



**External Mid-Term Review of the
Institutional Learning and Change Initiative
(ILAC)
of the Consultative Group on International
Agricultural Research (CGIAR)**

by

Victor Kommerell

February 2010

Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative
c/o Bioversity International, Via dei Tre Denari 472a,
00057 Maccarese (Fiumicino), Rome, Italy
Tel: (39) 0661181, Fax: (39) 0661979661, email: ilac@cgiar.org,
URL: www.cgiar-ilac.org

The ILAC initiative fosters learning from experience and use of the lessons learned to improve the design and implementation of agricultural research and development programmes. The mission of the ILAC Initiative is to develop, field test and introduce methods and tools that promote organizational learning and institutional change in CGIAR Centers and their partners, in order to expand the contribution of agricultural research to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

Citation:

Kommerell, V. (2010) *External Mid-Term Review of the Institutional Learning and Change Initiative (ILAC) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)*. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.

Table of contents

Executive Summary.....	4
1. Introduction.....	7
1.1 Objectives of the review.....	7
1.2 Implementation of the review	8
1.3 Overview of the final report.....	10
2. Context.....	10
2.1 Trends in international agricultural research for development	10
2.1.1 Conclusions	11
2.2 Major challenges facing the new CGIAR	12
2.2.1 Conclusions	13
2.3 The CGIAR Change Management Initiative.....	14
2.4 CGIAR change implications for ILAC’s future role.....	15
3. Assessment.....	16
3.1 ILAC’s origins, objectives and activities	17
3.1.1 Conclusions	21
3.2 ILAC’s future	22
3.2.1 Conclusions	27
4. Institutionalization	29
4.1 ILAC-in-PM&E	30
4.1.1 The need for a system-wide PM&E function.....	30
4.1.2 Challenges facing a system-wide PM&E function.....	31
4.1.3 Integrating ILAC in the CGIAR’s PM&E function	33
4.1.4 ILAC-in-PM&E in the Consortium Office.....	34
4.1.5 Observations on the recommendations for ILAC-in-PM&E.....	36
4.1.6 Challenges in establishing ILAC-in-PM&E.....	38
4.2 Other options for positioning ILAC in the new CGIAR	40
4.2.1 Independent Evaluation Unit.....	40
4.2.2 Strategic human resources	40
4.2.3 Knowledge management	42
4.2.4 Capacity-building	43
4.2.5 Innovations mega-programme.....	43
4.3 Conclusions	44
4.3.1 ILAC’s future role and how to institutionalize it	44
4.3.2 ILAC’s key partners	45
5. Main conclusions	45
6. Recommendations.....	47
6.1 Strategic recommendations	47
6.2 Operational recommendations (transition phase).....	49
Annexes	53
Annex 1. Online survey.....	53
Annex 2. Telephone interviews: interviewees and questions	59
Annex 3. Telephone interviews: selected consolidated responses.....	64
Annex 4. Strategic Common Services: output from ‘The Future of Common Services’ workshop, September 2009.....	74
Annex 5. Documents reviewed and cited.....	75
Annex 6. Reviewer’s Biographical Details	78
Acronyms and abbreviations	78

Executive Summary

The external Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the Institutional Learning and Change Initiative (ILAC), focusing on ILAC's future in the new Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), was based on stakeholder consultations and document reviews. The conclusions reached from the review are summarized here, and the strategic and operational recommendations arising from the review draw on these conclusions. The review process is described in the Introduction, and the full-text conclusions and recommendations are given in the relevant sections. The Annexes provide details on the documents reviewed and the people interviewed, as well as the interview and survey questions.

The context

The growing complexity of interrelated research areas and the greater number and diversity of actors involved in international agricultural research require the CGIAR to better harness its multidisciplinary talents and capacities. To effectively manage this complexity and the competitive nature of international agricultural research for development, it needs to act more effectively as a system and to place greater emphasis on research partnerships.

The challenges associated with the long-term nature of international agricultural research will grow with the trend towards longer-term, more complex mega-programmes. The CGIAR will need to improve its long-term management planning and monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) procedures, and to help its research partners build their PM&E capacity, which is critical to assessing research impact over the long term.

