

INCEPTION REPORT

Post-AGM 2007 Revision

Independent Review of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR System)

Review Panel
Elizabeth J. McAllister, Chair

Panel:
Dr. Keith Bezanson
Dr. Gopal Chadha
Dr. John Mugabe
Dr. Jeff Waage

Secretaries:
Ms. Karin Perkins
Dr. Kenneth Watson

February 2008

Acknowledgements

The Review Panel wishes to acknowledge the extensive assistance of the Centers, partners, the CGIAR System Office, and the ExCo ad hoc Advisory Panel in preparing this report.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the Review Panel, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the CGIAR or its shareholders.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The CGIAR System
- 1.2. The Objectives of the CGIAR Independent Review
- 1.3. The CGIAR Results-Based Framework
- 1.4. Previous Reviews
- 1.5. The Review Panel, Secretaries and Consultants
- 1.6. The Advisory Group and Commentators
- 1.7. Change Management
- 1.8. Limitations of the Review

2. Scope of the Independent Review

- 2.1. General Scope of the Review
- 2.2. Client for the Review
- 2.3. Period to be Reviewed (2002-2007)
- 2.4. Review Questions
- 2.5. Consultant Support
- 2.6. Products of the Review

3. Methodology

- 3.1. Review Standards (IEG Guidelines)
- 3.2. Information Sources and Analysis Methods
- 3.3. Visits to Centers
- 3.4. Surveys and Interviews
- 3.5. Exit Workshops

4. Focus of the Review

- 4.1. Governance
- 4.2. Effectiveness of the Centers
- 4.3. Partnerships

5. Work Plans

- 5.1. Tasks and Schedule
- 5.2. Budget

Appendices¹

- 1. Draft Table of Contents of the Report of the Panel
- 2. Work Components of the Review
- 3. Budget Summaries, Phases 1 to 3
- 4. General Survey Questionnaire
- 5. Terms of Reference of the Panel

¹ Other appendices under separate cover: Review Matrices: Questions, Data and Review; Questionnaire for Survey 1; Panel Members and Panel Secretaries Curricula Vitae; Advisory Group Mandate and Composition.

Executive Summary

The context in which the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) operates has changed greatly in recent years, with some factors coming to the fore that put at risk former gains in agriculture in developing countries.² At the same time global funds have proliferated and competition for resources for development purposes has intensified.

In October 2007 CGIAR convened an Independent Review Panel³ to examine the efficiency and effectiveness of the CGIAR system and Centers. The Terms of Reference for the Review (Appendix 5) were written by the ad hoc Advisory Group appointed by the CGIAR Executive Council (ExCo). The Review Panel will assess whether the CGIAR system remains relevant and is well positioned to make its best possible contribution to the agricultural research needs of developing countries, including natural resource management, and, ultimately, to support food security of poor people around the world.

The Review Panel's Terms of Reference are comprehensive, covering:

- the quality and impact of the Centers' science,
- financial oversight, resource allocation and risk management,
- the effectiveness of the governance and structural reforms since 2001 (the effectiveness of the CGIAR partnership itself), and
- how well the CGIAR and Centers cooperate with partners world-wide (NARS, ARIs, the private sector and NGOs).

It has been asked to "assess whether CGIAR is well positioned to address emerging food security and agriculture-related problems of developing countries." In summary, its objectives are to take stock and assess the efficacy of the CGIAR and Centers partnerships, to assess the effectiveness of the research it has supported, and to make recommendations for changes that will improve its efficacy and effectiveness in view of emerging challenges for food security, agriculture and natural resource management of the poor.

The Review Panel has the advice of an ad hoc advisory group appointed by ExCo. The Panel will undertake research, commission consultant inputs, and consult broadly with CGIAR stakeholders and shareholders. The Review Panel has five members. Collectively the members of the Panel have knowledge of the CGIAR, extensive experience in evaluation and review, and experience in agricultural research institutions and the bilateral and multilateral development cooperation system. The Panel is supported by two Secretaries, each with research and evaluation experience.

The Review will contribute to a simultaneous facilitated change management process within CGIAR by bringing an independent perspective to key questions. This Change Management process began in April 2007. It will continue during the work of the Panel.

² These include escalating demand arising from greatly increased populations and changing patterns of consumption, and increasing demand for biofuels, with consequent loss of arable land to urbanization, increased pollution and degradation of water and soils, increases in the food-related expenditures of the poor and climate change.

³ The Review Panel and its support team comprise experts in evaluation, scientists and persons experienced with and knowledgeable about the CGIAR.

Inception Report

The Panel presented its Inception Report at the CGIAR Annual General Meeting in 2007. The Inception Report was approved in principle, and some revisions⁴ were requested by members. The Panel accepts these points and has reflected them in this revised Inception Report.

The work of the Panel can conveniently be divided into three phases. The first phase is the five months from October 2007 to March 2008. During this period the Panel met four times (including attendance at the ExCo in Rome and AGM07 in Beijing). It planned its work components (See Appendix 2), conducted extensive initial discussions, commissioned a major survey of stakeholders, and began work on several topics simultaneously that will become part of its Report. Total expenses in this phase were approximately \$730,000, of which one third was travel expenses required because the Panel is dispersed internationally. Expert consultant assistance to the Panel was about \$135,000. The Panel members and its two Principal Secretaries committed 470 person days to this effort. Budget summaries for Phases 1 to 3 are presented in Appendix 3.

Phase 2 is also approximately five months. In March the Panel will present an Interim Report to the World Bank Agriculture and Rural Sector Board, which, in turn, will advise the World Bank's Development Grants Fund on the Bank's annual \$50 million contribution to the CGIAR. This phase will end with the circulation of the Report of the Panel on July 31, 2008. The Panel will visit some Centers and will conduct discussions on site with partner organizations. Unfortunately time and budget constraints make it impossible for the Panel to visit all Centers. During this phase the Panel will meet only twice, partly because of the other travel commitments to Centers and partly because of resource constraints. The Panel has conducted one videoconference and will continue to use this tool during the remainder of its work. The budget for this phase is similar to Phase 1 and the number of person days committed is similar as well. Consulting experts will complete their inputs to the Panel at a cost of approximately \$173,000. The Panel took advice at AGM07 that, given tight time constraints, the Panel should use consultants, as far as possible, in direct support of the work and writing of the Panel rather than to generate stand alone technical papers. This has been done.

The third phase of the work of the Panel will involve at least one revision of its Report. When the Report is circulated at the end of July, it will be the first opportunity for many stakeholders to comment on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Panel. There will be a facilitated website to enable easy submission of comments and discussion. The Panel will meet a month after circulation of the Report (early September) to consider submissions and will prepare a revision of its Report that will be presented to ExCo in

⁴ Revisions that were requested included the following. The Review should have a strong emphasis on partnerships, including the CGIAR partnership itself, and the overall governance issues, the partnership between the CGIAR and Centers, and partnerships between the CGIAR/Centers and other organizations (NARS, private sector and NGOs). The Panel should seek actively the views of Members and NARS from the South. The Review Panel should not expand its scope beyond its Terms of Reference. The Review should not be prolonged or delay the change management process unnecessarily. In this regard consultants to the Review Panel might best be employed to make direct inputs to the work and products of the Panel rather than aiming to produce stand-alone technical papers. The Panel should keep to its targets of presenting an interim report to the World Bank Agriculture and Rural Development Sector Board in March 2008 and circulating its full report for comment in July 2008.

October and to AGM08 in December. The Phase 3 costs for the work of the Panel are expected to be approximately \$345,000. In addition, in view of the lack of success of earlier reviews in regard to implementation of some recommendations, the Panel thinks it important that it conduct “exit workshops” to engage key stakeholders in discussions of the findings and recommendations of the Panel. It proposes to do this in August and early September 2008 so that input can contribute to the revision of the Report before ExCo 2008. However, obviously, bringing diverse stakeholders together for intensive discussions of the Report requires considerable preparation and investment. Three full workshops, one in Asia, one in Africa and one in the Americas, would cost approximately \$367,000, including all travel and facilities. A single large workshop with a similar number of participants would cost approximately \$237,000; and three much smaller workshops about \$167,000.

In summary, the Independent Panel will assess the achievement of the CGIAR and Centers, consider the structural and governance reforms of the past seven years and review the record of CGIAR and Centers partnerships. It will report its findings, conclusions and recommendations in July 2008 and will discuss them with stakeholders until AGM2008.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The CGIAR System

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) is an association of 64 donors interested in agricultural research and development. The members of the Consultative Group include states and private organizations. The CGIAR was created in 1971. Its co-sponsors are the World Bank, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The World Bank houses the CGIAR Secretariat and provides the CGIAR Chair and Director. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) houses the Science Council Secretariat. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) houses the Alliance Office, which was created in 2006 to facilitate common action by the Centers.

The CGIAR system has several related but not vertically integrated components. These include the Consultative Group (donors) and its Executive Council (ExCo). Fifteen legally independent agricultural research Centers are the core of the CGIAR system. They have formed an Alliance to facilitate collective action. A CGIAR System Office (SO)⁵ helps administer the system. The Science Council helps to maintain a high quality of science in the CGIAR System, by coordinating research priorities and by providing a forum for consideration of agricultural science issues.

The CGIAR Centers conduct research and research-related activities, with many partners, to support, conduct and disseminate products of agricultural science and technology aimed at food sufficiency for the poor. The aim is sustainable development in poor countries and the attainment of the food-and-natural-resources-related Millennium Development Goals. Specifically, the mission of the CGIAR is to achieve sustainable food security and reduce poverty in developing countries through scientific research and research-related activities in the fields of agriculture, livestock, forestry, fisheries, policy and natural resources management.

In the past five years CGIAR has adopted a Charter, established an Executive Council, created the Science Council in place of the previous Technical Advisory Committee, and launched Challenge Programs.

1.2 Objectives of the CGIAR Independent Review

This is the Inception Report for an Independent Review to be conducted in 2008. The Review has a mandate to consider the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the CGIAR. It will consider the reforms of the CGIAR system over the past seven years and options for the future. The Review Panel has been asked to “assess whether CGIAR is well positioned to address emerging food security and agriculture-related problems of developing countries.” The Terms of Reference for this Review (Appendix 5) state a set of

⁵ The SO includes a list of nine units - CGIAR Secretariat, Central Advisory Service on Intellectual Property, Chief Information Office, Alliance Office, Gender and Diversity Program, Strategic Advisory Service on Human Resources, Internal Audit Unit, Media Unit, and Science Council Secretariat.

questions. In summary, the objectives of the Review are to take stock and assess the efficacy of the partnership, to assess the effectiveness of the CGIAR research, and to make recommendations for the changes in the CGIAR system that will improve its efficacy and effectiveness in view of emerging challenges for food security, agriculture and natural resource management of the poor.⁶

The Review will also contribute to the simultaneous facilitated change management process within CGIAR by bringing an independent perspective to key questions.

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation cover three inter-linked topics:

1. Governance, Partnership, Management and Alignment of the CGIAR.⁷
2. The Scientific Work of the CGIAR.⁸
3. Partnerships (NARS, ARIs, the private sector and NGOs).

The context in which the CGIAR operates has changed greatly since it was founded.⁹ Many issues have come to the fore, putting at risk former gains in the finances of the poor related to agricultural productivity. These include greatly increased populations in some countries, loss of arable land to urbanization, increased pollution and degradation of water and soils, climate change and increasing demand for biofuels. CGIAR needs to find new roles and priorities in this fast-changing context. The Review Panel's Terms of Reference include questions regarding the positioning of the CGIAR on the research-to-development continuum. The Review Panel will assess whether the CGIAR system remains relevant and is well positioned to make its best possible contribution to the current agricultural

⁶ The TORS for the Review were finalized on October 3, 2007.

⁷ Does the CGIAR have a good governance structure, well aligned with objectives and priorities? The term "alignment" has been used in the CGIAR to encompass (i) alignment among Centers in terms of program, governance and corporate services, (ii) alignment at system level among Members, and (iii) alignment between the different components constituting the CGIAR System (i.e. Members, Science Council, Centers and System Office). Alignment in this context refers to the capacity to work more effectively together toward the accomplishment of the mission of the CGIAR. Included here are the roles, effectiveness and efficiency of the Pillars (the Consultative Group; the Science Council; and the 15 international agricultural research Centers) and supporting structures, e.g. the Executive Council and the System Office. The Review Panel will assess the organizational reforms undertaken since the last (third) independent review, especially questions of organizational decision making, priority setting, strategy development, resource allocation and operational implementation. The Panel will examine the Centers from the angle of governance, partnership, and resource management, relying heavily on existing evaluations complemented by a program of site visits. The Panel will examine other global partnerships and new public financing systems to establish bench marks for assessing the partnership and resource mobilization.

⁸ What have been the activities and outputs of the CGIAR, and have these been conducted efficiently and economically? What impact on poverty reduction has the CGIAR had? The Review Panel will not conduct original research on this key question but will rely upon a synthesis of the available evidence on the achievements (effectiveness and impact) of the research conducted by the CGIAR Centers. The Review Panel will draw upon EPMRs, donor evaluations, and other reviews and assessments of the Center programs and Challenge Programs. In other words, the Panel will try to determine the use of the systems outputs in its own research (intermediate outcomes) but not will rely on research by others to determine outcomes.

⁹ The membership has expanded and its institutional arrangements changed. Intellectual property rights have become the focus of international debates. Some developing countries now have world-class national agriculture research facilities, and some are lagging. Science and communications technology have changed beyond recognition, creating new challenges and many opportunities for rethinking how and where agricultural research is done. As well, development institutions are challenged to find new paradigms that are different from increasingly irrelevant donor/recipient and north/south dichotomies. The importance of adaptation to climate change has become more apparent.

research needs of developing countries, including natural resource management, and, ultimately, to support food security of poor people around the world.

The CGIAR Results-Based Framework

The World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group's guidelines for Global and Regional Program Reviews emphasize the importance of a results-based framework as the context for any evaluation.

The CGIAR appears to have several elements of such a framework, including a process for indicating strategic research priorities and aligning programs and activities with them. It conducts External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs) and administers a performance measurement system.¹⁰

The Review Team will assess the adequacy of CGIAR's results framework against the World Bank IEG standards, and in the context of the principles underlying the international agreements reached at the Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development and in the Paris Declaration on Development Effectiveness.

1.4 Previous Reviews

The CGIAR commissions independent reviews periodically. There have been three independent reviews commissioned by CGIAR in the past. These Reviews reported in 1976¹¹, 1981¹², and 1998¹³. After the Third System Review, the CGIAR initiated a Change Design and Management (CDM) process in 1999, and, in 2000, formed a Change Design and Management Team (CMDT).¹⁴ The CMDT issued its report in April 2001, making recommendations for reform of the CGIAR System.

The World Bank Operations Evaluation Department (now IEG) undertook an evaluation of the CGIAR in 2001-02,¹⁵ making recommendations for reform. There have also been a number of studies that addressed relevant questions. These include papers on crosscutting, thematic or program topics, and various management reviews and impact assessments (including "stripe" reviews of a single topic across all Centers).

