutritional security, livelihoods, human health, and environmental sustainability; **multi-spatial**, combining global and sub-global assessments; **multi-temporal**, taking a short- and long-term perspective (now to 2050); **integrates** local knowledge with institutional knowledge and looks at policy and institutional issues in light of history and plausible future scenarios.

<sup>ii</sup> **TORS Questions:** (1) \*Has the CGIAR system maintained its focus on global or international public goods? (2) \* Is the CGIAR efficient and suited to the development and dissemination of the international public goods? (3) \* Use the IEG Guidelines for evaluating Global Programs, which includes, for example, questions on the fairness of representation in decision-making bodies.

<sup>iii</sup> Questions: 1. Identify and give examples (3-5 cases) of the different types of successful global partnerships (that have been established in the two past decades or so) in such areas/sectors as health (e.g. AIDS) and the environment – what are the 3-5 successful (efficient and effective global partnerships? 2. Discuss reasons/aims for the establishment of the global partnerships – what stimulated the formation of the identified global partnerships? Or what are the goals and aims of the partnerships? 3. Analyze the governance and funding of the global partnerships – how are the identified global partnerships governed and funded? 4. Identify and analyze the characteristics of such partnerships in order to identify factors or conditions that have made them to be successful: in particular 5. What are the key attributes of success in (a) raising and sustaining sufficient funding; (b) reducing transactions' costs relative to the benefits of the partnerships; and (c) managing and demonstrating performance? Draw lessons for the CGIAR – What are the reference points or benchmarks for assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of CGIAR partnerships? 7. What can CGIAR learn from identified successful global partnerships?

<sup>iv</sup> What kinds of research and technological innovation partnerships were developed between CGIAR, the Centers and NGOs? The study should provide illustrative cases of scientific research, policy advocacy, technology diffusion, capacity building, etc. projects or activities of CGIAR-NGO partnerships. How were the partnerships formed, formalized (e.g. MOUs), funded and governed? Do NGOs participate in setting research priorities? What kinds of resources do they bring to the partnerships with CGIAR and the Centers? How much time, effort and resources were invested to coordinate the partnerships? What are the outputs and impacts of the CGIAR-NGOs partnerships? How are the benefits from the partnerships (joint projects or collaborative activities) shared between the CGIAR (and the Centers) and the NGOs? What kinds of explicit strategies have the CGIAR and its Centers deployed to engage NGOs in the partnerships? Did the partnerships face any risks and conflicts? What kinds of risks and conflicts? And how were the risks reduced and conflicts resolved? What lessons have or can the CGIAR and the Centers draw from their partnerships with NGOs? What measures should the CGIAR and the Centers take to improve the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of their partnerships with NGOs?

<sup>v</sup> [Jeff Waage on 5.2 CGIAR Science Management Reforms:](#)

The key science reforms in the CGIAR system since 2001 have been the establishment of the Challenge Programmes and Science Council (SC), and the development by SC of the System Priorities. An analysis of the effectiveness of each of these will involve a stakeholder survey, visits to a selection of Centres and analysis of reports and reviews.

---

For the Science Council, the activities of each of its four Standing Panels will be examined, in terms of outputs relative to mission, and a comparison will be made of the performance of the SC as a whole relative to the original objectives and expectations reflected in the Change Development Management Team proposal and subsequent documents which developed the purpose and design of the SC. This analysis will draw upon the SC reports to the Executive Council and AGM and other SC documentation. Across the range of its activities, where has SC been most successful in achieving its original objectives and where has it not? Has it engaged the global agricultural research community better in CGIAR research? Has it provided Centers with the timely support on science issues and strategy which they want? What factors have contributed to both?

The System Priorities were developed through an extensive process implemented by the interim SC and SC. They serve a range of objectives, but particularly that of achieving greater coherence in the research portfolio carried out by the 15 Centres, reducing “dispersion” of research and linking capabilities across Centres. As they have turned out, these Priorities reflect very much the breadth core competencies of the Centres and with a few exceptions regarding new areas of collective research, map well onto existing research activities in Centers. Achieving greater coherence through these Priorities will now depend on their implementation mechanisms, including Framework Plans and resource allocation strategies. This meta-review will draw upon SC documentation on the development of System Priorities, augmented by the questionnaire and interviews, and will examine how effective the process of setting up the System Priorities been in achieving original objectives. It will consider how likely it is that System Priorities can be implemented so as to achieve greater system coherence and deliver CGIAR objectives with respect to poverty reduction and food security.