The CGIAR needs to establish more research partnerships and to improve their management¹. It also needs to be clearer about its role and responsibilities in partner selection and to foster greater cooperation from the outset between mega-programmes, lead CGIAR Centers, participating Centers and non-CGIAR research partners. All this presents challenges to the CGIAR's organizational culture, and achieving the required attitudinal changes will need dedicated effort.

Since its establishment, the CGIAR mission has focused primarily on reducing poverty by aligning scientific goals with development goals². Aiming for pro-poor impact requires an understanding of the evolving dynamics of rural poverty in different contexts, but the CGIAR lacks the necessary network or unit for bringing relevant outside knowledge and expertise into the system, at the right time and into the right place.

ILAC's current role

ILAC places great emphasis on capacity building in relation to collaborative research and working in partnership with a range of stakeholders. The demand for ILAC capacity-building services has been significant, and appears to outstrip supply.

Given its size, ILAC has probably taken on too many objectives and corresponding activities. Its Coordination Team has compensated for the small size by building functioning, active networks.

Inter-Center initiatives, such as the ILAC Initiative, depend upon the partners and participants being willing to invest time in their activities, adding to participants' workloads and taking them away from their 'regular job'. This has limited what ILAC has been able to achieve.

¹ This is one of the aims of the CGIAR Change Management Initiative. CGIAR change-related factors, which influence ILAC's future, are described in section 3.2.

² Most CGIAR staff probably strongly identify with this mission, which is a great asset.

ILAC needs to improve its evaluation procedures and its documentation of achievements and outcomes. It also needs to improve the learning from its own successes and failures, thereby achieving, in effect, the kind of learning that it encourages others to achieve. Focusing on fewer objectives should make it easier for ILAC to demonstrate its achievements and the effectiveness of the methods and tools it promotes.

ILAC's future role

ILAC's objectives and activities remain highly relevant to the future of the CGIAR. The greatest need for learning in the CGIAR relates to how agricultural research and development can more effectively contribute to reducing poverty. This learning requires working with research partners and extracting evidence and knowledge from research programmes/projects using PM&E approaches, methods and tools.

ILAC needs to engage with more Centers in order to increase its knowledge base and expertise. It also needs to develop effective approaches and methods for transferring the learning generated from its portfolio of 'cases' (programmes participating in its Learning Laboratory) to other CGIAR programmes/projects.

Working on partnership issues is a significant ILAC strength and will continue to be important in its future work. Partnership encompasses a complex array of issues, however, and ILAC will need to devote more attention to collaborative PM&E, including *ex ante* impact evaluation (IE). It could also make a valuable contribution to a future 'partnership relationship management' unit or network run by another entity in the new CGIAR³.

The CGIAR needs an integrated PM&E framework. There is a gap between, on the one hand, its Strategic Objectives and its Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) and, on the other, the Centers' programmes/projects that need to be planned in terms of their combined contributions to mission-level objectives. The CGIAR needs to invest in developing an *ex ante* IE approach across its programmes/projects and it should involve ILAC in this effort.

ILAC needs to improve its ability to meet CGIAR researchers' demand for its expertise and support. It should also ensure that its body of knowledge can be adapted to specific contexts. This involves developing a portfolio of advisory and support services and providing them to its 'clients', tailored to suit individual client needs.

ILAC needs to focus on IE and on using IE-generated knowledge to influence policy change. It should optimize its comparative advantage in this area and examine how it could help to involve policy decision-makers in CGIAR programmes/projects.

ILAC's position in the new CGIAR

The new CGIAR categorizes the organizations under its umbrella and those it works with into two main groups: Doers (e.g., Centers and research partnerships) and Funders (e.g., national and international donors). The most effective way to position ILAC in the new CGIAR is to involve it, as a Doer, in the PM&E of programmes/projects in order to help researchers align their work with poverty reduction.

The CGIAR as a system, as well as its constituent parts, would benefit from ILAC's participation in:

- a long-term effort to use the learning from all pro-poor agricultural research to inform strategy development and improve current and future pro-poor programmes/projects

³ The idea of such a competency or network is phrased as a conclusion, which may be considered by the Alliance or the nascent Consortium. As a recommendation it would be out of scope for this Review. See sections 3, 4.2.1 and 6, and Tables 10 and 12 for more detail.