¹⁰ In 2003, at the request of ExCo, the CGIAR System Office established the Working Group on Performance Measurement. It was hoped that a performance measurement system would serve as a tool for decision making and performance management by the Centers; and would encourage Centers, through incentives, to improve their performance. It was to stimulate change and learning through benchmarking and similar exercises; and to help demonstrate performance, and fulfill accountability obligations. Lastly it was to aid CGIAR donors in making resource allocation decisions. The CGIAR Performance Measurement System (PMS) measures Center performance along three dimensions: results; potential to perform; and stakeholder perceptions. These are reviewed in the CGIAR Annual Report.

¹¹ CGIAR, First Independent Review. W. Baum, Chair. Dr. Alex McCalla, Study Director. (1976). Report of the Review Committee. CGIAR: Washington, D.C.

¹² CGIAR, Second Independent Review. W. Baum, Chair. (1981). Report of the Review Committee. Washington, D.C.

¹³ CGIAR, Third Independent Review. M. Strong, Chair. (1998). The International Research Partnership for Food Security and Sustainable Agriculture. CGIAR: Washington, D.C.

¹⁴ The CMDT was chaired by Margaret Catley-Carlson.

¹⁵ World Bank, Operations Evaluation Department. (2003). The CGIAR at 31. World Bank: Washington, D.C.

1.5 Review Panel, Secretaries and Consultants

A Review Panel has been appointed by the CGIAR to conduct an independent study. It has the advice of an ad hoc advisory group appointed by ExCo.¹⁶ The Panel will undertake research, commission consultant inputs, and consult broadly with CGIAR stakeholders and shareholders.¹⁷ The Review Panel has five members. Collectively the members of the Panel have knowledge of the CGIAR, extensive experience in evaluation and review, and experience in agricultural research institutions and the bilateral and multilateral development cooperation system. The Panel is supported by two Secretaries, each with research and evaluation experience.

1.6 The Advisory Group and Commentators

An Ad Hoc Advisory Group was appointed by ExCo¹⁸ to guide the writing of terms of reference for the Independent Review Panel and the selection of the Review Panel. At AGM 2007 the mandate of the Advisory Group was extended so that it can advise the Review Panel during the review and be the conduit through which the Panel communicates with the CGIAR membership. The Ad Hoc Advisory Group will work with the Panel while respecting the independence of the review

In addition to the Advisory Group, the Panel intends to commission three readers who will each write a commentary on the Report of the Review Panel. These commentaries will provide perspective on the conclusions and recommendations of the Panel. The commentators might be study directors from previous Reviews or evaluations of the CGIAR, or they might be persons who have led reviews of global partnership programs.

1.7 Change Management

In April 2007, the CGIAR ExCo initiated a facilitated change management process as the next step in reforms that began with the recommendations of the Change Design and Management Team in April 2001. To manage the first phase of this process, ExCo established an ad hoc committee, or “scoping team”, consisting of two ExCo members, and representatives from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers, the Science Council, and partners. A consulting firm was engaged to assist the Scoping Team. AGM 2007 approved the proposal in principle for the next phase of the Facilitated Change Management Process in 2008.

¹⁶ The process of appointing the Panel comprised several steps. The CGIAR members were invited to nominate firms, institutions or individuals for inclusion in the Panel, in light of the characteristics set out in the Panel Member Profile. This profile listed the skills and qualifications needed by the Panel overall. Terms of Reference for the Review Panel were posted on the CGIAR website. (See Appendix 4, Terms of Reference for the Review Panel). Nominations or applications were invited. The TORs were also circulated to professional evaluation associations. Responses were compiled and a “long list” of all the nominations and applications received was prepared and presented to the ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group for the Independent Review (See Section 1.6). The ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group proposed a Panel, based on its appraisal and selection from the long list, and the list of proposed Panel members was sent to ExCo for approval and will be presented to the CGIAR at AGM07 for ratification.

¹⁷ The CGIAR Secretariat, the Science Council Secretariat and the Alliance Office will provide information documentation in support of the Review; and the CGIAR Secretariat is providing logistical support where appropriate, such as helping the Panel arrange its visits to ExCo and the AGM.

¹⁸ Summary Record of Proceeding of the 12th Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council May 2007.

Without compromising the Review's independence, it was agreed in Beijing that the Facilitated Change Management Process will concentrate in the first half of 2008 on "strengthening the system mindset" and "strengthening trust and empathy" while further identifying issues to be addressed. Formal change plans not already proposed and underway in the Facilitated Change Process will incorporate the Review Panel's recommendations from its July 2008 draft report. In the meantime, the Review Panel will share selected outputs when they are available in discussion form, to the change teams. It agreed that the Chairperson of the Independent Review will join the change Steering Team as one of two "external advisors". There will be full communication between the Chairs of the four Working Groups in the Change Process team and the Panel Chair on issues of common interest. This will include each being informed of each other's agendas and key documents and having the option of sending observers to meetings.

1.8 Limitations of the Review

This Review is limited in scope. First, the time allocated for the review is short, given the breadth of the questions in the Terms of Reference.¹⁹ It is also short in comparison to previous reviews and reviews of similar scope being undertaken by the international community of global programs and institutions.

Second, the review is charged with assessing impact on the basis of existing evidence, not charged with collecting new evidence. Third, a change management exercise is being conducted simultaneously with the Review. A more usual approach would be to complete the Review first and then to design a change management exercise in light of the findings and recommendations of the Review that are accepted by the CGIAR. The response burden on CGIAR members to have these efforts proceeding simultaneously may be significant and certain lines of information gathering that the Review Team might otherwise have pursued might be foreclosed. Lastly, the members of the Review Panel have constraints. They are not full-time and have other responsibilities to manage at the same time as the Review.

¹⁹ Previous Reviews have taken much longer to complete than the anticipated timeframe for the present review. One lesson drawn from previous Reviews was that it is preferable to be realistic about the time and resources required for an adequate review, especially since such a review is commissioned by the CGIAR infrequently.

2.0 Scope of the Independent Review

2.1 Scope

The Independent Review of the CGIAR System has an appropriately broad scope, similar to the scope of the three previous comprehensive reviews of the CGIAR. It covers the impact of the CGIAR, its partnerships, and its governance and management, as set out in the Review's Terms of Reference.

2.2 Client for the Review

The CGIAR and the Centers collectively is the client for the Independent Review. The final report of the Review will be circulated broadly for comment, presented to ExCo in October 2008, and presented to the CGIAR membership for its consideration at AGM 2008.

2.3 Period to be Reviewed (2002-2007)

The period to be reviewed is from the initiation of reforms in 2002 to 2006/7 (approximately five years), although in some cases the Panel may look at longer trends.²⁰

2.4 Review Questions

The Terms of Reference set out 32 questions to be addressed by the Review Panel. The Review Panel grouped related questions together to help identify the necessary components of the Review. (See Appendix 2) There are four major groups of questions. Within each major group several "work packages" have been defined. The four groups of topics and their component work packages are listed in Table 2.4.1.

Table 2.4.1 Topics in the Terms of Reference

Topic 1: CGIAR Overview
• Analytical Profile of the CGIAR (structure, resources, activities, and outputs)
• CGIAR and Global Public Goods
• Resource Allocation Processes, Expenditures and Financial Management
• Management for Development Results and Performance Monitoring
Topic 2: Governance, Management and Alignment
• The CGIAR System: An Overview of its Partnership Relations
• Alliance
• Executive Council
• The CGIAR Secretariat
• System Office and the Secretariat

²⁰ CGIAR has undergone independent evaluations several times in its 36-year history. The Third System-Wide Review was completed in 1998. This was followed by a Change Design and Management Process; and by a major study by the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group. The result of this round of studies was a period of governance reform and related initiatives starting about 2001.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CGIAR's Members/Sponsors
Topic 3: Effectiveness of CGIAR Centers' Research
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Science Achievements of the Centers: Quality, Relevance and Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural Research and Poverty Reduction: Challenges for the CGIAR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Science Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Programs: Challenge Programs, Eco-Regional Programs
Topic 4: Partnerships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and Dissemination Partners: CGIAR-NARS/ARI Relationships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center-to-Center Partnerships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and Dissemination Partners: Private Sector
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and Dissemination Partners: CSOs

2.5 Consultant Support

The Panel will be supported by consultants' research, with oversight by Panel members. The consultants' topics may include topics such as those outlined below: (See Table 2.5.1).

Table 2.5.1 Consultant Inputs to Panel Deliberations (Topics)

1. Evaluation of CGIAR Research Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts
2. Setting Research Priorities in the CGIAR System
3. Global Partnerships for Public Goods
4. CGIAR Costs and Financial Risk Management
5. CGIAR Partnerships with NGOs
6. Best Practices in the Structure and Governance of Global Research Partnerships

2.6 Reports of the Review

The Panel's products will be:

1. Interim Report. Presentation to the Agriculture and Rural Development Sector Board of the World Bank. March 31, 2008.
2. Circulation Draft of Full Panel Report (including analysis, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and commentary by three readers). July 31, 2008.
2. Revised Report. Presented and Tabled in October 2008 at ExCo.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Review Standards

The Review Panel is charged with being as rigorous as possible. In that regard it is worth noting that the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) has published guidelines for the review of global partnership programs.²¹ The *Guidelines* are not official requirements of the Bank. Nevertheless the document is a useful guide to good practices; and one expects that it will be taken into account if and when IEG advises the Bank whether it can rely on the report of the Review Panel. The standards for an independent review have evolved since the Third System-Wide Review ten years ago. It is essential that the present Independent Review meet those standards.

At the same time the international community has articulated review standards through the OECD-Development Assistance Committee.²² At a minimum the Review must cover the core criteria for evaluations set out by the OECD-DAC – that is, relevance,²³ effectiveness or efficacy,²⁴ efficiency,²⁵ sustainability²⁶ and impact.²⁷ (OECD-DAC IEG *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Programs*.)²⁸

In addition, the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) has a mandate to assess the adequacy of evaluations of Bank-funded global programs, such as the CGIAR Review, against the Bank's "Review Framework for Global and Regional Public Reviews," which expands on the OECD-DAC criteria. At a minimum the IEG will expect the CGIAR Independent Review to cover the core DAC criteria plus "governance and management" which should include World Bank performance. IEG may also comment on the process used to govern the CGIAR Independent Review and, in particular, the process to protect the independence of the Review according to criteria drawn from the "Template for Assessing the Independence of Evaluation Organizations" produced by the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks²⁹

²¹ See comments by World Bank, OED, "CGIAR at 31", 2003.

²² OECD/DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance (1991); OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (2006); OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (2002); OECD Principles of Corporate Governance (1999, revised 2004).

²³ The extent to which the objectives and design of the program are consistent with (a) current global/regional challenges and concerns in a particular development sector and (b) the needs and priorities of beneficiary countries and groups.

²⁴ The extent to which the program has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, taking into account their relative importance.

²⁵ The extent to which the program has converted or is expected to convert its resources/inputs (such as funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results in order to achieve the maximum possible outputs, outcomes, and impacts with the minimum possible inputs.

²⁶ When the term is applied to the activities of a program, the extent to which the benefits arising from these activities are likely to continue after the activities have been completed. When the term is applied to organizations or programs themselves, the extent to which the organization or program is likely to continue its operational activities over time.

²⁷ Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

²⁸ <http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/grpp>

²⁹ IEG Guidelines for Global and Regional Program Reviews (GRPRS) Annex: Review Framework for GRPRS.

3.2 Information Sources and Analysis Methods

The Review Panel will use all research methods appropriate to such a review (See Section 3.1 Review Standards). As with previous independent reviews, the Panel will rely on existing evidence to a considerable extent and will not conduct or commission direct measurement of the impact of the CGIAR Centers and programs. The Panel will gather information from a wide variety of sources. The sources of information will include:

- Publications and citations analysis, including examination of the information collected by the CGIAR Performance Measurement System (PMS) and other information on the accountability and transparency of the System.
- Review of the extensive literature³⁰ of reports previously commissioned by CGIAR or by CGIAR's stakeholders and shareholders, and other documents relevant to the development impact of CGIAR.³¹ This will include pertinent development literature (including independent academic research on the CGIAR)
- Examination of previous independent reviews, and major evaluations conducted by CGIAR Members, including the independent World Bank OED Meta-evaluation of the CGIAR.
- Evaluations of other Global Programs including the recent independent evaluations of IFAD (2005), FAO (2007) and the WDR (2007) report analysis of the effectiveness of the World Bank in the agriculture and rural development center and the 2007 IEG Report "World Bank Assistance To Agriculture In Sub-Saharan Africa".
- Examination of financial information in components of the CGIAR System Office and the Centers.
- Information on and recent reviews of governance and management of the CGIAR system.
- Documents on financial risk management.
- Structured Interviews, surveys and ideally facilitated group discussions with stakeholders and shareholders.³²

³⁰ Relevant literature includes core CGIAR documents (e.g. the Charter), CGIAR/ExCo decision records, the reports of previous reviews and studies (e.g., System Office, Stripe Review of Corporate Governance of CGIAR Centers) and the general literature of agricultural research and development impact.

³¹ Reviews of Centers External Program Management Reviews (EPMRs) together with the external reviews of the Challenge Programs (CPs) and Independent and Eco-regional Programs (SWEPs). In addition, the evaluations of impact and other CGIAR evaluations including evaluations done by Centers to assess the impact of the CGIAR on poverty reduction.

³² At a minimum interviews will be conducted with CGIAR Members; partners; Center Director Generals, Board chairs, and staff; CGIAR staff in various units; and other stakeholders, including private sector organizations and civil society organizations. Time and resource constraints and overlaps with the Change Management exercise could limit the ability of the Panel to take full advantage of consultations with stakeholders.

- Visits to the Co-Sponsors, CGIAR's administrative and coordinating units, and to the CGIAR Centers.
- Information may be gathered, as well, through inputs by consultants to the Panel and by participation of the Panel Chair in the Steering Committee of the Facilitated Change Management Process.

Methods of analysis, including syntheses of evidence, will be developed by the lead Panel Member for each Paper. The terms of reference for consultants' inputs will relate each to a Panel Paper. The Final Report of the Panel will be organized around standard criteria of development effectiveness, including relevance, efficacy, efficiency, sustainability, governance and institutional development, and comparative value.

3.3 Visits to Centers

Panel members will visit selected Centers during the course of the Review. Unfortunately time and resource constraints will probably make it impossible to visit all Centers.

The visits are not to evaluate some Centers individually but rather to enable the Panel members to develop an in-depth understanding of the Centers collectively, based on a reasonably large sample, and to consult in depth with Centers on the Review questions. This is vital to a successful Review.

The Panel has prepared for its visit to Centers by having discussions with a wide variety of persons including Directors General and Board Chairpersons at AGM 2007. The study team will prepare an analytical brief describing each Center to be visited. The briefs for Centers to be visited will be in a standard format.³³ In preparing the brief, the study team will correspond with the Center, and review documents including the EPMR(s).

On average the Review team expects to spend three to four person days on site at each Center, or approximately one 'person week' per Center, including travel. Most time will be spent at the Center but the Panel member will take the opportunity to visit one or more stakeholders in the vicinity. The expected interviews and group discussions are summarized in Table 3.4.1. Center visits will include interviews with the Director General, the Board Chair (by phone if necessary), senior scientists and young scientists, CGIAR member representatives where possible, NARS, and stakeholder organizations.