The Challenge Programmes process was initiated in 2001, to establish a portfolio of time-bound, independently-governed programs of high impact research, that targets the CGIAR goals in relation to complex issues of overwhelming global and/or regional significance, and requires partnerships between a wide range of institutions in order to deliver its products. Most have now been reviewed, as have System-Wide and Eco-regional Programmes, and these reviews, together with “lessons learned” documents and reports of the programmes will be used to answer whether Challenge Programmes have (1) improved CGIAR global relevance and impact, (2) increased coordination amongst Centres, (3) improved external partnerships and (4) mobilized more and more stable financing for Centres. This will involve comparison of Challenge Programme activity in Centres with core research. Does a mix of core research activities, Challenge Programmes and other inter-Centre research programmes now present a clearly delineated set of approaches to CGIAR research which are necessary and sufficient to deliver its research priorities?

<sup>vi</sup> Questions: What kinds of outputs have been generated by Centers over the period? What has been the quality of these outputs, and is there evidence that this has changed between EPMPR’s? What is the probable cause of this change? How have outputs and their evaluation been affected by changes in the CGIAR, e.g. System Priorities, Performance Measurement, Science Council advice, Challenge Programs? What recommendations have been made to improve outputs, outcomes and impacts, and how have Centers responded to these? Which stakeholders are the principle users of Center outputs and what outcomes do they generate? Have these outcomes changed in quantity or nature between EPMPRs? What kinds of impacts have been generated by Centers over the period? Has there been a change in impacts, impact assessment or impact “culture”? Outputs, outcomes and impacts? Consultant’s Deliverables: A data collection and analysis work plan to address the questions. Participate in the Panel discussions and dialogue on this topic.

---

vii **Progress made by Chris Gibbs:**

**Looking for Impacts: An Interim Report on an Assessment of CGIAR  
External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs)**

**Task**

This work forms part of the background to the Fourth Independent Review of the CGIAR. The specific task is to review EPMRs and related documents to identify and assess conclusions on outputs, outcomes and impacts among the 15 CGIAR Centers. A summarized TOR is attached that identifies three sub-tasks and nine questions.

**Approach**

The approach being taken for each Center is to review the two most recent EPMRs as pairs.

For seven Centers, there is a pair of EPMRs that post-dates the last Independent Panel Review in 1998 (IITA, IWMI, ICARDA, WARDA, ICLARM/Worldfish, CIP and CIAT). For the remaining eight, only one EPMR has been completed since the previous Independent Panel Review (IRRI, IFPRI, CIMMYT, ICRISAT, CIFOR, ICRAF, IPGRI and ILRI) and the previous EPMR pre-dates the Independent Panel Review.

By pairing EPMRs it should be possible to detect the influence of the of the last Independent Review Panel (1998), the Change Design and Management Process (1999) and the subsequent steps taken to reform the CGIAR System. When there are two post-1998 EPMRs, the effect of the reform process would be expected to be stronger.

Substantively, the logic of the EPMR assessment process is that, when successful, Center outputs translate into outputs, and outputs translate into impacts where, for example: (i) a principal indicator of **output** is good scientific output – a “global public good” – measured by publications in high-quality, refereed journals; (ii) a principal indicator of **outcome** is placement of new varieties with NARS and their adoption by farmers; and (iii) a principal indicator of **impact** is improvements in productivity or technology that reduce poverty or make production systems more sustainable. Because the CGIAR recognizes that most developing country farmers are women an indicator of gender has been also added

Conceptually, the assessment is structured as follows to look within and between EPMRs:

Assessment of first EPMR	Assessment of second EPMR	Change or difference between first and second EPMR and its cause?
Center context	Center context	?
Outputs	Outputs	?
Outcomes	Outcomes	?
Impacts	Impacts	?
Summary	Summary	?
Gender note	Gender note	?
Overall assessment or rating	Overall assessment or rating	?

### Progress made

To date, The consultant has reviewed all of the 15 Centers and drafted working reports using a framework based as directly as possible on the template above. Examples of these drafts are provided to give an indication of the nature of their content and value building blocks.

### Overall comments after 6 reports reviewed:

Recognizing that EPMRs are complex documents both to prepare and to assess, some overall comments based on reviews so far, are:

- EPMR teams have very distinguished members that produce thoughtful, insightful and highly professional reports;
- As reports, EPMRs follow a broadly similar pattern but they are quite variable in their orientation and level of detail making comparative analysis quite difficult;
- However, because of their diverse membership and the changing operational contexts of Centers, each EPMR tends to have its own character;
- Successive EPMRs tend not to read as if they are two parts of a continuing story, except in the very broadest sense;
- Sometimes, the emphasis and specific recommendations of successive EPMRs are completely different (e.g. ICARDA's Fourth and Fifth EPMRs);
- Most EPMRs are lengthy documents that seek to be thorough and address all aspects of Center activity: their volume is considerable and detail is plentiful;