- assessing the limits of CGIAR's competitive advantage in conducting pro-poor research and evaluating its impact, compared with other organizations and networks
- developing new methods for pro-poor research programmes/projects and the assessment of their impact

ILAC needs to:

- play an enabler role, which involves providing strategic advisory and support services to Center directors and research managers
- provide advice and support in designing and implementing PM&E approaches to pro-poor programmes/projects and help improve CGIAR partnerships, specifically in terms of establishing and maintaining them
- play a piloting role in brokering knowledge and expertise from outside the CGIAR and trying out new approaches and methods in cooperation with CGIAR programmes/projects

The services should be based on a portfolio of complementary, learning-focused PM&E approaches, methods and tools developed by ILAC and other PM&E professionals working at system level. Service delivery should be supported by a system-wide community-of-practice developed by ILAC.

In terms of its PM&E functions, ILAC should routinely cooperate with those involved in Funder-side IE⁴ and strategic decision-making, given that evaluations (*ex post* or *ex ante*) provide information for both Doer- and Funder-side learning and decision-making. It should also work with:

- Center-based PM&E professionals and networks in national agricultural research systems (NARS) as learning partners and for service delivery and capacity building
- the proposed CGIAR-wide Strategic Common Services, benefiting from them as well as being part of them

Strategic recommendations

ILAC should become part of a system-wide PM&E unit or network, positioned in the CGIAR Consortium Office, where:

- a PM&E-for-accountability function is merged with a PM&E-for-learning (ILAC) function in order to ensure that these two aspects of PM&E are addressed, mutually reinforcing and well coordinated
- ILAC staff work with Center- or mega-programme-based PM&E staff to ensure that centrally provided services are firmly based on field-level realities
- there is a third staffing layer of regional roving consultants, working with the central PM&E unit as well as on a Center-by-Center basis

The basic principles for guiding the delivery of services by a future ILAC are presented in the review.

Operational recommendations

The first recommendation relates to the scope of work that ILAC should aim for during the transition from its current situation to its future role (2010-2011)⁵. The recommendation notes that the ILAC project on 'Impact Evaluation Approaches for Agricultural Research for

⁴ E.g., the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) and the future Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). A future ILAC should have a distinct role, compared with the Funder-side SPIA and IEU roles, although they need to be 'well connected'. See the Conclusions about an integrated PM&E framework.

⁵ The transition phase also refers to implementation of the CGIAR Change Management Initiative.

Development' (a 4-year project funded by the International Fund for Agricultural Development, IFAD) provides ILAC with a good opportunity to reach more Centers and programmes/projects and could generate learning about how to involve policy-makers in the research-to-development chain.

The second recommendation focuses on a multi-phase, participatory organizational change process, initiated and initially led by ILAC, to bring together CGIAR's dispersed PM&E community. Through this process, the community would reach a consensus about the future scope of PM&E and how to organize it within the new CGIAR, including interaction between the Doer and Funder sides. The process would involve three phases:

- Phase 1: Bring together the PM&E community: Who do we want to be and what do we need to do?
- Phase 2: Consult internal CGIAR clients (e.g., Centers): What do you really need?
- Phase 3: Consult the CGIAR's research partners: What do you really need?

It is also recommended that ILAC:

- commissions a study of a small number of research programmes/projects that have used a comprehensive range of mainstream and alternative PM&E approaches and methods
- organizes an event to bring CGIAR's PM&E professionals together (preparations for the event could include a team-building exercise to build bridges between the different schools of thought on PM&E in the CGIAR)

The third recommendation concerns the need for dedicated resources and funding so that ILAC is able to coordinate the organizational change process. It is recommended that the two current ILAC donors meet to investigate possibilities for joint, increased engagement during the transition phase.

The fourth recommendation relates to the need for a small informal strategy group to guide ILAC during its transition phase.