Key topics to be addressed during Center visits include: focus of the Center (strategy, scenarios); funding (restricted and unrestricted, other resource mobilization), stability profile, and financial performance; productivity of the Center (outputs); impact of the Center (outcomes); strength of partnerships (specific links within CGIAR and outside); perceptions of the value-added of the CGIAR (incremental funding, scientific priorities advice, integration of gender perspectives, Challenge Programs, and administrative support); and willingness to embrace possible reforms to the CGIAR system.

³³ The standard template for Center briefs would include inter alia the size of the Center (budget, number of scientists, size of Board, etc.), the outputs of the Center (publications – self, other and peer reviewed), assets and collections, percentage distribution of work over the 20 CGIAR priority areas (% budget and % of scientist time), etc.)

3.4 Surveys and Interviews

(A) Survey of Persons Engaged with the CGIAR

The Panel will survey approximately 300 people who have been actively engaged with the CGIAR in some capacity since 2001. The survey is not based on a sample but rather is a survey of all persons who held certain positions in the CGIAR or the Centers during the past five years. These include Directors General of the Centers, Deputy Directors General (Research), Chairs of Center Boards, Members of the Science Council, members of the System Office professional and executive staff and representatives of CGIAR members.

A questionnaire was developed with wide consultation, pre-tested in January 2008 and distributed in early February 2008. The Panel hopes to have the results of the survey analysed by the end of March.

(B) Structured Interviews

The Panel has developed structured interview protocols for interviews at Centers during visits by a Panel member(s) and for interviews with partner organizations. Information collected in these interviews will be held completely confidential and no names will be linked to specific information reported to CGIAR or to anyone else.

Panel Members and Panel Secretaries have also conducted in-person interviews, individually and in small groups, during meetings of ExCo, the Science Council, the Alliance, and at the AGM 2007. They may also conduct some telephone interviews. Table 3.4.1 lists the groups of shareholders and stakeholders from whom the Review Panel expects to solicit information. The membership of the various groups over-laps so the total number of interviews/surveys will be less than the simple aggregate of sample sizes. That is, some respondents will represent more than one group.

Table 3.4.1: Interviewees and Survey Recipients

Stakeholders/Shareholders	Sampling Frame ³⁴	Sample to Be Interviewed and/or Surveyed
1. Scientist Peers outside Centers	Not limited	10
2. The Centers		
Directors General	15	15
Board Chairpersons	15	15
Senior Scientists	Not limited	12-15
Younger Scientists ³⁵ (under 35 years of age)	Not limited	12-15
3. Co-sponsors		
World Bank (donor principals ³⁶)	05	05
World Bank (oversight groups ³⁷)	05	05
World Bank (senior general managers)	05	05
FAO	02	02
IFAD	03	03
UNDP	02	02
4. CGIAR Members (2008)	64	64
5. Non-Members		
Lapsed Members	To be determined	
Prospective Members but Never Joined	To be determined	
6. ExCo Members (2001-2007)	Approx. 90	90
7. CGIAR Chairs and Directors (Exec. Sec.)	4	4
8. Science Council/TAC Chairs	2	2
9. Science Council Members (2001-2007)		
10. Professional Staff		
CGIAR Secretariat	23	23
SC Secretariat	10	10
System Office: Heads of Units	09	09
Alliance Office	02	02
11. NARs	To be determined	10
12. CSOs	Not limited	05
ARIs	Not limited	05
NGOs	Not limited	05
Private Sector	Not limited	05

³⁴ The 'sampling frame' is the list of persons from which the sample was drawn by random assignment.

³⁵ The panel will also consult with representative(s) of the association of Young Professionals In Agricultural Research and Development (YPARD).

³⁶ The World Bank donor principals are the Agriculture and Rural Sector Department and the Committee of the Development Grants Fund (DGF).

³⁷ The World Bank's main oversight of its funding of the CGIAR is provided by the Office of the Chief Economist and by the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG)

3.5 Exit Workshops

The Panel proposes to conduct one to three Exit Workshops in different locations, subject to the availability of resources for this work. These workshops will focus on testing the findings of the Review Panel and, as such, will cover a wide range of issues. The Workshops will test the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Review. Exit Workshops have proven effective in assisting stakeholders to understand the rationale behind a Review's conclusions. Such meetings create a better understanding among key stakeholders and a greater likelihood of recommendations being correct and being adopted.

Participation at an Exit Workshop will be by invitation. The Workshops will be small to facilitate discussion.³⁸ There will be translation and professional facilitation. The product of each Exit Workshop will be a Summary of Proceedings, and recommendations from the Workshop.

³⁸ Five people from the host Center, two Panel members, one representative of the other participating Centers in the region, one representative from each of the CGIAR Secretariat, the Science Council Secretariat, the System Office, and the Alliance Office.

4.0 FOCUS OF THE REVIEW

4.1 Governance of the CGIAR Partnership

The Panel has been charged with examining the governance of the CGIAR. This comprises several topics, including:

- The legal, oversight and operating structures of the CGIAR/Centers network and partnership, including appropriate representation of shareholder and stakeholder groups.
- Decision making process of the CGIAR, especially financial and policy decision making.
- The financial management of the CGIAR.
- The implementation of governance reforms from 2002 to the present, including the development of a Charter and the formation of the Alliance.
- The collective functioning of the main components of the governance of the CGIAR/Centers, including Center Boards, the AGM and its ExCo, the CGIAR Chair and the System Office, including the Science Council, the CGIAR Secretariat and other units.

The CGIAR was among the first “global partnership” initiatives of the World Bank and the international development community. Since the launch of the CGIAR in 1971, the world has changed dramatically and the challenges to global programs have become more complex. New forms of governance for global programs and new approaches to governing large systems have emerged over the last decade. The Panel will examine new approaches for international and global public goods delivery and financing as context to the Panel’s review of the governance reforms undertaken by the CGIAR.

The Panel will attempt to put the governance considerations within the framework of the CGIAR as a provider of international public goods in three domains: (1) Global (knowledge, public awareness and policy influence) (2) Networks (institutional arrangements for provision of GPGs) and (3) Local (national and local activities to provide global public goods). This framework will assist the Panel to address the 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. Are the levels of responsibility and accountability among the three pillars appropriate? Are the voices of the three pillars appropriately represented in the System governance?

The Panel will also consider best practices in the governance of other global and regional public goods program partnerships.

Other questions that the Panel is asked to address, in regard to governance, are set out in Appendix 2 Work Components of the Review.

4.2 Effectiveness of the Centers

(A) Meta-evaluation of the Impact of CGIAR Research

The fifteen international agricultural research Centers³⁹ that constitute the functional and operational scientific core of the CGIAR System plan develop and implement research and produce research-related global and regional public goods. The Centers conduct research in agriculture, crop production, livestock, forestry, fisheries, natural resource management, and institutional innovation, aiming to enhance food security, reduce hunger and poverty, foster human nutrition and health, promote agricultural growth and protect the environment in developing countries.

The quality and content of science at the Centers, the degree of success it has achieved in fulfilling its mission, and the impact it has made on agriculture and the welfare of the rural population in the developing world are key to the current Review.

The Review of CGIAR science outputs, outcomes and impacts will largely rely on existing studies. That is it will be a meta-evaluation, compiling and synthesizing existing evidence on the relevant questions that the Review Panel has been asked to address.

There are many existing sources of evidence. For example, the results achieved by the Centers are regularly evaluated through self-assessments and Center-sponsored external reviews. There are 5-yearly EPMRs organized by the Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat; and inter-Center Stripe Reviews organized by the Science Council. The SPIA undertakes impact assessments, and donors have sponsored periodic assessments. There were two papers in support of the World Bank OED study in 2001-02 that used meta-evaluation techniques to assess certain areas of research by the CGIAR Centers.

This meta-evaluation of the impact of CGIAR Centers will cover the period 2002-2007, with some references to longer trends. It seeks answers to a number of questions. The first important question is to ascertain whether the research priorities of the Centers have indeed been directed, largely, to the needs of the smallholders and the rural poor in the developing world. How have the CGIAR research funds been allocated among the system priorities, and among the individual research sectors within each priority area? Has the CGIAR research system significantly assisted smallholders in adjusting to changing conditions?

The impact of CGIAR research can be assessed from many different angles, including its direct impacts, indirect impacts, and unintended impacts. The Review Team will examine

³⁹ Geographically, five Centers are located in Africa, five in Asia, three in Latin America, and one each in Europe and USA. The Centers, staffed by more than 8500 research workers drawn from various disciplines and specializations, work directly in more than 100 countries and indirectly in many others. Each Center is legally constituted as an independent, self-governing institution with its own charter, research responsibilities or mandate, Board of Trustees, Director General, staff and budget. Each Center functions under legal agreements with its current host countries. Together, the Centers function inter-dependently within the CGIAR System and inter-Center collaborations and partnerships are encouraged. Also, each Center collaborates with external agencies including NARs, private companies, and CSOs.

the CGIAR Impact assessments and donor evaluations of the CGIAR effectiveness for evidence of impact. Emphasis in examining CGIAR studies and related literature will be on the degree and nature of yield improvement and productivity growth (for crops such as wheat, rice, maize, vegetables, fruit, and non-crop products such as livestock products, fish, forest products, etc.); expanded agricultural employment (for some countries, separately for male and female workers); agricultural wage improvement; increased earnings from agriculture, and as well as other impacts which emerge.

The available evidence would be collated to see whether food security among smallholders has been improved by research. To some extent there may be evidence related to effects on land tenure, the intensity of cultivation, non-farm employment of land-poor rural households, total household earnings of the smallholders and the landless, decreases in poaching of forest land by the rural poor, healthier crop rotations, food prices among the lower-income strata of the rural society, and human capital among farming households.

Unintended effects could include stagnation in yield rates for specific crops in specific regions, as proxies for technological lulls and land fatigue; declines in water tables as surrogates of unintended resource depletion; or increasing marginalization of land and agrarian disputes. In summary, the Panel will enquire whether there is evidence of links the CGIAR effectively examining the links between the CGIAR research and overall agricultural productivity and growth rates, with consequent impacts on poverty.

The Meta-evaluation would also venture to see if the CGIAR Centers have learned well from their own experience. Do their vision documents, medium-term plans and agreements prompt them to re-orient their research to respond to climate change (e.g. changing pattern of rainfall, droughts, floods and storms); land degradation (land fatigue, fragmentation and marginalization of landholdings; over-chemicalization); the quantity and quality of irrigation water (depleting water tables, highly water-intensive crop combinations, brackish water); competing demands on dwindling land resources (grains/corn production for rising human/animal consumption in competition with steeply increasing demand from bio-gas/ethanol industry); and increasing urbanization and changing food habits in the developing world.

Finally, with the rising pace of CG-Centers' partnership with the private sector in recent years, how much of the research agenda is being driven by market forces and is this problematic given the original CGIAR mission of need-driven research. Tied with this is the question of the sharing of intellectual property rights. Is there an indication, as is feared in many developing countries, international development agencies, and CSOs, that the market-driven crucial input price regimes have adversely affected the production base of the marginal and small farms in the developing world? Has the CGIAR remained well-defined, mission-oriented, transparent, patent-wise accountable, and internationally orchestrated?

Some informative documents are likely to include: Centers' Annual Reports, Centers' Vision Documents, Center's commissioned impact assessment studies, direct interviews with the Center DGs, Board Chairmen, research scientists, etc., to take note of the Center's claims; and EPMRs, CGIAR and Science Council commissioned reviews of Centers, individual CGIAR member commissioned evaluation such as World Bank-OED meta-evaluation (2003), other donor-supported studies, etc., besides core CGIAR

documents such as the Charter, CGIAR/ExCo decisions. Finally, views of scholars and public analysts, in academic writings, would also prove to be informative, especially for drawing our attention to any negative impacts.

Understandably, the evaluation will have limitations. For example, Centers contributions to yield improvements through research need to be put in context. There are often other factors. Other research agencies (e.g. NARS) have often contributed. Similarly many other poverty-eradication initiatives may also be at work. Nevertheless, a careful study of the documents is expected to identify plausible incremental effects. The Panel's review of partnerships will look at the role of partnerships in leveraging the investments in agriculture, natural resource and policy influence.

(B) Meta-evaluation of the Challenge Programs

Challenge Programs (CPs) were established by the CGIAR in 2001, as time-bound, independently-governed programs of high-impact research to target CGIAR goals in relation to complex issues of global and/or regional significance.

This Meta-Review of the Challenge Programme will be based on an examination of the extent to which CPs have addressed four objectives:

- (1) Improving CGIAR's global relevance and impact,
- (2) Improving greater integration, efficiency and cohesion amongst Centres,
- (3) Improving partnerships with non-CGIAR research organizations (ARIs, NARS etc),
and
- (4) Mobilizing more stable and long term financing, by members and externally.

There are presently only four ongoing or developing CPs: Generation, HarvestPlus, Water and Food and a CP for Sub-Saharan Africa. It is premature to evaluate impacts on any of these, and even outputs in most cases. Therefore, this Review will examine their progress so far and their future plans in light of their declared objectives. To do this, a simple hypothetical model for a successful CP will be created, against which existing CPs can be compared.

Documentation on the rationale for, and establishment of, the CPs will be reviewed and discussions will be held with the Secretariat, Science Council and Alliance to scope and refine the methods proposed below, and to identify sources of information. The assessment of how well CPs have delivered on their four objectives will be based on information in Annual Reports and MTPs, and, particularly, the recent External and Internal Reviews of three of the CPs. Most CPs have also had donor commissioned reviews, which would be considered. The reasons for differences between CPs will be assessed based on External Reviews and interviews.

Have CPs improved Centre performance on these four objectives relative to "conventional" research programme? To assess this, several Centers involved in CPs will be asked to provide information on similar projects, and these will be compared with CPs with respect to global relevance, centre integration, partnerships and investment. A comparison with System-Wide and Ecoregional Programmes will also be made, based only on the 2006 Meta-review of the SWEPP programmes. Additional work may be undertaken to gain more insight on performance on specific objectives. Have CPs brought substantial new research

funding into the CGIAR? This will be assessed using the analysis of recent CGIAR funding to Centers and programmes prepared for the main review. Is the CP partnership model successful? A study in the full CGIAR review on partnerships will be used to characterize effective and successful partnerships, against which CP partnerships can be compared. Selected interviews with partners will also contribute to this analysis (see below).

There is a view within the CGIAR that CPs have not yet realized their potential. Has the process of CP development been effective in developing programs, and is there an indication that this is changing or improving? To address this, an examination will be made of the process for soliciting, evaluating and selecting proposals, to identify aspects which support or do not support the four objectives above. This will make use of (1) guidelines and procedures for CP proposals, (2) records of assessment panels for successful and unsuccessful projects (which will be treated confidentially), (3) External Reviews and records of ExCo and other discussions of CPs, (3) interviews (see below). Particular attention will be paid to the alignment of proposals to CGIAR objectives and the competitive bidding process.

In addition, the Independent Review Team will gather information about the CP grant process from two institutions expert in competitive agricultural research funding, one national and one international. A set of proposal briefs and their evaluations, to include successful and unsuccessful proposals will be provided to experts in grant assessment and they will be asked to comment on the quality of assessment and the appropriateness of the assessment process design.

The CPs have been suggested by some as a possible model for the future migration of CGIAR funding and projects from a Center-based to a programme-based approach. A short assessment will be made of this potential, comparing the results of the analysis above to stated plans for CP and programme development. This will make use of documents prepared for Systems Priorities and their funding, and interviews.