- 
- Few EPMRs aim for brevity (e.g. ICRISAT's Fifth EPMR is an exception) even though the iSC has asked to reduce the cost of the review process;
  - None of the documents reviewed so far achieves the 50-page guideline provided to recent EPMR Panels: they all exceed it;
  - EPMR statements are mainly qualitative: simple tabulations of results are not usually provided, even when they are central, e.g. numbers of accessions, cultivar releases and publications;
  - Some EPMRs make clear evaluative statements but typically the language is reserved and criticism is almost always paired with praise to "soften the blow"
  - Post-2000, the SC emphasis on scientific publication as a measure of performance is clear in EPMRs, although the assessment of these outputs is uneven among EPMRs;
  - Nevertheless, EPMRs still "hedge their bets" by asking (as the CGIAR appears to do) for both high performance "upstream" in the form of good science that is a "global public good" and "relevance" downstream in the form of applications that are efficient, effective, equitable socially and environmentally sound. This results in report recommendations that appear to want to "have it both ways";
  - The relationship between levels of "outputs" and levels of resources (inputs) are typically not drawn beyond a general desire for "improved prioritization of the research agenda" where expected "impacts" drive a strategic agenda. Actual "impact" measurement is usually related to investments that were made from 10 to 20 years earlier and their value as a guide to future investment is limited; and
  - Gender is pretty consistently ignored.

## Key issues

Looking specifically for indicators of success of the reform process in terms of outputs etc., a number of issues are apparent:

- There is a general lack of clarity and consistency in use among EPMRs of key terms, such as output, outcome, impact and science quality;
- EPMR Panels tend to define "outputs" far more narrowly than the Centers do;
- EPMR Panels tend to see "outputs" mainly as germplasm releases and scientific publications;
- Centers tend to see a broader and more diverse set of "outputs" that include expanded germplasm collections, new cultivar releases, maps and databases, partnerships, capacity building and training courses, as well as publications of all kinds;
- "Outcomes" (real world applications of outputs beyond the walls of the Centers) seem to receive the least attention from both the EPMR Panels and from Centers, i.e. a "missing middle";
- "Impacts" are understood fairly consistently to mean adoption rates and rates of return, although the methods employed to measure impact are commonly criticized by EPMRs for being methodologically weak;
- "Science quality" is a frequently used term that lacks consistent definition. EPMR Panels regard quality as something "strategic" measured by publication in peer-reviewed, high-quality science journals that are frequently cited. Centers tend to see science quality as something

---

rigorous, related to both processes and outputs, but tempered by relevance and impact (regional or commodity), and influenced by staffing and the maintenance of a critical mass of facilities and skills;

- As soon as you move from plant genetics for crop productivity improvement into natural resource management or policy research, the nature of outputs: (i) as “science” measurable by publications in top journals, and (ii) something strategic of global/international importance is weakened;
- Because Centers and the CGIAR tend at times to pull – and be pulled – in opposite directions (i.e. the “upstream” – “downstream” pull), it makes deciding what “outputs, outcomes and impacts” are legitimate; and
- These factors make it difficult to develop a clear and consistent metric to evaluate Center performance.

## Conclusion

The approach being taken should produce results but because of the diversity of EPMRs, findings will be more qualitative, less clear-cut and more nuanced than they should be given the long history of EPMRs in the CGIAR.

### viii **Consultant Dr JOSHI**

The consultant will conduct a meta-review of the impact of CGIAR research in achieving productivity improvement and rural poverty reduction. The sources of information are CGIAR-driven impact studies, including those of Centers and of the Science Council Standing Panel on Impact Assessment. The research will also involve a study and analysis of the whole range of impact studies conducted by the CGIAR system itself and various external agencies, under each of the five System Priority areas, encompassing, on the one hand, the Center’s viewpoint or claims, and on the other hand independent assessments made by the whole lot of external agencies. To understand Centers’ claims the consultant will refer to *inter alia* Centers’ Annual Reports, Centers’ vision documents, and CCERs. The consultant shall refer to EPMRs, individual CGIAR member-commissioned evaluations (such as World Bank-OED Meta Evaluation), other donor-supported studies, etc., in addition to core CGIAR documents such as the CGIAR Charter, CGIAR/Executive Board decisions, etc., to take note of what non-Center agencies have to say about the Centers’ impacts. Finally, views of independent scholars, researchers, public analysts, in academic writings, would also prove to be informative, especially for drawing our attention to any unintended impacts.