The fifth and final recommendation is that ILAC should encourage the System Office Units to define, in detail, a set of integrated Strategic Common Services, following up on initial collaborative work done in 2009.

1. Introduction

1.1 Objectives of the review

The external Mid-Term Review (MTR) was carried out between September 2009 and January 2010 to assess ILAC's activities implemented under the project 'Innovating for Sustainable Poverty Reduction', funded by the Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGIS).

The review covered all activities since ILAC's inception in 2003, with the main emphasis on the period since 2007, when the DGIS funding began. Its focus, however, was on the future of ILAC rather than its past performance. The main issues addressed by the MTR were therefore:

- To what extent are ILAC's objectives relevant to recent and expected changes in the CGIAR?

- Given the expected changes in the CGIAR, what strategies should ILAC use to make the most effective contribution to a new CGIAR?
- What governance, management and institutional base would be most effective for ILAC in the new CGIAR?
- Should ILAC be institutionalized within the CGIAR system and, if so, what are the main options for this and what are their pros and cons?
- What is the preferred option?

1.2 Implementation of the review

It was agreed to contract a consultant to conduct the MTR⁶. The consultant:

- was guided by a Review Support Team (RST), responsible for reviewing the overall approach, giving guidance on the audiences of the final report, and reviewing conclusions in the draft report to ensure that they met the MTR objectives and that the options presented were sufficiently comprehensive and practically oriented⁷
- developed a plan of work, reviewed by the RST
- familiarized himself with ILAC's objectives, activities and history by attending the September 2009 Learning Laboratory Workshop, conducting interviews and an online survey, and reading relevant documents
- implemented the MTR plan of work
- delivered the final report

The target audiences of review are given in Table 1.

Table 1. The target audiences of the MTR

Audiences	Reasons
ILAC donors	Project agreement with donor; obtain donor reaction, and commitment to proposed conclusions and recommendations; possibly, investigate donor interest in further funding during the ILAC transition phase
Consortium Board; senior CGIAR decision-makers on CGIAR change implementation at system and Center levels	Inform their decision-making on the functions and services to be delivered across Centers, particularly in relation to mega-programmes; contribute to the debate on the future role of research and partnership in the new CGIAR
ILAC and its partners (including participants in ILAC activities)	Build commitment to proposed conclusions and recommendations; enlist their continued engagement in shaping the ILAC transition phase
Unit Heads of CGIAR's Strategic Services	Contribute to developing a better understanding of the Common Services, in which ILAC could be involved
PM&E professionals in the Centers	Initiate dialogue about ILAC's future role in CGIAR PM&E

⁶ Consultant TORs are documented in ILAC (2009).

⁷ Agreed to RST TORs are described in ILAC (2009). The RST was made up of one donor (from DGIS: J. Rijniers), one ILAC Coordination Team representative (Coordinator: J. Watts), a member of the Learning Laboratory team (from CIP: G. Thiele) and a senior CGIAR manager (DG of Bioversity International, ILAC's host Center: E. Frison).

The consultant then:

- Reviewed documents on:
 - ILAC objectives, activities, work plans and outputs, to understand ILAC's origins, current situation and future plans
 - the decisions, outcomes, proposals and process of the CGIAR Change Management Initiative, to identify contextual information relevant to looking at options for ILAC's role in the new CGIAR
 - the history, status and evaluation of the CGIAR's social science capacity, poverty reduction mission and PM&E approaches, including IE and the performance management system (PMS)
- Consulted stakeholders in ILAC: donors; senior CGIAR senior decision-makers, research managers and PM&E professionals; ILAC partners and participants in ILAC activities; the CGIAR System Office Units; and external experts on PM&E and agricultural development, by:
 - conducting an online survey on ILAC's place in the new CGIAR, to which 55 of 155 people invited to participate responded (34% response rate)⁸
 - conducting in-depth telephone interviews with 31 of the 36 people who were asked to participate
 - facilitating a session during the Learning Laboratory Workshop in September 2009, to obtain the views of the 21 participants on: 'What ILAC should be focusing on mainly in 2012' and 'What major services, uses or expertise ILAC should provide to the new CGIAR'
- Liaised with the RST to:
 - agree on the RST role and review MTR objectives, actions and the interviewee list (via a conference call on 26 October 2009)
 - review the draft report (via a conference call on 7 January 2010)
 - review the final report (end of January 2010)
- Liaised with the ILAC Team on implementing the activities in the MTR work plan, including preparing the RST discussions
- Delivered the final report, with conclusions and recommendations, to ILAC, the donor and specified primary and secondary audiences (via the ILAC Coordinator)