As part of the CGIAR review, structured interviews will be organized with members, partners, Centers and other stakeholders. Questions relevant to CPs will be included in these reviews, and Centers and partners will be selected to ensure feedback from some which are involved in CPs. Interviewees will be asked for their opinion on how successful CPs have been relative to the four objectives above, and on what “success” would look like (i.e. exploration of which CPs are most successful, or how would CPs need to change to be successful).

4.3 Partnerships

The CGIAR is a partnership of members, donors, Centers and many other stakeholders. The Centers have established a wide range of partnerships between and among themselves, and with NGOs, NARS, private sector, ARIs and other groups. The partnerships take different forms and are organized differently for different purposes. These are mechanisms that the CGIAR uses to develop common agendas and programs, share resources such as information, facilities and expertise, reach out to farmers, and implement joint projects as well as disseminate technologies for agricultural productivity in developing countries.

Partnerships are increasingly critical to the success of the CGIAR System. Such factors as globalization, rapid scientific and technological developments in biotechnology and ICTs, the emergence of new social movements, the changing international financial architecture, increasing role of private sector in agricultural research and innovation and feminization of agriculture are changing the ways in which agricultural research and development are governed. These developments make partnerships for agricultural research more important than ever before. Stand-alone programs and individual institutions are incapable of responding to the challenges.

The CGIAR and its Centers have recognized the urgency and importance of building and strengthening partnerships in order to achieve their goals. This is shown in the various policy statements, institutional changes, partnership strategies, decisions of AGMs, and other efforts of the CGIAR. Since the early 2000s the CGIAR has been designing strategies to improve its internal and external partnerships. Most EMPRs have assessed the Center's partnerships. The CGIAR Secretariat has developed a perspective and set of principles on partnerships. In March 2006 the Science Council released a survey of the CGIAR Center collaboration and in 2007 the Council commissioned a study of CGIAR partnerships with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). Committees have also been established by the CGIAR to help govern CGIAR partnerships with the private sector and NGOs.

On the whole, the CGIAR and its Centers are investing considerable financial, human and other resources to establish and manage partnerships. It is essential that the Panel understand the nature, effectiveness and efficiency of these partnerships as they relate to the governance and performance of the CGIAR. This component of the CGIAR Review will focus on the TOR questions below:

1. How effective are current approaches to collaborative research with partners?
2. Do the respective partnership roles properly exploit the comparative and complementary advantages of those involved?
3. Are linkages with NARS and ARIs effectively supporting the achievements of CGIAR research objectives as well as meeting partner needs and expectations – e.g. how effective have Centers been in capacity building of NARS?
4. How effective has the CGIAR been in establishing and facilitating partnerships among CGIAR Centers and between CGIAR Centers and external partners (both public and private sector)?

The Review Panel will identify and analyze the nature of partnerships entered into or developed by the CGIAR. It will develop a typology of the partnerships and examine the relationships between CGIAR centers and NARS, ARIs, private sector, farmers' organizations and other CSOs. It will assess partnerships between CGIAR Centers and among the Centers. It will focus on norms and practices institutionalized by the CGIAR to establish and/or promote partnerships for research and innovation in agriculture. Emphasis will be placed on the quality and productivity of the partnerships. To the extent possible, the review will seek to provide evidence on how partnership arrangements enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of CGIAR operations.

The review of the CGIAR partnerships will be largely a meta-evaluation. Already a desk review of EMPRs, CGIAR and Centers' partnerships strategy documents, commissioned surveys and studies on partnerships is being undertaken. It will identify the kinds of internal

and external partnerships established by the CGIAR and the strengths and weakness of such partnerships. A typology and features of CGIAR partnerships will be developed. Emphasis will be placed on the nature and content of Center-to-Center partnerships, Centers' partnerships with NGOs (both international and local), Centers' partnerships with private sector, Centers' partnerships with NARS and ARIs (from both developing and developed countries), and Centers' partnerships with donors and members.

A conceptual framework of what constitutes successful partnerships will be developed. This will be guided by a commissioned study of selected cases of global partnerships for generating global public goods. The study should identify and describe characteristics of successful partnerships and lessons for the CGIAR.

The Panel will retain a consultant to provide an in-depth analysis of the experience of the CGIAR in working in partnership with non-governmental organizations (NGOs). He will address several issues and questions:

1. What kinds of research and technological innovation partnerships have been developed between CGIAR, the Centers and NGOs?
2. How have the partnerships been 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 the CGIAR and the Centers?
3. How much time, effort and resources have been invested to coordinate the partnerships?
4. What are the outputs and outcomes 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 NGOs?
5. What kinds of explicit strategies have the CGIAR and its Centers deployed to engage NGOs in the partnerships?
6. Did the partnerships face any risks and conflicts? What kinds of risks and conflicts? And how were the risks reduced and conflicts resolved?
7. What lessons has or can the CGIAR and the Centers draw from their partnerships with NGOs? and
8. What measures should the CGIAR and the Centers take to improve the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of their partnerships with NGOs?

The review will also examine CGIAR partnerships with the private sector. This is will be based on desk review of EPMRs and various recent studies on CGIAR-private sector partnerships. The survey of CGIAR collaboration will be used and recent studies published by IFPRI and other organizations. Initial desk reviews raise further questions about the nature and quality of CGIAR-private sector partnerships. It is not clear as to the content and benefits of such partnerships. There are few research partnerships between CGIAR and private companies. This review will seek to determine what barriers exist to greater partnership with the Private Sector. . Structured interviews with DGs and other representatives of the Centers as well as with representatives of private sector will be conducted. A set of core questions is being designed for interviews on partnerships with the private sector. Three or four questions on CGIAR-private sector partnerships are also included in the general questionnaire distributed by the Independent Review Panel.

4.4 Gender

The World Development Report 2008 affirmed that gender equality and investment in removing the barriers women face in agriculture are essential to achieving the efficiency and productivity gains that are essential to poverty reduction.

The Panel notes that its Terms of Reference said little explicitly about gender and the role the CGIAR has played in addressing the needs of women farmers. The Panel therefore has taken the sections on effectiveness and impact to include consideration of gender issues and will address gender throughout.

The Panel will draw from CGIAR evaluations such as the Evaluation of the Participatory Research and Gender Analysis Program (2007). In cooperation with IFPRI, the Panel is contributing to a self assessment of the Centers that will help identify institutional practices that best support the integration of gender perspectives in the science agenda and other activities of the Centers. The self assessment led by IFPRI will be considered in the Panel's deliberations on gender.

5.0 WORK PLANS

5.1 Tasks and Schedule

The Review Panel met for the first time at the Executive Council meeting in Rome in October 2007. The Panel considered its Terms of Reference and planned the Panel Papers (and related work packages) that would need to be completed during the Review. The Panel has planned a series of seven meetings and one videoconference. It plans to visit about 8 to 10 Centers. A key milestone is the July 31 target for the circulation of the draft Full Panel Report, for comment. The work of the Panel is expected to be fully complete after a presentation at AGM 2008.

Table 5.1 Milestones of the Work of the Independent Review Panel

Period	Panel Meeting	Other	Location
Oct. 2007	Oct. 2007	Initial Panel Meeting (at ExCo Meeting)	Rome
Dec. 2007	Dec. 2007	Panel Meeting (attendance at AGM07)	Beijing
Jan. 2008	Jan. 2008	Panel Meeting ⁴⁰	Rome
Feb. 7, 2008	Stakeholder	Survey distributed by email	
Feb. 21	Feb. 21	Panel Videoconference	
Mar. 4-7	Mar. 5-6	Panel Meeting. Meet w/Advisory Committee (Mar. 7)	London
March 31		Chair Presents "Interim Progress Report" to the WB ARD Sector Board	Washington
March - April		Center Visits	
May 12-17	May 15-16	Panel Meeting (w/Advisory Group). ExCo Meeting (May 13-14)	Ottawa
July	Mid-July	Panel Meeting to finalize circulation draft of Report.	
July 31		Circulation Draft of Full Panel Report.	
August/Sept		Exit Workshops	To be decided
Sept.		Panel Meeting to consider comments on its Report and make final revisions if necessary.	London
Oct., Dec. 08		Full Panel Report (revised) Presented to ExCo and to AGM 08	

5.2 Budget

The Terms of Reference for the Review Panel are comprehensive. They cover an assessment of the effectiveness of the Centers (impact of the science), an assessment of the approaches to partnerships by both the CGIAR and the Centers, and an assessment of the governance of the CGIAR. In addition, the Independent Panel includes members from regions throughout the world – India, South Africa, the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada. The Advisory Panel is similarly international.

The scope of the tasks with which the Panel is charged, and the international nature of its composition and its consultations, make a significant travel, research and support budget necessary. Nevertheless the resources are a very small fraction of the annual expenditures of the CGIAR and Centers; and the CGIAR incurs the cost of a

⁴⁰ Consultations with EIARD, FAO, IFAD, Bioversity, CAS-IP, Alliance Office, SC Secretariat, GFAR Secretariat

comprehensive Independent Review only about every decade to fifteen years. In this light the likely expenditures to enable the Panel to complete its work are modest, and, of course, the possible gains to the CGIAR are substantial, not least in providing a firm basis of analysis to inform the Change Management Process.

There are no definitive figures available for the budget for the 1998 Third System Review but it appears to have been between \$1.5 million and \$2 million.⁴¹ The budget plan for the current review indicates a likely expenditure of approximately \$1.4 million up to the point of the release of the circulation draft of the report of the Panel, and \$1.7 million to \$2.0 million including Phase 3 and depending on the choice of options in Phase 3.

The Panel believes that consulting widely with CGIAR members and stakeholders – including, importantly, those from the South – is critical to the ultimate success of the Review and to its usefulness to the CGIAR. Such consultation will take place throughout the review process, but would importantly include interaction following dissemination of the Panel's conclusions and recommendations in July 2008, via exit workshops in developing countries and interaction with the Change Management process. (See Appendix 3)

⁴¹ The initial budget for the Third System Review in 1997 was also \$1.5 million, plus \$155,000 for report preparation. (The equivalent figure in 2008, given general inflation and the sharp decline in the purchasing power of the US dollar internationally, is approximately \$2.7 million.) Pineiro, Martin, Elliot Stern, and Dana Dalrymple. 2000. "System-Wide Reviews in the CGIAR: Concepts, Options, and Recommendations". October 2000.

APPENDICES

(1) Early Draft Table of Contents: Report of the Panel.

Acknowledgements

Glossary

Executive Summary

1. Preface: The Challenges to Agriculture in the 21st Century: Implications for the CGIAR

2. Introduction

2.1. The Consultative Group on Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

2.2. Previous Reviews

2.3. Scope and Objectives of this Review

2.4. Standards and Limitations of this Review

2.5. Review Methodology

2.6. Change Management

3. Profile of the CGIAR and Centers, 2003-2007

3.1. The CGIAR System

3.2. Consultative Group, including Objectives and Founding Principles

3.3. The Centers (mandates, resources, activities and outputs, 2003-2007)

3.4. The Science Council

3.5. The Co-Sponsors

4. Achievements of the Centers

4.1. Quality, Relevance and Impact of CGIAR-funded Science

4.2. International Public Goods

4.3. Strategic Programs (Challenge Programs, Eco-Regional Programs)

4.4. A Thematic Perspective (policy, productivity, environment and gender)

4.5. Knowledge Management and Intellectual Property

4.6. Recommendations.

5. Priority Setting and Evaluation

5.1. The Priorities Exercise

5.2. A Results-Based Framework?

5.3. Evaluation (Performance Measurement, EPMRs, Reviews and Studies)

5.4. Recommendations.

6. Governance of the CGIAR Partnership

6.1. Reform Initiatives 2003-2007

6.2. ExCo and Centers' Boards

6.3. Executive Management: Role of the Chair and Director

6.4. The Role and Performance of the World Bank

6.5. The Alliance

6.6. Central Administration and Services (Secretariat and Systems Office)

6.7. Recommendations.

7. Financial Management

- 7.1. Funding the CGIAR and the Centers, 2003-2007
- 7.2. Costs of the CGIAR
- 7.3. Resource Allocation
- 7.4. Financial Risk Management
- 7.5. Recommendations.

8. Partnerships

- 8.1. Overview of Partnerships (CGIAR and Centers with other organizations)
- 8.2. Center-with-Center Partnerships
- 8.3. Challenge Programs
- 8.4. External Partnerships (Global, NARs, ARIs, NGOs and Private Companies)
- 8.5. Recommendations.

9. Gender

- 9.1. Overview of the Role of CGIAR in Addressing the Implications Gender in Productivity in Agriculture and Poverty Reduction
- 9.2. The CGIAR's Integration of Gender in its Science and Technology Agenda
- 9.3. The CGIAR and Gender: Organizational Issues
- 9.4. Recommendations

10. Overview and Conclusions

- 10.1. Value for Money: The CGIAR and Poverty Alleviation
- 10.2. The CGIAR: Comparative Advantage in the International Agricultural Architecture
- 10.3. Summary of Recommendations

Appendices

- 1. Commentaries on this Report
- 2. Funding of Centers 2003-2007
- 3. Survey of Key Participants in the CGIAR
- 4. Status of Recommendations from Previous Reviews
- 5. Typology of Partnerships
- 6. Bibliography

Appendix 2: Work Components of the Review

Report of the Panel

The final (synthesis) report of the Panel will sum up its findings and recommendations. It will answer the questions set out in its Terms of Reference. It will put its recommendations in the context of best practices among global partnership programs. It will also relate its findings to the recommendations of previous reviews and will address issues of implementation.⁴²

Among other topics the report will describe the evolving context and likely future scenarios for agricultural research and poverty reduction. It will assess governance options including funding, organization and management. It will address relevance, efficacy, efficiency, and sustainability. The Panel will assess value-for-money, report its findings and recommendations, and note lessons.

Some conclusions of the Panel may be in the form of firm recommendations and, given the time constraints on the work of the Panel, some may be in the form of partly assessed options with recommendations that they be examined in more depth.

The following sections constitute the entire work program of the Panel that form the foundation of the final synthesis report.

Panel Paper 1. Context

Work Package 1A The Methods of the Review

Lead: Elizabeth McAllister

Support: Ken Watson

Selected literature:

- Martin Pineiro; Elliot Stern; Dana Dalrymple. 2000. *System-wide Reviews in the CGIAR: Concepts, Options, and Recommendations*.

Work Package 1B Challenges - Agriculture Research, Natural Resource Management, and Poverty Reduction

Lead: Gopal Chadha

Support: Karin Perkins

Readers: Panel Member, E. McAllister, Jeff Waage, John Mugabe, Keith Bezanson

This will be a short synthesis of the recent major documents that have assessed the situation of agricultural research and natural resource management in regard to poverty reduction.

Selected literature:

- World Bank (July 2007). *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*. Washington: World Bank.

⁴² What recommendations were made of previous reviews, including the third System-Wide Review, the 2001 Change Design and Management Team Report, and by the WB OED evaluation 2001-2003? What was the process of responding to recommendations? What progress has been made to implement the recommendations that were accepted?