4. Depending upon the diversity of mandates among the CG-Centres, as also the multi-disciplinary nature of their functioning, (single/multiple crop; natural resource management; policy improvement, etc.) and the concrete evidence that the numerous published reports and evaluation studies uncover, Consultant will endeavor to classify the impact of past investment into the following three categories, besides framing ideas about the future research vision of the CGIAR system, especially for addressing the newly emerging problems:

#### **i) Direct Positive Impact**

- a) yield improvement and productivity growth (some quantitative estimates for crops such as wheat, rice, maize, vegetables, fruit, and non-crop products such as livestock products, fish, forest products, etc.);

---

or

policy improvements at the global and national level (state interventions in marketing and trade regimes; R & D, IPR and smallholding agriculture; crucial role of infrastructure and other institutional support; public-private partnerships in agricultural investment; farm-firm-fork linkages; rural diversification, employment promotion, and poverty alleviation; food security versus biofuel development; improving human nutrition and health, etc.);

or

Natural Resource Management ( preservation of plant genetic resources: gene banks; influencing and shaping of (i) convention on biological diversity; (ii) framework convention on climate change; (iii) international treaty on plant genetic resources; (iv) millennium ecosystem report, etc.; combating desertification, etc.).

- b) expanded agricultural employment, especially for female workers;
- c) improved agricultural wage rates;
- d) higher total earnings from agriculture; and
- e) other improvements.

**ii) Indirect Positive Impact:**

- a) greater food security among smallholders;
- b) brisker functioning of land-lease market;
- c) intensive cultivation by land-scarce farm operators;
- d) expanding non-farm employment;
- e) higher total household earnings;
- f) more enlightened resource conservation (e.g. less poaching of forest land by the landless and the land-poor households; healthier crop rotation etc.)
- g) other improvements (e.g. improving human capital; augmented farm-nonfarm linkages; poor-friendly food price regime; impact on urban poverty etc.).

**iii) Unintended Impact:**

- a) unequal gains and agrarian disparities/unrest;
- b) land fatigue and technological lulls (slackness or stagnation in yield rates among crops and regions);

- 
- c) unsustainable pace of resource depletion (over-chemicalization of land; excessive withdrawal of ground water, etc.)

#### iv) Addressing the Newer Problems

5. The major challenges that future research in agriculture, in tandem with other associated disciplines, has to contend with, to ensure that food security in the developing world in general, and smallholders in particular, is not jeopardized, and that the pro-poor mission of the CGIAR system, especially terms of minimizing biodiversity losses and preservation of land, water and forest resources, proceeds unabated, say, in 2020 and beyond, are getting well documented and accepted by national and international development agencies.

6. Apart from consulting the references described above, the Consultant will look through vision documents of the Centers and the Science Council (a System Priorities 2005-2015); FAO projections; Policy Submissions of the Inter-governmental Council for Climate Change and other global development agencies connected with agriculture in the developing world; vision documents of a few NARSs, especially those connected with such crop production activities as are likely to face increasing competition between human and animal consumption, on the one hand, and increasing crop output drafted for ethanol and other bio-fuel production, on the other. An attempt would be made, *albeit* sketchily, to see if the CGIAR research agenda is steadily moving towards addressing the problems arising out of:

- a) fall-out of climate change (changing intensity and pattern of rainfall; storms, floods, droughts, etc.);
- b) land degradation (land fatigue; fragmentation and marginalization of farm holdings, over- and imbalanced use of chemical fertilizers, etc.);
- c) increasing water scarcity (depletion of ground water resources; increasing incidence of brackish water; undiluted resort to water intensive crop combinations, etc.);

<sup>ix</sup> Questions: 1. How has the process for setting systems priorities, led by the Science Council, contributed to CGIAR's strategic alignment? 2. How well do the system priorities position the CGIAR with respect to its mission? 3. What forces are affecting programs and decision-making in regard to the system priorities? Is this (the system priorities) the most effective focus to alleviate poverty? 4. How effective are the Challenge Programs in terms of addressing issues of global relevance and improving the science and impact of the CGIAR?

Related Questions to be addressed: 1. How the System Priorities have evolved? 2. How they align CGIAR research with development needs and opportunities? 3. How the CGIAR aligns its research with its development mission, creating a framework for accountability?

4. How it aligns its research with organizational structures and operating modalities to improve effectiveness and responsiveness?

Additional Questions: 1. What models and "best practice" contribute to aligning scientific research with development priorities? 2. What are the implications for partnerships, impact and innovation systems? 3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the CGIAR approach to setting priorities to implement its mandate? 4. Has the CGIAR reform process improved CGIAR priority setting? 5. What actions might improve the development impact of priority setting?