The list of documents reviewed and the people interviewed, as well as the interview questions and a facsimile of the online survey, are given in the Annexes. Hereafter, unless otherwise stated, the participants in the interviews and in the online survey will be referred to as 'interviewees'.

⁸ The survey was sent to 155 people, in the following categories (some respondents belonged to two or more of these categories): CGIAR and external M&E and IE contacts (45 people), ILAC publication authors and reviewers (39), ILAC consultants (10) and participants in the 'Rethinking Impact' and 'Policy Influence' workshops (72), ILAC Learning Laboratory members (36), CGIAR DDGs (14) and Training/HR managers from Centers that hosted ILAC facilitation workshops (9).

1.3 Overview of the final report

The MTR final report is divided into six sections: introduction; context; assessment; institutionalization; main conclusions; and recommendations.

The context section describes trends in international agricultural research for development that are relevant to ILAC's role in the new CGIAR. The directions and decisions taken by the CGIAR Change Management Initiative set the context in which ILAC would be placed and which, to some extent, it could influence.

The assessment section presents ILAC's strengths and weaknesses, including lessons learned and options for ILAC's future, based on the consultations, the document review and the consultant's conclusions.

The institutionalization section reviews the options and draws conclusions that focus on:

- arguments for a CGIAR-wide PM&E function and why ILAC should be part of this function
- how a CGIAR-wide PM&E function could be organized
- principles that should guide decisions on ILAC's future position

Conclusions relating to the major issues are presented in the relevant subsections of the review. The final part of the report presents the review's main conclusions. They relate to the challenges facing the CGIAR, the role of partnerships, ILAC's relevance in the new CGIAR, its future collaboration with other CGIAR units, expanding the scope and use of PM&E methods and tools, and positioning ILAC in the new CGIAR.

The recommendations section builds on the assessment and institutionalization findings and includes proposed objectives and activities for ILAC during the transition phase (2010-11).

2. Context

2.1 Trends in international agricultural research for development

A recent Strategy Team Report lists multiple and complex challenges currently facing international research for development⁹:

- reduced agricultural productivity growth due to decades of under-investment
- food and financial crises fuelled by various factors, including energy prices and population growth
- depletion of the natural resources on which agriculture depends (due to climate change, soil degradation, etc.).

A recent review of the CGIAR system highlighted the main challenges facing its agricultural research agenda¹⁰:

- uncertain effects of climate change
- slowing down of technical change
- access to new science in an era of privatization
- gender

⁹ Braun et al. (2009).

¹⁰ McAllister (2008a:22).

- new market structures
- health risks from agricultural practices

Agricultural research and development is becoming increasingly competitive¹¹. Its role in poverty reduction is once again receiving high-level political attention and the demand for agricultural research outputs is now rising, after a longer period of limited demand.

The CGIAR should be centre stage in addressing the critical questions of climate change and food security, but it is largely absent¹². Its continued relevance depends largely on functioning better as a system. Established and new donors are increasing their funding, but they are increasingly demanding clear measures of impact.

Looking at the new CGIAR's role in international agricultural research, the Stripe Review of the Social Sciences (SRSS) of the CGIAR recommended that social science research should focus on productivity growth and poverty reduction through:

- technological innovation
- institutional innovation
- directly informing agricultural and rural development policy

The SRSS linked the focus of future research to CGIAR's comparative advantages, which it listed as:

- a producer of significant new intellectual property in agricultural sciences
- multidisciplinary research on increasing agricultural productivity by and for the poor
- close interaction with stakeholders at local, national and global levels
- a multidisciplinary organization with opportunities for data integration and inter-operability
- a unique combination of international-level technical expertise and its multinational nature
- widely perceived as an honest broker for policy guidance¹³

2.1.1 Conclusions

The challenges, trends and identified comparative advantages indicate:

- the growing complexity of interrelated research areas (e.g., natural resources base for agriculture; the role of markets and their changing dynamics)
- the greater number and diversity of actors in international agricultural research for development

The CGIAR needs to better harness its multidisciplinary talents and capacities, whatever research agenda it decides to focus on. Research partnerships will become more important if it is to handle the growing complexity effectively. In addition, the more competitive nature of international agricultural research makes it important for the CGIAR to act as a system.