Work Package 1C: **A Profile of CGIAR 2001-2007.**

Introduction:

This paper is a factual profile of CGIAR 2001-2007. What are its structures, resources and activities, outputs and outcomes and how have these evolved during this period of change and reform?

Lead: E. McAllister

Support: Karin Perkins and Rita Dambita

Readers: Jeff Waage, John Mugabe, Gopal Chadha, Keith Bezanson

Many of the questions in the Panel's Terms of Reference assume a deep knowledge of the facts of the CGIAR. These will emerge as the Panel's research proceeds. Some preliminary profile questions include the following:

Questions:

1. What is the logic, rationale/additionality of the CGIAR? What are its expected outcomes? (Knowledge management.)
2. History, mandate and objectives.
3. What is its context, within all Global Programs?
4. What are the "system" characteristics? What is the CGIAR structure (governance)?
5. What is its membership? (donors, contributions, trends)
6. What are the Centers (characteristics)
7. What are its activities and outputs?
8. Who are its beneficiaries of CGIAR resources and activities? What are its expenditures? (trends, restricted/unrestricted). How important to the beneficiaries is CGIAR funding?
9. What have different donors funded (funds to Centres and against priorities, 2001-2007)?

Selected literature:

- World Bank. Operations Evaluation Department. (2003) "CGIAR at 31"
- CGIAR Secretariat. Francisco Reifschneider, Ernest Corea and Ian Johnson. (2007). *Revolutionizing the Evolution of the CGIAR 2001 to 2007: A Contribution to the Institutional Memoir and Some Thoughts for the Future.*
http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/af_cgiar_reform_050207.pdf
- CGIAR. Change Design and Management Team (CDMT). Margaret Catley-Carlson, Chair. (2001, April). *Designing and Managing Change in the CGIAR: Report to the Mid-Term Meeting, 2001.*
- CGIAR Charter,
- CGIAR Annual Reports
- CGIAR ExCo and AGM Proceedings

Work Package 1D: <u>CGIAR and Global Public Goods</u>

Introduction:

This paper explores the international-public-good (IPG) nature of CGIAR outputs and outcomes and how these contribute to the attainment of System priorities.

Lead: Elizabeth McAllister

Deputy Lead: Keith Bezanson
Readers: Jeff Waage, John Mugabe, Gopal Chadha

TORS Questions:

1. Has the CGIAR system maintained its focus on global (or international) public goods?
2. Is CGIAR efficient and suited to the development and dissemination of international public goods?
3. How well do the system priorities position the CGIAR with respect to its mission?
4. What forces are affecting programs and decision-making in this regard?
5. Is this the most effective focus to alleviate poverty?

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

“A Conceptual Framework for Measuring CGIAR as a Provider of International Public Goods”
Francisco Sagasti and Vanessa Timmers.

Related Questions:

1. To what extent does CGIAR produce outputs that have GPG properties? What are their core and complementary components?
2. How does CGIAR determine the desirability of its interventions into processes of agricultural research and development from an IPG perspective?
3. How does the System view and address collective-action problems within the System, particularly with regards to governance and financing?
4. What role do regional and national public goods play, e.g. as complements or as stepping stones towards the IPGs provided by the CGIAR? And what role have the NARS and the System Centers played in this context?
5. How are potential access problems at the national or regional level to CGIAR-supported knowledge?

Selected literature:

- CGIAR. Science Council. *Positioning the CGIAR in the Research for Development Continuum*. November 2006.
- Dalrymple, Dana G. “International Agricultural research as a Global Public Good.” Mimeo. 2002.
- Kaul, Inge et al, eds. *Providing Global Public Goods*. New York: Oxford University Press 2003.
- World Bank. Global Programs and Partnerships. (2007, August 20). “Global Public Goods: A Framework for the Role of the World Bank”.

Intellectual Property

Related Questions:

1. What is CGIAR’s competitive advantage?
2. Are the internal capabilities of the Centers well managed? Best scientists, capital equipment, and quality assurance? Are these facing downslides?
3. Has the Systems Office unit providing guidance on intellectual property (CAS-IP) performed well?
4. How are IPR issues addressed by CG-centres under the CGIAR System against those under collaborative research with the private sector?

Selected literature:

- World Bank (2006). Intellectual Property Rights-Designing Regime to Support Plant Breeding in Developing Countries. Washington: ARDD
- William Lesser (2003). Review of Biotechnology, Genetic Resources, and Intellectual Property Rights Programs, Thematic Working Paper for Meta Evaluation of the CGIAR at 31. Washington: OED/World Bank
- Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GPPC) Think Tank on Genetic Issues.
- CGIAR. Intellectual Property Rights: Product Stewardship and Ethics.

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. An examination of the effectiveness of the CGIAR policy centers
2. A review of evidence on the effective management of germplasm collections
3. A review of CGIAR's management of intellectual property rights

Work Package 1E: <u>Funding, Resource Allocation, Costs and Financial Management</u>

Introduction:

This paper will describe the income and expenditures of CGIAR, how resources are allocated, and whether finances are managed well.

Lead: Elizabeth McAllister

Deputy leads: Ken Watson, (Consultant: Joan Barclay)

Readers: Gopal Chadha, Jeff Waage, John Mugabe, Keith Bezanson

TORS Questions:

1. Is the current financing structure for the system appropriate?
2. Is the CGIAR aligning priorities and funding well?
3. What is the role of unrestricted resources in supporting the system, including the reform program?
4. How has the decline in unrestricted funding affected the system as a whole, particularly its governance and its ability to deliver research products that contribute to the fulfillment of the CGIAR mission?
5. How effectively does the system deal with financial risks?
6. What are the costs, including transaction costs, and benefits of the governance structure?
7. Is the distribution of these costs and benefits among the three pillars appropriate to enhance the implementation of the mission of the CGIAR?

Related Questions:

(A) Funding

1. What funds do the CGIAR, its Programmes and its Centers receive and what are the trends?
2. What are the funding mechanisms by which donors channel their support to CGIAR and System entities? Does new thinking in public finance offer other options for modes of funding?
3. To what extent do issues of financing agricultural development, including agricultural research, figure within CGIAR's work agenda?
4. How adequate and sustainable is funding? Is there a CGIAR strategy to promote Centers' increasing financial sustainability over time?
5. Have increases/decreases in resources over time made a significant difference? (Loss of scholarship/fellowship programs at the Centers?)

6. What are the trends in restricted and unrestricted funding over time? How are unrestricted CGIAR funds used by recipient centers? (Issues of fungibility, attribution and full costing of activities.)

(B) Resource Allocation

1. Are resources allocated well by CGIAR's donors, including the World Bank, according to priorities, need, potential pay-off and Center performance?
2. Should funds be pooled and allocated by the CGIAR itself? If so how should CGIAR transition to such a system?

(C) Costs

1. What are the CGIAR costs in total and by activity?
2. What are the "core activity" and "overhead" costs of the CGIAR?
3. How do costs vary by Center? What are the driving factors? Are reforms needed?
4. What are the costs of the administrative superstructure?

(D) Financial Management

1. Do the Centers manage their finances well?
2. Are internal and external audit 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?

Selected literature:

- Wadsworth, Jonathan, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities (2007, September). *Final Report*. For discussion at ExCo 13.
- Science Council. Finn, Norman Christensen. (2006, May). *Positioning the CGIAR in the Global Research for Development Continuum*. Also the Proceedings of the AGM 2005 where the report was discussed.
- Proceedings of Member Coordination Forum held at AGM 2006, including background documents
- CGIAR Secretariat. (2007, April). *RiskLow. A New Comprehensive Program to Address Financial Risk Management in the CGIAR System*. A Think Piece by the CGIAR Secretariat
- CGIAR evaluation, monitoring, review and other study reports, including annual reports of the Centers, Alliance and other System entities. Various years
- CGIAR, Ad Hoc Committee on Funding System Priorities (2007, September). *Final Report*. For discussion at ExCo 13.
- Kaul, Inge. *The New Public Finance*. New York: OUP, 2006.
- Masters, William A. "Paying for Prosperity: How and Why to Invest in Agricultural Research and Development in Africa." *Journal of International Affairs*, 58(2) 2005.
- Pardey, P.G. et al, eds. *Agricultural R&D in the Developing World: Too Little, Too Late?* Washington D.C. IFPRI, 2006.
- Various articles in journals of agricultural economics.
- World Bank. *WDR 2008 on Agriculture for Development*. Washington DC, 2007.

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Funding Analysis: Sources of Funds, Stability of Funding and Constraints on the Use of Funds (including Best Practices in Unified Funds)
2. Cost Analysis: Transactions Costs in the CGIAR

3. Resource Allocation: Best Practices in Rules-Based Resource Allocation Systems
4. Financial Risk Management: CGIAR Practices and Best Practices in other Global Program Partnerships

Work Package 1F: Evaluation, Performance Measurement, Environmental Scanning, and Managing for Development Results

Introduction:

This paper will examine whether CGIAR follows best practices in managing for development results.

Lead: E. McAllister

Deputy Lead: Keith Bezanson

Support: Ken Watson

Readers: Jeff Waage, John Mugabe, Gopal Chadha, Keith Bezanson

TORS Questions:

1. Does the partnership operate in a transparent manner?
2. How are the members of the partnership accountable to the partnership?

Related Questions:

- What previous reviews and major studies of CGIAR were done and how strong were they methodologically?
- Are the “20 priorities” measurable and monitorable?
- Does CGIAR take a results-based approach? If so does it have appropriate systems and practices to manage for development results? Is there an adequate M&E framework (system-based, center-based and program-based)?
- Does CGIAR have adequate “knowledge management” systems and practices? (ISCT, knowledge management unit, Rome-based). Is the database well used?
- Does CGIAR manage its outputs conceptually and quantitatively to align them with its objectives and strategy?
- What commitments to action resulted from past reviews? Is there a system to track progress against these commitments?
- Are the LogFrames useful tools? Are the indicators listed therein actually measured and monitored?
- How much does CGIAR spend on M&E annually? Is this reasonable?
- How does the CGIAR scan the economic, social, and natural resources environment to set direction and to prepare for new challenges?

Selected literature:

- Mywish Maredia, Derek Byerlee and Jock Anderson. *Ex Post Evaluation of Economic Impacts of Agricultural Research Programs: A Tour of Good Practice*. (Year?) Paper presented to the Workshop on “The Future of Impact Assessment in CGIAR: Needs, Constraints, and Options”, Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) of the Technical Advisory Committee, Rome, May 3-5, Rome.
<http://impact.cgiar.org/methods/docs/maredia.pdf>
- Namita Datta, Note summarizing CGIAR’s experience from past reform/change exercises including System Reviews, including: Lucerne Declaration 1995; Third System Review 1998; CDMT Report 2000 that led to reform program; Federation proposal 2000; and OED 2003

- SSA Task Force 2005 (quite important to also track what decisions resulted from this Task Force)
- Peter Hazell: Study of CGIAR Impact in South Asia

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Describe CGIAR's "evaluation system" (medium-term plans, EPMRs, performance measurement system, STRIPE reviews, system-wide reviews, World Bank IEG evaluations, center-commissioned studies, donor-commissioned studies, and *ad hoc* evaluations).
2. Assess the central strategy function in the CGIAR including environmental scanning function of the CGIAR.

Work Package 1G: <u>CGIAR's Capacity to Implement Reforms</u> (Management for Development Results)

Over the past decade CGIAR has been the subject of several major reports and a number of minor reports that have made recommendations that have not been implemented. In some cases this may have been because the recommendations were not well founded but in other cases there appears to have been problems of lack of capacity to make firm decisions and to implement them.

Lead: Elizabeth McAllister
Deputy lead: Keith Bezanson
Readers: Jeff Waage, Gopal Chadha, John Mugabe

Related questions:

1. How does the System address collective-action problems within the System?

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Analysis by the Change Management Team of the Internal Structural and Cultural Constraints to CGIAR Adopting Needed Reforms

Panel Paper 2. Governance, Management and Alignment

Work Package 2A: **The CGIAR System**

This paper will examine CGIAR's structure and organization (governance, management and programme/project implementation). The Review will look for evidence that indicates whether and to what extent these arrangements have enabled CGIAR operations to be efficient and effective, and perhaps also, improved the sustainability of results.

Lead: Keith Bezanson and Elizabeth McAllister
Readers: Jeff Waage, Gopal Chadha, John Mugabe

TORS Questions:

1. *How effective is the (internal) partnership approach taken by CGIAR (i.e. its forming an informal international association)?*
2. What have been the key changes in the governance and management processes/procedures in recent years and how did they affect the partnership?
3. Are the levels of responsibility and accountability among the three pillars appropriate? Are the voices of the three pillars appropriately represented in System governance?

4. Are there any lessons from other global partnerships?
5. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the partnership as a whole?
6. Are there key constraints/limitations to the partnership? If so, what are they?

Related Questions:

1. Are the three pillars stovepipes? Could the system be more integrated?
2. Could the governance of the system be organized more economically? Is it necessary, for example, for the ExCo to meet twice a year in addition to the AGM?
3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of embedding the executive management of the CGIAR in the World Bank?
4. Should the CGIAR system be a legal entity?
5. Are incentives aligned with the CGIAR mission and strategic objectives?

Selected literature:

- Alliance of CGIAR Centers. "The Way Forward for the CGIAR System." May 2007.
- CGIAR. Major review, evaluation and assessment reports; CDMT reports; Stripe review; SSA Task Forces report. Various years.
- CGIAR Center reports. Various years.
- Kaul, Inge. "Exploring the Policy Space between Markets and States: Global Public-Private Partnerships." In: Kaul, Inge et al, eds. *The New Public Finance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- CGIAR Sub-Saharan Task Force. 2005. *Report of the CGIAR Sub-Saharan Africa Task Forces. The Tervuren Consensus*.
- CGIAR corporate options; STRIPE Reviews: Governance/Boards, Human Resources, NRM, etc.
- Sielman, David J. and Klaus von Grebmer. "Public-private Partnerships in Agricultural Research." Washington: IFPRI, 2004.
- Widdus, Roy. "Public-private Partnerships for Health." In *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 79(8):713-20.
- World Bank. IEG. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs. Washington 2007.
- Paul Egger; Lili-Ann Foster; Samuel Paul . 2006. *Report of the Stripe Review of Corporate Governance of CGIAR Centers*.
- Maredia, M.K., Raitzer, D.A. (2006). *CGIAR and NARS partner research in sub-Saharan Africa: evidence of impact to date*. CGIAR. Science Council Secretariat, Rome, Italy.
- Bezanson, K. External Evaluation of the Partnership Committees of the CGIAR.

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Describe best practices in the governance of global partnership programs, including board governance, executive management, and system (common service) units.

Work Package 2B: Alliance

Introduction:

The Alliance was established in 2006 by the Future Harvest Centers to "provide a forum for the Centers to discuss the implementation of the CGIAR mission at the operational level anda focal point for enhancing corporate spirit and action." This paper will examine the evolution, rationale and performance of the Alliance. It will focus on whether the Alliance adds value to the efficiency and effectiveness of CGIAR system. Emphasis will be placed on the extent to which the Alliance enables and/or ensures that the CGIAR evolves and operates a systemic way. The paper will also

review the governance and programmatic activities of the Alliance as well as its funding and sustainability.

Lead: Elizabeth McAllister

Deputy Lead: Keith Bezanson

Support: Karin Perkins

Readers: Jeff Waage, E. McAllister, Gopal Chadha

TORS Questions:

1. How well does the Alliance of the CGIAR Centers perform collectively?
2. Is the Alliance a cost-effective mechanism for collective action?
3. How is it perceived by Centers, Members and other partners?
4. How does system governance (ExCo and the CGIAR) relate to Center governance?
5. How does system governance relate to the governance of the Alliance of the CGIAR Centers?
6. How does the autonomy of the 15 research centers and of the 64 Members balance with the need for accountability and collective action at the System level?
7. What are the challenges of keeping the system aligned while also respecting this autonomy?
8. How effective is the oversight and governance of the individual centers? How well equipped are the Center Boards in playing this oversight role at the center level?
9. How well do Centers form partnerships outside the CGIAR?

Related Questions:

1. How is the Alliance structured and governed?
2. What are the main sources and levels of funding for the Alliance?
3. What were the motivations to (1) develop a bottom-up approach to collective action by the Centers; and (2) rationalize Centers through mergers or close alliances?
4. What kinds of collaborations or partnerships exist or are formed among the centers?
5. Do the centers belong to other networks/partnerships?
6. What does the Alliance add to or detract from the executive management of the CGIAR?
7. To what extent are corporate services aligned (shared)?
8. To what extent does the Alliance lead to program alignment?
9. How does the Alliance help individual Centers to upgrade their performance?
10. Is the Alliance open to new members and new types of members?

Selected literature:

- Alliance of CGIAR Centers. (2007, May). *The Way Forward for the CGIAR System*.
- Alliance of CGIAR Centers. (2007, October). *Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centres to ExCo 13, Rome Italy*.
- Alliance of CGIAR Centers. Best, S.G. and Godfrey, J. (2007, October). *Alliance Board Update on Implementation of Key Stripe Review Recommendations*.
- Alliance of CGIAR Centers (April 2006) *Principles and Procedures of the Alliance of Future Harvest Centers of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research*.
- Proceedings of the Meeting of Center Board Chairs (CBC) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research May 4-6, 2005, WorldFish Center, Penang, Malaysia.
- Proceedings of the Meeting of CBC, Mexico City, October 2004
- Proceedings of the Member Coordination Forum (AGM 2006)
- CG Secretariat paper prepared for ExCo October 2006 on ExCo's role in oversight of centers and implications of that.

- Proceedings of the Alliance Board/Alliance Executive Joint Meeting, Nov 30-Dec 1, 2006. Washington DC.
- Report of the Joint Alliance Board/Alliance Committee, April 26-27 2006, Cali, Colombia
- Proceedings of the Meeting of the Alliance Board (AB) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, IFPRI Washington DC December 1, 2006.
- External Programme and Management Reviews (EPM)

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Examine the rationale for an “alliance” of the CGIAR Centers separate from the Executive Council and executive management of the CGIAR. Is this a pillar or a stovepipe?

Work Package 2C: **Executive Council** (Executive Decision Making/Resource Allocation)

Introduction:

This paper will examine the design and performance of the Executive Council, and the importance of the Council to executive decision-making in the CGIAR.

Lead: Keith Bezanson and Elizabeth McAllister

Readers: Jeff Waage, John Mugabe, Gopal Chadha

TORs Questions:

1. In terms of the governance of the System, what has been the performance of the Executive Council since its inception in 2001, as one of the important components of the reform program?
2. Has the Executive Council made decision-making more effective and efficient within the CGIAR partnership?
3. Are the roles, size and composition of ExCo appropriate for its mandate?
4. How effective are the CGIAR Annual General Meetings, including the Stakeholder Meeting and Business Meeting?

Related Questions:

1. Does ExCo have appropriate scope and authority?
2. Does the “consensus culture” serve CGIAR ExCo well?
3. Do various partners and stakeholders have sufficient voice in ExCo?

Selected literature:

- Secretariat Report: “ExCo Roles, Size and Composition” (ExCo 12, May 2007)
- Document review and interviews. Minutes review.

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. What is best practice among global program partnerships in regard to Board structure (Governing Boards and Executive Boards) and what are the lessons for the CGIAR?

Work Package 2D: **CGIAR Executive (Chairperson, Director and Secretariat)**

Introduction:

This paper will examine the design of the positions of CGIAR Chairperson, Director and Secretariat, and the importance of these positions to strategy, decision-making and operations in the CGIAR.

Lead: Keith Bezanson and Elizabeth McAllister
Panel Member Readers: Jeff Waage, John Mugabe, Gopal Chadha

TORs Questions:

There were no questions in the TORs explicitly on the CGIAR executive. Nevertheless the TORs made it clear that all significant aspects of CGIAR governance were to be examined.

Related Questions:

1. What are the roles and functions of the CGIAR Chair, Director and Secretariat?
2. Do the CGIAR Chair, Director and Secretariat have appropriate scope and authority?
3. Are these functions properly integrated into the overall governance of the CGIAR?

Selected literature:

- Secretariat Report: "ExCo Roles, Size and Composition" (ExCo 12, May 2007)
- Document review and interviews. Minutes review.

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. What is best practice among global program partnerships in regard to executive management?

Work Package 2E: System Office (Administration and Coordination)

Introduction:

This paper will examine the design, efficiency and effectiveness of the various units of the System Office and the performance of the Office as a whole.

Lead: Keith Bezanson
Deputy Leads: Elizabeth McAllister
Readers: Jeff Waage, John Mugabe, Gopal Chadha

TORS Questions

1. How effective is the System Office, as a virtual structure, in helping to increase coordination, capture synergies and increase overall performance of central service units that support the Centers and the CGIAR System as a whole?
2. How well do three units of the System Office, namely the CGIAR Secretariat, Science Council Secretariat and the Alliance Office - perform their functions?
3. Are their structure, size and composition appropriate for the key functions they perform? Are accountability mechanisms and processes for increasing efficiency appropriate given their respective roles?
4. Is there a potential conflict of interest in the CGIAR Secretariat's involvement in administration of the allocation of the funds from the World Bank and other donors?

Related Questions:

1. Is it necessary to have nine separate units of the System Office?

2. Is it efficient to have a separate Steering Committee for each Unit or should there be a single Committee or something else?
3. How does the System Office relate to the CGIAR Secretariat? Is this an efficient way to design the administrative machinery of the CGIAR?
4. To what extent should units of the System Office, such as the Gender and Diversity Unit, be focused on external programs, compared with internal matters?
5. How has the Gender and Diversity Office performed?
6. How has Internal Audit performed?

Selected literature:

- CGIAR System Office. (2007, May). *Integrated Operating Plan 2007*.
- CGIAR Secretariat. (2007, October). *Governance of the System Office – Structure, Lessons Learned and Options for Simplification*. Discussion Draft at EXCO 13.
- Daniels, Doug. (2006, August). *Review of the CGIAR System Office*.

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Assess the performance of each of the units of the System Office on the basis of existing evidence (documents).

Work Package 2F: CGIAR's Members and Co-Sponsors

Introduction:

This paper will examine the reach, roles, motivations and incentives of the CGIAR's members/sponsors.

Lead: Keith Bezanson and Elizabeth McAllister

Readers: John Mugabe, Gopal Chadha, Jeff Waage

TORS Questions:

1. What is the role - the strengths and weaknesses of the World Bank, as one of the largest contributor of unrestricted resources, in facilitating the operation of the system?
2. How is the World Bank contribution (which is not only monetary), assisting to leverage other CGIAR Members funding into the CGIAR and impacting reform of the system, its governance, mode of operation, etc.?
3. What is the role of the other Co-Sponsors?
4. What are the perceptions of CGIAR membership about their involvement and change of involvement over the past few years?
5. And roles are played by the Co-Sponsors? What are CGIAR Members perceptions about the issues of relative autonomy and accountability and about the current layers of governance in the System?
6. What are CGIAR Members views of the role of the World Bank?
7. Members and Centers perceptions about the three units (Executive Council, Science Council, and System Office)?

Related Questions:

1. What is the role of the other Co-sponsors and the perceptions of CGIAR membership about this role?
2. What is the likely direction of evolution of membership?
3. What are the priorities of various (groups?) of members?

4. What are the costs and benefits to members of CGIAR membership?
5. Are developing countries/emerging donors sufficiently represented?
6. Is the membership fee set at the right level?
7. Use of Trust Funds, e.g. Bank-Netherlands Partnership Program.

Selected literature:

- Jock R. Anderson, Consultant, CGIAR Secretariat. (2006, Nov. 27). *The CGIAR as a Vertical Program Contributing to Country Development Activities*
- A Global Partnership Program Study.
- CDMT Report
- TSR 1998

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

Re-examine the World Bank's (OED) conclusion that there should be more separation between the management and oversight roles in regard to the CGIAR. Has the Office of the Chief Economist played a sufficient oversight role to achieve the desired separation?

Does FAO play an appropriate role in the governance of the CGIAR?

Are the other co-sponsors sufficiently involved in governance of the CGIAR?

Panel Paper 3. Effectiveness of CGIAR Research

Three work packages will cover CGIAR research effectiveness. They will consider its relevance to the development needs and problems of small-holder agriculture, and will note the importance of food quality and prices, and natural resource management, in poverty reduction. Collectively, they are expected to address the following TOR questions.

TOR Questions:

1. Given the level of investment, how do CGIAR funds contribute to enhancing agricultural productivity, natural resource management and food security?
2. What is the evidence of the relationship between achieving these and economic growth and poverty alleviation?
3. How does investment in agricultural R&D relate to agricultural GDP (e.g. Sub-Sahara Africa) and what is the share of the total CGIAR investment in total agricultural R&D (for the same region)? What is the trend and would an increase in international agricultural research investments (such as the CGIAR) affect agricultural GDP significantly? For example, given the small share of the total investment in agricultural R&D that is represented by the CGIAR investment, and given the returns on this investment, so far, would an increased investment in CGIAR research bring about more than proportional returns in terms of impacts on the CGIAR mission?
4. How effective is the CGIAR system as a whole in serving as a platform and catalyst in supporting and delivering international agricultural research for poverty reduction and sustainable development?
5. What evidence is there that CGIAR-generated technology and policy options are international public goods that are utilized by partners, with the former ultimately adopted by smallholders and the latter implemented by development agencies?
6. Does the CGIAR contribute to poverty reduction objectives of international development agencies (including the World Bank) and how are CGIAR outputs being utilized by them?
7. What pressing issues should be considered for new and expanded CGIAR efforts? Are there areas where CGIAR research could be reduced?

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

Work Package 3A: Economic and poverty reduction returns to investment in agricultural research

Introduction

This paper, based on world experience of agriculture development, will underline the crucial role of agricultural research and its potential contribution to agriculture development, economic growth and rural poverty reduction. It will consider agricultural dimensions of the Millennium Development Goals and synthesize recent publications on the future of agriculture in development, including the World Development Report. It will take a view of the contribution that global research organizations, most notably the CGIAR, have made - and could make - to addressing these key challenges.

Lead: Gopal Chadha
Deputy Lead: Jeff, Waage
Readers: E. McAllister, Panel Member, John Mugabe,

Related questions:

1. What is known about the relative effectiveness of increasing the agricultural GDP towards poverty reduction, compared with other types of development investments and interventions?
2. To what extent do the CGIAR 20 research priorities fit the real needs of agricultural growth and poverty alleviation?
3. What mechanisms are built into the CGIAR research system to effect re-prioritizations to meet the challenges of food security, resource preservation and other related agrarian developments?

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Paper on the topic.

Work Package 3B: Relevance and Quality of CGIAR Research.

Introduction:

This paper will cover the nature, relevance and quality of CGIAR science outputs (largely from an analysis of the data collected by the three annual performance measurement surveys that CGIAR has conducted).

Lead: Jeff Waage
Deputy lead: G.K. Chadha
Readers: E. McAllister, Keith Bezanson, John Mugabe

Related questions:

1. What have been the trends in relevance and quality of CGIAR's research outputs?
2. How are the CGIAR research outputs disseminated and used?

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Paper on the topic.

Work Package 3C: CGIAR Impact on Productivity Improvement and Poverty Reduction

Introduction:

This paper will examine evidence on the impact of CGIAR research on productivity growth and poverty reduction. It will review recent trends and key issues and will, as far as possible, take a medium-term view of the likely future trends and situate CGIAR and its impacts within those future scenarios.

Lead: G.K. Chadha

Deputy lead: Jeff Waage

Readers: E. McAllister, Keith Bezanson, and John Mugabe

Related questions:

1. How has CGIAR research contributed to **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.); b) expanded agricultural employment; c) agricultural wage rates; d) total earnings from agriculture;
2. How has CGIAR research contributed to **Indirect Positive Impact**: a) food security among smallholders; b) brisker functioning of land-lease market; c) intensive-cultivation possibilities; d) expanded non-farm employment; e) total household earnings; f) resource conservation (less poaching of forest land; healthier crop rotations; etc.). Others (e.g. improving human capital; augmented farm and non-farm linkages; food prices; impact on urban poverty).
3. How has CGIAR research contributed to **Unintended Impact**: a) unequal gains and agrarian disparities; b) land fatigue and technological lull; c) resource depletion (over-chemicalization excessive withdrawal of ground water); d) slackness or stagnation in yield rates: crops, regions?
4. At the macro-level, what has been the impact of CGIAR research on: a) agricultural growth; b) rural poverty; c) overall growth; d) rural-urban migration?
5. What evidence is there to show that the CGIAR future research vision is steadily moving towards addressing problems arising out of climate change, land degradation, water scarcity, competing demands on land resources, changing food habits, future technology frontiers?

Selected literature (Work Packages 3A-3C):

- See Separate list of studies relevant to CGIAR impacts
- CGIAR Science Council. David Raitzer. (2003). *Impact of the CGIAR: Everybody's Business*. www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org
- EPMRs of the Centers
- Robinson, M. and Elliot, H... (2007). *Meta-Evaluation of Center EPMRs (Most Recent 11 EPMRs)*.
- CGIAR Science Council. (2007, Sept. 27). *Commentary on the Meta-Evaluation of EPMRs*.
- CGIAR Secretariat. (2007, September 19). *Options to Streamline CGIAR Handling of Center EPMRs*
- Binswanger-Nkhize, H.P. (2007) Consultation on the Roles and Productivity of International Centers in Africa's Agriculture Research Systems. Study conducted for the New Partnership for Africa's development.