¹¹ "The CGIAR System finds itself in a very crowded field with multiple new actors in the form of strong research universities and national agricultural institutes in the south, international NGOs that perform many of the tasks once the exclusive domain of the CGIAR, and a range of national and multinational corporations that are forging breakthroughs in agricultural science." See Change Steering team (2009). The SRSS came to similar conclusions: "The CGIAR is a relatively small player even within the limited domain of agricultural research." See CGIAR Science Council (2009:11).

¹² See McAllister (2008b).

¹³ CGIAR Science Council (2009:18).

2.2 Major challenges facing the new CGIAR

The interviewees were asked to identify the main challenges and needs that the new CGIAR will face with regard to research for development, partnership and PM&E. They were then asked to describe how ILAC could help in addressing these challenges and needs¹⁴.

On research for development, they saw the main challenges and needs as:

- 1 Raising awareness among donors and policy-makers about the long-term nature of agricultural research
- 2 Linking research findings more effectively to action to change farmers' lives.
- 3 Encouraging national partners to invest more in agriculture and extension

On the CGIAR system, the main challenges were seen as:

- 4 The need for greater clarity about the roles and responsibilities of the CGIAR system, mega-programmes and Centers with regard to development (as opposed to conducting research)
- 5 Improving its ability to manage research over the long term
- 6 Ensuring synergy between mega-programmes
- 7 Funding, including constraints related to long-term funding and quasi-unrestricted funding
- 8 Changing the mindset from 'working for the poor' to seeing the rural poor as 'clients' who could be categorized into groups and who have needs that should become the starting point for research
- 9 Learning from failure

On partnerships, the main challenges were seen as:

- 10 Developing systematic partnerships with development actors
- 11 Finding the right partners and being more flexible in partnering (and not regarding partnership as an aim in itself)
- 12 Linking with the private sector, which also provides an opportunity for learning
- 13 Working more effectively with both traditional partners and new ones
- 14 Helping partners improve their capacity and capability to deliver results
- 15 Investing in partnering across many projects and years
- 16 Encouraging a culture change based on the recognition that CGIAR's work will have an impact on the ground only through its partners

On PM&E, including IE, the main challenges are seen as:

- 17 Standardizing PM&E to help guide resource-allocation decisions and foster better performance
- 18 Developing an integrated framework that takes account of both the big picture and the smaller components of mega-programmes, and strengthens the links between M&E and IE
- 19 Developing a systematic approach to applying learning when planning new programmes and projects

¹⁴ Out of the 32 interviewees, 16 were asked one, two or all the 'Challenges and needs' questions. Some interviewees mentioned challenges and needs without being prompted.

- 20 Managing data over the long term (from research to results to impact) more effectively, and ensuring long-term research remains consistent and does not become separated from decision-making
- 21 Reducing conflict between PM&E-for-accountability and PM&E-for-learning, and getting rid of the misconception that IE differs from evaluation; PM&E should encompass traditional and non-mainstream methods
- 22 Conducting M&E of the interrelationships among mega-programmes
- 23 Being clear about how to set up and manage mega-programmes and to plan their research
- 24 Bringing together disparate PM&E activities and resources in the CGIAR, to give them more leverage, but preventing PM&E staff from becoming detached from researchers in the new CGIAR and not creating a central unit on which all PM&E work is ‘dumped’
- 25 Responding to the emerging paradigm of interlinked causes and addressing the key question: Which parts of a complex system (e.g., ecosystems, market dynamics, policy environment) should the CGIAR system engage with, and why?
- 26 Ensuring greater cooperation at planning stage; participatory *ex ante* and *ex post* IE needs to be implemented, and always with partners
- 27 Improving partners’ capacity to conduct PM&E
- 28 Finding mechanisms for linking knowledge and information generated by agricultural research to policy decision-making