- Adato, M. and Meinzen-Dick, R. (eds.) (2007). Agricultural Research, Livelihoods, and Poverty – Studies of the Economic and Social Impact in Six Countries. Washington: IFPRI.
- Anderson, J.R. (2007). Agricultural Advisory Services: Background Paper for the WDR 2008.
- World Bank (July 2007): World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development, Chapters Overview, 2, 7 and 8. Washington: World Bank.
- System-level Syntheses and Centre “Best Practice” Impact Assessment Case Studies covering the period 2003-2007 (2007).
- Centre-Selected Case Studies that Capture the Nature and Magnitude of Impact covering the period 2003-2007. (2007).
- Alliance of CGIAR Centres (May 2007). The Way Forward for the CGIAR System. Rome: Alliance.
- World Bank (August 2007): Global Public Goods: A Framework for the Role of the World Bank. Washington: GPP/World Bank
- Pardey, Philip G., et.al. (2006). Agricultural Research: A Growing global Divide? Food Policy Report 17. Washington: IFPRI.
- Perrings, C. and Gadgil, M. (2006). Conserving Biodiversity: Reconciling Local and Global Public Benefits. New York: Oxford Scholarship Online Monographs.
- Pinstrop-Andersen, P. (2006). The Organization of International Agricultural Research: Background Note for the WDR 2008. Rome: Sciences Council
- CGIAR (April 2005). Report of the CGIAR Sub-Saharan Africa Task Forces – The Tervuren Consensus. Washington: CGIAR Secretariat
- Gardner, B. (2003). Global Public Goods from the CGIAR: Impact Assessment, Thematic Working Paper for Meta Evaluation of the CGIAR at 31. Washington: OED/World Bank
- Raitzer, D.A. (Sept. 2003), Benefit-Cost Meta-Analysis of Investment in the International Agricultural Research Centres for the CGIAR, Rome: CGIAR Science Council.
- Ingram, G.K. (2003). The CGIAR at 31: An Independent Meta Evaluation of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, Volume 1: Overview Report and Volume 2: Technical Report. Washington: OED/World Bank
- Evenson, R.E. and Gollin, D. (eds.) (2003). Crop Variety Improvement and its Effects on Productivity – the Impact of International Agricultural Research, Cambridge: CABI Publishing

Work Package 3D: **The Science Council**

Introduction:

The Science Council (SC) was established in 2001 as a successor to the Technical Advisory Council of the CGIAR. It has three objectives: enhancing and promoting the quality, relevance and impact of science in the CGIAR; advising the Group on strategic scientific issues of importance to its goals; and mobilizing and harnessing the best of international science for addressing the goals of the international agricultural research community? The SC operates through four Standing Panels covering Strategies and Priorities, Monitoring and Evaluation, Mobilizing Science, and Impact Assessment (SPIA). This paper assesses the performance of the Science Council relative to its original objectives and with particular reference to its four Panels and their operations. It will pay particular attention to the role that the SC has played in the development of Systems Priorities and Challenge Programs, and to the effect, which it has had on the Centres and the quality and impact of their science.

Lead: Jeff Waage

Deputy lead: Keith Bezanson

Readers: G.K. Chadha, John Mugabe, Elizabeth McAllister

TORS Questions:

1. How has the SC implemented its role within the CGIAR?
2. **Has the SC effectively fulfilled the three main objectives for which it was set up?**
3. **How is the SC's perceived by internal stakeholders, including Centers and members, and external stakeholders?**
4. How has the process for setting system priorities, led by the SC, contributed to the CGIAR's strategic alignment?
5. How well do the system priorities position the CGIAR with respect to its mission?
6. What forces are affecting programs and decision-making in regard to the system priorities?
7. Is this (the system priorities) the most effective focus to alleviate poverty?
8. Are the size, composition and structure of the SC suitable for the key functions it performs within the CGIAR system?

Related Questions:

1. How effectively has the SC balanced its responsibilities to ExCo and members with its support role to the Centres?
2. How effectively has the SC supported the development, evaluation and impact of the different kinds of science that CGIAR Centres undertake?
3. What specific impact has the SC had on the research programme of Centres and has this helped to achieve MDGs and CGIAR System Priorities?
4. How effective are the four panels of the SC in delivering their objectives and providing the CGIAR with valued products?
5. Does the SC have the structure, resources and instruments it needs to fulfill its mandate?
6. Has the Science Council been successful in promoting new science and new ways of doing science in the CGIAR?

Selected literature:

- CGIAR Secretariat. Francisco Reifschneider, Ernest Corea and Ian Johnson. (2007). *Revolutionizing the Evolution of the CGIAR 2001 to 2007: A Contribution to the Institutional Memoir and Some Thoughts for the Future.* http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/af_cgiar_reform_050207.pdf
- Rabbinge, R. (2007) CGIAR Science Council. Report to ExCo 13.
- CGIAR Science Council. (2007). Science Council Workplan 2008-2009.
- Science Council Secretariat; CGIAR Secretariat. (2007). *Guidelines for the Reporting of Performance Indicators for CGIAR Centers PM System Guidelines.* Science Council Secretariat of the CGIAR. 2005. *System Priorities for CGIAR Research 2005 – 2015.*
- Science Council Secretariat of the CGIAR. 2005. Monitoring and Evaluation System for the CGIAR Centers.
- Science Council annual reports and documents from the four Panels, e.g. evaluations

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Examination of priority setting by the CGIAR.
2. Examination of the role of the Science Council in maintaining quality control of CGIAR science, natural resource management, and policy.

Work Package 3E: **Strategic Programs: Challenge Programs, Eco-Regional Programs (SWEPs)**

Introduction:

Challenge Programs (CPs) were established by the CGIAR in 2001, as time-bound, independently governed program of high-impact research that targets the CGIAR goals in relation to complex issues of overwhelming global and/or regional significance. This paper will examine to how and to what extent CPs have addressed four key opportunities: (1) improving CGIAR's global relevance and impact, (2) improving greater integration, efficiency and cohesion amongst Centres, (3) improving partnerships with non-CGIAR research organizations, including NARS and ARIs and (4) mobilizing more stable and long term financing, including external (non-member) investment. The longer tradition of System Wide and Eco-regional Programs (SWEPS) will also be examined with respect to these opportunities. The fitness of CPs and SWEPS as future models for achieving Systems Priorities will be examined. This analysis will use reports and reviews of ongoing CPs, information from Science Council on new proposals and their selection, and opinions from Centres, partners and existing and potential sponsors about their effectiveness and potential.

Lead: Jeff Waage

Deputy lead: John Mugabe

Readers: Elizabeth McAllister, Keith Bezanson, Gopal Chadha

TORS Questions:

1. How effective are the CPs, in terms of the partnership models which they use and the partnerships which they establish, between Centers and particularly with other organizations?
2. How effective are the CPs in terms of addressing issues of global relevance and improving the science and impact of the CGIAR?
3. How effective are the CPs at mobilizing more stable, long-term financing?
4. How effective are SWEPS at improving partnerships, addressing issues of global relevance and attracting financing?

Related Questions:

- Is the competitive model used in awarding CPs effective in achieving CP opportunities, relative to other possible models?
- Are CPs aligned closely to Systems Priorities, MDGs and the future plans of Centres and the CGIAR?
- How do the CPs compare with similar strategic grant programs for science outside the CGIAR?

Selected literature:

- Change Design and Management Team (2001). Designing and Managing Change in the CGIAR. Report to the Mid-Term Meeting 2001.
- CGIAR Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat (2004). Synthesis of Lessons Learned from Initial Implementation of the CGIAR Pilot Challenge Programs
- Bevege, I., Egger, P. and Debela, S. (2006). Meta-review of CGIAR System-wide and Eco-regional Programs.
- GlobeScan (2006). The CGIAR's 2006 Stakeholder Survey
- Ndiritu, C., Karanga, D. and Flek, P (2006) Subsaharan African Challenge Programme External Review (and earlier reviews by EU and SSA CP)
- Biswas, A.K., Palenburg, M. and Bennet, J. (2007). External Review of the Challenge Program on Water and Food.
- Uauy, R., Palenburg, M. and Zakri, A.H. (2007). Report of the First Challenge Program External Review of the HarvestPlus Challenge Program.
- CGIAR Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat. (2007). Lessons Learnt from Selection and Implementation of the CGIAR Challenge Programs.

- Ad Hoc Committee on Funding Systems Priorities (2007). Final Report
- Alliance Deputy Executive (2007). Lessons Learnt Analysis of First Cycle Challenge Programs
- Annual Reports and Medium-Term Plans for SSA, HarvestPlus, Water and Food and Generation CPs.
- Unpublished records of applications to the CP and their assessment

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Examine Best Practices in Other Strategic Research Grants Programs

Panel Paper 4. Partnerships

Work Package 4A: **Research, Innovation and Communication Partnerships**

Introduction:

This paper will analyse the nature of partnerships entered into or developed by the CGIAR. It will develop a typology of the partnerships and examine the relationships between CGIAR centers and NARS, ARIs, private sector, farmers' organizations and other CSOs. The paper will also discuss partnerships between CGIAR Centers and among the Centers. It will focus on norms and practices institutionalized by the CGIAR to establish and/or promote partnerships for research and innovation in agriculture. Emphasis will be placed on the quality and productivity of the partnerships. To the extent possible, the paper will seek to provide evidence how partnership arrangements enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of CGIAR operations.

Lead: John Mugabe

Co-Lead: Gopal Chadha

Readers: Keith Bezanson, Jeff Waage, Elizabeth McAllister

TORS Questions:

5. How effective are current approaches to collaborative research with partners?
6. Do the respective partnership roles properly exploit the comparative and complementary advantages of those involved?
7. Are linkages with NARS and ARIs effectively supporting the achievements of CGIAR research objectives as well as meeting partner needs and expectations – e.g. how effective have Centers been in capacity building of NARS?
8. How effective has the CGIAR been in establishing and facilitating partnerships among CGIAR Centers and between CGIAR Centers and external partners (both public and private sector)?

Related Questions:

1. What factors stimulate CGIAR centers to establish partnerships with the NARS, ARIs, private sector, farmers' organizations and other CSOs?
2. What factors stimulate inter-Center partnerships?
3. What forms of partnerships have been established between the Centers and non-centers and among the centers?
4. What organizational forms do the partnerships take? Do internal partnership arrangements differ in their purpose, form and functioning from those with external partners?
5. How do the various types of partnerships function? What are some of the facilitating factors, and what perhaps, some of the complicating ones?

6. What factors stimulate CGIAR Centers to establish partnerships with the NARS?
7. What forms of partnerships have been established between the Centers and non-Centers and among the Centers?
8. Does CGIAR contribute significantly to capacity building in the NARS?
9. What is the quality of relationships between and among the Centers as well as between the Centers and NARS, ARIs, private sector and other CSOs?
10. How are the partnerships governed and funded?

Selected literature:

- Alliance of CGIAR Centers. "The Way Forward for the CGIAR System." May 2007.
- Bezanson, K. et al (2004) Independent Evaluation of the Partnerships Committees of the CGIAR
- CGIAR. Major review, evaluation and assessment reports; CDMT reports; Stripe review; SSA Task Forces report. Various years.
- CGIAR Center reports. Various years.
- David J. Spielman, Frank Hartwich and Klaus von Grebmer. (2007, June). *Sharing Science, Building Bridges, and Enhancing Impact of Public-Private Partnerships in the CGIAR*. International Service for National Agricultural Research Division and Communications Division. IFPRI Discussion Paper 00708.
- Kaul, Inge. "Exploring the Policy Space between Markets and States: Global Public-Private Partnerships." In: Kaul, Inge et al, eds. *The New Public Finance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Maredia, M.K., Raitzer, D.A. (2006). *CGIAR and NARS partner research in sub-Saharan Africa: evidence of impact to date*. CGIAR. Science Council Secretariat, Rome, Italy.
- Hans P. Binswanger-Mkhize (2007) Consultation on the Roles and Productivity of International Centers in Africa's Agricultural Research Systems. Study conducted for the New Partnership for Africa's Development.
- Recent WB IEG study led by Narlini Kumar on agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa
- Report of the Task Force on Africa (2005) – corporate options; STRIPE Reviews: Governance/Boards, Human Resources, NRM, etc.
- Sielman, David J. and Klaus von Grebmer. "Public-private Partnerships in Agricultural Research." Washington: IFPRI, 2004.
- Widdus, Roy. "Public-private Partnerships for Health." In *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 79(8):713-20.
- World Bank. IEG. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs. Washington 2007.
- World Bank (2007). World Development Report 2008: Agricultural for Development. Washington: World Bank (pp.239-248)
- Kremer, Micheal and Alix Peterson Zwane. "Creating Incentives for Private Sector Involvement in Poverty Reduction." In Kaul, Inge et al. *The New Public Finance*. New York, OUP, 2006, pp. 564-584.
- David J. Spielman, Frank Hartwich, and Klaus von Grebner (2006). *Building Bridges and Sharing Science: Public-Private Partnerships in the CGIAR*. Washington: IFPRI.
- Byerlee, Derek and Grag Traxler (2006). *The Role of Technology Spillovers and Economies of Size in the Efficient Design of Agricultural Research Systems*. In Julian M. Alston, et al, (eds.) *Agricultural Science Policy: Changing Global Agendas*. Baltimore, M.D: John Hopkins University Press.
- World Bank (2006). *Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: How to go beyond the Strengthening of Research Systems*. Washington, D.C: ARD/World Bank
- David J. Spielman (2003). *International Agriculture Research and the Role of the Private Sector*, Thematic Working Paper for Meta Evaluation of the CGIAR at 31. Washington: OED/World Bank

- CGIAR (2002). CGIAR Private Sector Committee Terms of Reference: Technical Report. Washington, D.C: CGIAR
- Pray, C.E. (2001). Public-Private Sector Linkages in Research and Development: Biotechnology and the Seed Industry in Brazil, China, and India. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 83(3):742-47.
- CGIAR. Reports of the Meetings of the CGIAR Private Sector Committee (various years). Washington: CGIAR.

Analytic Inputs to Panel Deliberations:

1. Global Partnerships: Good Practices and Lessons for the CGIAR
2. CGIAR Partnerships with NGOs: Practices and Experience

Appendix 5: Terms of Reference for the Independent Review

Summary

In the last several years the CGIAR has witnessed considerable changes as part of its internal reforms, including establishing an Executive Council, creation of the Science Council, and the launching of the Challenge Programs. The 15 Centers have also created an Alliance to more effectively facilitate and coordinate their collective activities. Even though all CGIAR Centers and Programs undergo external reviews regularly there has been no review at the system level to assess the impact and effectiveness of changes initiated during the reform program except for one of the components of the reform (the System Office).⁴³

The last CGIAR system-review was conducted 9 years ago, and it has been 4 years since the last independent meta-evaluation commissioned by the World Bank was released. Therefore this external evaluation will take stock of the efficacy of the CGIAR partnership and address issues of governance, management, alignment, and other changes required at the system level.⁴⁴ The Review will also assess the achievements and effectiveness of the CGIAR research through an analysis and synthesis (of existing reviews and impact assessments of the Center programs and Challenge Programs) and assess if the system is well positioned to address the emerging future food security and agriculture related problems of developing countries.⁴⁵

Introduction

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, the CGIAR, created in 1971, is an informal association of sixty-four independent public and private sector members, from South and North, with the World Bank, FAO, IFAD and UNDP as Cosponsors. The CGIAR provides 15 international agricultural research centers with strategic guidance, financial assistance and a forum for interaction with donors. A loosely connected network of several components forms the CGIAR System. The pillars of the CGIAR System are: the Consultative Group, its Executive Council, and partners that provide funding and strategic guidance; the Science Council that helps to maintain a high quality of science in the CGIAR System; 15 legally independent international agricultural research Centers, and the Alliance they have formed for their collective action, which are the implementing agencies and research arm of the CGIAR system,

These are supported by the CGIAR System Office (SO)⁴⁶ which has a pivotal facilitating role in the integration and administration of the System.

⁴³This System Office External Review focused on assessing the synergies and added value of operating as a System Office, but it did not review the individual units composing the System Office, as those are reviewed individually.

⁴⁴ The term "alignment" has been used in the CGIAR to encompass (i) alignment among Centers in terms of program, governance and corporate services, (ii) alignment at system level among Members, and (iii) alignment between the different components constituting the CGIAR System (i.e. Members, Science Council, Centers and System Office). Alignment in this context refers to the capacity to work more effectively together toward the accomplishment of the mission of the CGIAR.

⁴⁵ In addition, the review would also help to meet requirements of the World Bank Development Grant Facility (DGF) whereby DGF grant recipients need to be evaluated every 3-5 years. The World Bank has contributed \$50million/year in the several past years to the CGIAR, and is the largest provider of unrestricted funds to the system. It provides the system with its Chair, Director, and houses the CGIAR Secretariat. The strategy used by the World Bank in the past several years is to support the Centers with unrestricted resources (general support) and the reform program initiated in 2001.

⁴⁶ The SO includes a list of nine units - Central Advisory Service on Intellectual Property, CGIAR Secretariat, Chief Information Office, Alliance Office, Gender and Diversity Program, Strategic Advisory Service on Human Resources, Internal Audit Unit, Media Unit, Science Council Secretariat.

Each part of the System is expected to perform a distinct set of functions, based on its roles and responsibilities. These functions are meant to be mutually supportive and complementary, i.e. the components are interdependent and the whole is far greater than the sum of the parts, thereby providing the CGIAR with its systemic character. The CGIAR System collaborates in research and research-related activities with many partners, to support, conduct and disseminate international agricultural research of the highest quality, in order to ensure that agricultural science and technology contribute significantly to sustainable development and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

The mission of the CGIAR is to achieve sustainable food security and reduce poverty in developing countries through scientific research and research-related activities in the fields of agriculture, livestock, forestry, fisheries, policy and natural resources management.

These terms of reference describe the following: Objectives of the External Review; Scope of the Review; Methodology; Reports; Budget; Review Panel; ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group; Tentative Timeline and key next steps; An **ExCo ad hoc advisory group** to guide finalization of the TORs for the external review and panel composition has been established. The group is composed of 1 Alliance representative, 2 CGIAR Members, and 1 SC/SPIA member.

Objectives of this Review

The Review will have the following objectives with a special emphasis on (but not limited to) the impact of the recent reform program:

- To take stock and assess the efficacy of the CGIAR partnership;
- To assess the effectiveness of CGIAR research;
- To make recommendations for changes in the CGIAR system that will improve its efficacy and effectiveness in view of emerging challenges for food security, agriculture, and natural resource management of the poor.

Scope of the Review

The Review would have two concurrent, closely linked and equally important parts- Part One: the review of the efficacy of the CGIAR system operating as an international partnership building on three pillars - the Consultative Group, the Science Council (SC), the 15 research centers and their Alliance; and Part two - the review of the effectiveness of research supported by the CGIAR based on analysis and synthesis of the existing external evaluations such as center EPMRs, the ongoing external reviews of Challenge Programs, reviews of the system-wide and eco-regional programs (SWEPs), impact assessment studies, the CGIAR Member-commissioned reviews of centers/projects and other external reviews of the CGIAR programs. Findings from both parts will be consolidated in a final report that will also highlight linkages between the two components of the Review.

Part I: Efficacy of Partnership: governance, management and alignment in the System

A. The Consultative Group, its Executive Council, and partners

- 1)What are the strengths and weaknesses of the partnership as a whole? Is the governance structure effective and enhancing the system? What have been the key changes in the governance and management processes/procedures in recent years and how did that impact the partnership? Are there key constraints/limitations to the partnership and if so what are they?

- 2) How effective is the partnership approach taken by the CGIAR, i.e. forming an informal international association? Are there any lessons for/from other global partnerships?
- 3) How effective is the CGIAR in serving as a platform and catalyst in supporting and delivering international agricultural research for development?
- 4) In terms of the governance of the System, what has been the performance of the Executive Council since its inception in 2001 as one of the important components of the reform program? Has the Executive Council made decision-making more effective and efficient within the CGIAR partnership? Are the role, size and composition of ExCo appropriate for its mandate? How effective are the CGIAR Annual General Meetings, including Stakeholder Meeting and Business Meeting?
- 5) Does the partnership operate in a transparent manner? How are the members of the partnership accountable to the partnership?
- 6) How effective is the CGIAR in establishing and facilitating partnerships among CGIAR Centers and between CGIAR Centers and external partners (both public and private sector)?
- 7) Is the current financing structure for the system appropriate? Is it efficient and suited to the development and dissemination of international public goods? Is the CGIAR constricting or creating synergies for aligning the funding? What is the role of unrestricted resources in supporting the system, including the reform program? How has the decline in unrestricted funding affected the system as a whole, particularly its governance and its ability to deliver research products that contribute to the fulfillment of the CGIAR mission? How effectively does the system deal with financial risks?
- 8) What is the role - the strengths and weaknesses of the World Bank, as the largest contributor of unrestricted resources, in facilitating the operation of the system? How is the World Bank contribution (which is not only monetary), assisting to leverage other CGIAR Members funding into the CGIAR and impacting reform of the system, its governance, mode of operation, etc.? What is the role of the other Co-Sponsors?
- 9) What are the perceptions of CGIAR membership about their involvement and change of involvement over the past few years? And the role played by the Co-Sponsors?

B. The Science Council (SC)

- 1) How does the SC fulfill its role within the system? How is their performance perceived by internal and external stakeholders? Has the SC effectively fulfilled the three main objectives for which it was set up:
 - enhancing and promoting the quality, relevance and impact of science in the CGIAR;
 - advising the Group on strategic scientific issues of importance to its goals; and
 - mobilizing and harnessing the best of international science for addressing the goals of the international agricultural research community?
- 2) How has the process for setting system priorities, led by the SC, contributed to the CGIAR strategic alignment?
- 3) Is the size/composition/structure of the Science Council suitable for the key functions it performs within the CGIAR system?
- 4) How is the SC perceived by CGIAR Members and Centers?

C. The Centers

- 1) How well does the Alliance of the CGIAR Centers perform collectively? Is the Alliance a cost-effective mechanism for collective action? How is it perceived by Centers, Members and other partners?
- 2) How does system governance (ExCo and the CGIAR) relate to Center governance? How does system governance relate to the governance of the Alliance of the CGIAR Centers?
- 3) How does the autonomy of the 15 research centers and of the 64 Members balance with the need for accountability and collective action at the System level? What are the challenges of keeping the system aligned while also respecting this autonomy?
- 4) How effective is the oversight and governance of the individual centers? How well-equipped are the Center Boards in playing this oversight role at the center level?

5) How effective is the partnering of CGIAR Centers outside the system?

D. The System Office

1) How effective is the System Office, as a virtual structure, in helping to increase coordination, capture synergies and increase overall performance of central service units that support the Centers and the CGIAR System as a whole?

2) How well do three units of the System Office, namely the CGIAR Secretariat, Science Council Secretariat and the Alliance Office - perform their functions?

Are their structure, size and composition appropriate for the key functions they perform? Are accountability mechanisms and processes for increasing efficiency appropriate given their respective roles? Is there a potential conflict of interest in the CGIAR Secretariat's involvement in administration of the allocation of the funds from the World Bank and other donors?

3) What are CGIAR Members and Centers perceptions about the three units?

E. Relations and synergies across the three pillars of the CGIAR System

1) Are the levels of responsibility and accountability among the three pillars appropriate? Are the voices of the three pillars appropriately represented in System governance?

2) What are the costs, including transaction costs, and benefits of the governance structure? Is the distribution of these costs and benefits among the three pillars appropriate to enhance the implementation of the mission of the CGIAR?

3) What are CGIAR Members perceptions about the issues of relative autonomy and accountability and about the current layers of governance in the System?

Part II: Achievements and Effectiveness of CGIAR Research

To assess the achievements (i.e. outputs, outcomes and impact) and the effectiveness of the CGIAR research, the evaluation will rely mainly on analysis and synthesis of the EPMRs, the Challenge Program External Reviews (CPEs), external reviews of system-wide programs, the CGIAR Member commissioned reviews of centers/projects and other external reviews of the CGIAR programs, Center or SC commissioned impact assessment studies, general Center reports as well as pertinent development literature. The evaluation should address the following issues:

1) Given the level of investment, how do CGIAR funds contribute to enhancing agricultural productivity, natural resource management and food security? What is the evidence of the relationship between achieving these and economic growth and poverty alleviation?

2) What evidence is there that CGIAR-generated technology and policy options are international public goods that are utilized by partners, with the former ultimately adopted by poor smallholders and the latter implemented by development agencies?

3) Does the CGIAR contribute to poverty reduction objectives of international development agencies (including the World Bank) and how are CGIAR outputs being utilized by them?

4) How effective are the Challenge Programs, both in terms of partnership models they use and also in terms of the productivity of the research?

5) What pressing issues should be considered for new and expanded CGIAR efforts? Are there areas where CGIAR research could be reduced?

6) How does investment in agricultural R&D relate to agricultural GDP (e.g. Sub-Saharan Africa) and what is the share of the total CGIAR investment in total agricultural R&D (for the same region)?

What is the trend and would an increase in international agricultural research investments (such as the CGIAR) affect agricultural GDP significantly? For example, given the small share of the total investment in agricultural R&D that is represented by the CGIAR investment, and given the returns on this investment, so far, would an increased investment in CGIAR research bring about more than proportional returns in terms of impacts on the CGIAR mission?

7) Has the CGIAR system maintained its focus on international public goods? How well do the system priorities position the CGIAR with respect to its mission? What forces are affecting programs and decision-making in this regard? Is this the most effective focus to alleviate poverty?

8) How effective are current approaches to collaborative research with partners? Do the respective partnership roles properly exploit the comparative and complementary advantages of those involved? Are linkages with NARS, CSOs, ARIs and the private sector effectively supporting the achievements of CGIAR research objectives as well as meeting partner needs and expectations, e.g. how effective have Centers been in capacity building of NARS?

Methodology

The methodology for the Review will include the following components:

- 1) Interviews with Members, partners, Center staff, Center Board members, SO Unit staff, other stakeholders
- 2) Review of core CGIAR documents, e.g. the Charter, CGIAR/ExCo decisions, available reviews (e.g., System Office, Stripe Review of Corporate Governance of CGIAR Centers) etc. Specific issues to look at are the programmatic and structural alignment efforts (for example, the Centers in Africa), and the system wide management of financial risks.
- 3) Analyses and Syntheses - including:
 - a. Reviews of Centers External Program Management Reviews (EPMRs) together with the external reviews of the Challenge Programs (CPs) and System-wide and Eco-regional Programs (SWEPs). In addition, the evaluations of impact studies, and other CGIAR evaluations including evaluations done by Centers can serve to assess the impact of the CGIAR on poverty reduction at large. Also the annual Performance Measurement (PM) System can provide information on the system including accountability and transparency.
 - b. Review of evaluations conducted by other CGIAR Members, including the independent World Bank OED Meta-evaluation of the CGIAR.
 - c. Evaluations of other Global Programs
 - d. Pertinent development literature (including independent academic research on the CGIAR)
 - e. Center reports
- 4) Assessment of CGIAR financial and funding information to better understand the use of unrestricted funding.
- 5) The Review Panel could also commission studies to address some of the specific issues which would be outlined during the inception consultation (as described later).
- 6) The Review Panel would also use quantitative indicators in their assessment, where possible.

Reports

The evaluation panel is expected to prepare three reports:

1) Inception consultation and work plan

The panel will have two inception consultations with the ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group:

- (i) at the outset of the work to seek overall guidance and briefing from the Advisory Group
- (ii) 2-3- weeks later the evaluation panel will present a work plan to the ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group seeking their feedback and suggestions.

The work plan will provide an opportunity to

- further specify methodological and organizational aspects of the evaluation, including any provisions for needed meetings, interviews, site visit travel, new data collection, etc.
- further specify the deliverables available for the interim report (please see below)

The panel would explore the feasibility of developing quantitative indicators which could possibly be used in the evaluation.

2) Interim Report

An interim report is expected by March 10, 2008.

3) Final Report

The final full report should be submitted by July, 2008, and will highlight a set of clear and actionable recommendations. A draft final report should be sent by the panel for comments.

Budget

While the World Bank has agreed to defray a major part of the review cost, it would be important for other CGIAR Members to share the costs. The CGIAR Secretariat would be approaching other Members on this issue of sharing costs of the Review. Estimates are being generated.

Review panel

a. Composition

The Review Panel will be composed of a core team of 5 members

- A panel chair with extensive expertise in evaluation, preferably of international research for development networks or global partnerships.
- A member with extensive experience on institutional governance issues, and expertise in organizational structure issues in the public/private sector.
- A member with an understanding of networks or partnerships of multilateral organizations.
- Two members with extensive expertise in international agricultural research for development leading the program review through Part II of the Review.

It would be desirable to have 1-2 members of the panel with significant CGIAR system-knowledge.

b. Support and Backstopping

One or two consultants will support the panel and report to the panel chair. The CGIAR Secretariat, the SC Secretariat and the Alliance Office will help with providing necessary background documentation supporting the Review.

d. Process for panel

The CGIAR Membership will be invited to nominate firms/institutions/ individuals for Panel membership according to the above specified profiles. The TORs of the External Review will be posted on the CGIAR website inviting nominations/applications. The TORs will also be circulated on listserves of professional evaluation associations. A long list of all nominations/ applications received will be prepared and presented to the ExCo Ad Hoc Group. The proposed final list identified by the ExCo Ad Hoc Group will be sent to ExCo/CGIAR for approval.

ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group

ExCo established an "ExCo ad hoc advisory group to guide finalization of the TORs for the external review and panel composition. The group should be composed of 1 Alliance representative, 2 CGIAR Members, and 1 SC/SPIA member." (Summary Record of Proceeding of the 12th Meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council May 2007).

As such the ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group will guide (i) the finalization of the TOR (ii) the selection of the Review panel, and (iii) advise the review panel during the review, in particular during the inception consultation. At the same time, the ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group will maintain an adequate distance from the panel to ensure the independence of the review.

Tentative timeline and key next steps

- 1) ExCo Ad Hoc Group formed – June 29, 2007
- 2) ExCo Ad Hoc Group meeting to finalize TORs, discuss panel composition and next steps- July 17, 2007
- 3) Invite nominations for panel composition from July 17 to August 2, 2007 – including nominations from CGIAR Membership, the ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group, open call for nominations/applications on the CGIAR website, wide dissemination of TOR to professional evaluation associations.

Independent Review of the CGIAR

- 4) Long list of nominations and applications compiled and sent to ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory group – August 3, 2007
- 5) Virtual meeting of the ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group on the selection of a short list of the panelists for consideration by ExCo/CGIAR– August 7, 2007
- 6) TORs and panel composition approved by ExCo/CGIAR before September 30th, 2007
- 7) Inception consultation/work plan discussed with ExCo Ad Hoc Advisory Group by November 16th, 2007
- 8) Final Inception Report by December 14, 2007
- 9) Interim Report on Part 1 and Part 2 by March, 10 2008
- 10) Final report submitted by July 30, 2008.

cgtemp1

G:\CURRENT PROJECTS (feb 08)\CGIAR\REPORTS\Inception Report\Inception Report Post AGM Revision (v10).doc
02/24/2008 10:36:00 AM