2.2.1 Conclusions

The long-term nature of most international agricultural research presents an ongoing donor-partner relationship management challenge. With the move towards longer-term, more complex mega-programmes, this challenge is likely to grow. The CGIAR will need to improve its ability to manage information (e.g., research outputs, outcomes and impact) over the long term. It therefore needs to develop a PM&E framework based on effective collaboration between Doer- and Funder-side IE¹⁵.

The learning from PM&E activities, at different stages and performed by different components of the CGIAR system, needs to be translated into action at different levels (e.g., from CGIAR system level to mega-programme to project to CGIAR Center), taking care not to mix up the levels. It is important to ensure that there is an effective learning-to-action process, with collaboration among the various actors along the PM&E ‘value chain’.

Research partners and, in particular, national partners need CGIAR support to build their PM&E capacity in order to obtain a more detailed picture of research impact. Partnering and building partners’ PM&E capacity requires significant CGIAR investment. There is also a need for greater national investment in agriculture and in funding for international development.

Greater clarity about the CGIAR’s role and responsibilities in agricultural development will help in research partner selection. Achieving this clarity requires greater cooperation among mega-programmes and participating Centers and their research partners at the planning stage.

Running through the identified challenges and needs is the issue of the organizational culture. Bringing about attitudinal changes requires dedicated effort.

¹⁵ See stakeholder views 1, 5, 18, 20, 24 above. Subsequent consultant conclusions are also based on key themes, which cut across a subset of stakeholder views.

2.3 The CGIAR Change Management Initiative

The CGIAR change process was initiated in early 2008 to revitalize the CGIAR “to do more and better”¹⁶. In December 2008, the CGIAR committed itself to a new business model through which it aims to deliver on a set of people-centered strategic objectives. In December 2009, the proposed reforms were endorsed and some donors pledged to increase their support; notably, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation joined the CGIAR Fund. The Chair and Co-Chairs of the new CGIAR Consortium Board were appointed.

The change implementation milestones for 2010 are given in Table 2¹⁷.

Table 2. Change implementation milestones, 2010

January	February	March	April-May	June-December
Updated SRF produced	Meeting of Alliance, Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) and the Science Council to agree on the updated SRF and the portfolio of mega-programmes to present at the Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD)	CGARD meeting	Lead Centers for the mega-programmes agreed, and detailed planning for each programme initiated	SRF and mega-programme portfolio finalized, and one or more mega-programmes approved
	Meeting of the Fund Council	Meeting of the Funders Forum Meeting of the Consortium Board		CEO appointed Consortium Office set up Preparations for Consortium Board to meet in September

Senior CGIAR management considered that the major challenges in reforming the CGIAR would be¹⁸:

- ensuring that all CGIAR staff, regardless of hierarchy and location, participated in implementing the changes and coped with the difficulties involved
- designing a system that encourages learning, so as to create a learning organization
- bringing the scientists together
- bringing the donors together
- ensuring clarity and that the right actions are taken in the right order
- obtaining and deploying resources

The focus of the new CGIAR will be on “reducing poverty and hunger, improving human health and nutrition, and enhancing ecosystem resilience through high-quality international agricultural research, partnership and leadership”. This vision is based on the following objectives:

¹⁶ Quoted from the CGIAR website on change management <http://www.cgiar.org/changemanagement/index.html>

¹⁷ Sourced from Alliance Exchange and CGIAR change management websites <http://alliance.cgxchange.org/welcome> and <http://www.cgiar.org/changemanagement/index.html>

¹⁸ CGIAR change management website, carrying video interview clips showing answers to the question “What is the biggest challenge faced in reforming the CGIAR / implementing the agreed changes?” http://www.cgiar.org/changemanagement/embracingchange/embracing_change_december14_2009.html

- clear strategic focus
- increased research outputs, outcomes and impact
- greater efficiency, effectiveness and relevance
- simplicity and clarity of governance
- enhanced decentralized decision making
- active subsidiarity to capitalize on inter-Center complementarities¹⁹

On increased research outputs, outcomes and impact, the External Program and Management Review (EPMR) panel at Bioversity International concluded in 2009 that “the CGIAR change process offers an important opportunity to increase the professionalism of PM&E in the CGIAR and to stimulate learning and change behaviour across the system²⁰.”

The CGIAR Change Management Initiative documents refer to the new set-up as the “CGIAR Partnership”, replacing the term “CGIAR System”.

2.4 CGIAR change implications for ILAC’s future role

The factors described here relate to the key building blocks of the new CGIAR and will influence many parts of CGIAR, including the future of ILAC. There are opportunities for ILAC to influence these factors. It could do this at two levels:

- CGIAR Partnership level:
 - by looking at how pro-poor impact will be anchored in the SRF and reflected in the mega-programmes in order to inform PM&E approaches and methods. ILAC could contribute to these stages of the planning process, drawing on its participatory, pro-poor planning (*ex ante* IE) expertise
 - by looking at how and to what extent clarity can be achieved in the interaction among the Doers and Funders Centers, the Consortium Office, the Funders Council and the International Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) in order to cooperate effectively on programme PM&E
- Doer level (e.g., CGIAR Consortium, Centers):
 - by looking at how the Centers’ willingness to become collaborators²¹ (i.e., to deliver on the SRF via jointly delivering mega-programmes) will affect the development of a PM&E-based learning culture/organization. ILAC could play a significant role in creating such an organization
 - by looking at how to achieve sufficient clarity about the role of the Consortium Office vis-à-vis its constituent Centers, particularly with regard to the Strategic Common Services, which could include ILAC. Issues to address would include: What is the basis on which centrally provided services will be provided? What range of services will be centrally provided, and at what depth? What will be the mode of collaboration between central support functions in the Consortium and their counterparts in mega-programme offices and Centers?

¹⁹ Quoted from Sierra (2009).

²⁰ See Flavell et al. (2009).

²¹ Such willingness is also contingent on donors’ incentivizing inter-Center collaboration.

- by looking at how to achieve consensus on the nature of mega-programmes and how they will be run, so as to determine the breadth and depth of PM&E support and how to deliver it (e.g., centrally or through decentralized mechanisms)²².

Additional observations on CGIAR change implications for ILAC and beyond include the following:

- The CGIAR’s learning activities are seldom formalized or costed. The tendency is to develop bottom-up ‘learning’ initiatives; and sharing research data among Centers, which is critical to learning, is not routine practice²³. The CGIAR Change Management Initiative focuses on ‘continued relevance’. Why does learning not come more naturally to this network of Centers? Why are measures to develop a ‘learning organization’ not part of the CGIAR change strategy?
- The network of Centers seems to lack an institutional memory. Often, programmes/projects ‘reinvent the wheel’. Does this apparent lack of memory relate to an inability to learn and apply the lessons learned?
- Since its inception in 1971, the CGIAR’s mission has focused on poverty reduction, based on linking scientific achievements to development goals. But the learning about pro-poor impact – what it should be and how to achieve it – is so dispersed or limited that a 2001 study suggested that within the CGIAR very little is known about this complex problem²⁴. Why has the CGIAR not generated a significant amount of learning?
- Aiming for pro-poor impact requires understanding the evolving dynamics of rural poverty in different regions, nations and localities. The CGIAR achieves this partly by involving partners and beneficiaries in individual programmes. Does it need to become more knowledgeable about rural poverty dynamics beyond the programme level? How should it do this? What could a future ILAC-in-PM&E function contribute here? (See Box1)
- The CGIAR Centers often compete for funds from the same donors. Center independence and inter-Center competition has not led to a culture of constructive debate about core issues, such as how to achieve poverty reduction impact or run research programmes effectively. Why is this so?²⁵

Box 1. Implications of a pro-poor approach to IE

- Participatory IE approaches and methods
- Increased use of poverty mapping
- Broaden IE to include impact of other factors on food security
- Consider additional stakeholders or target groups (poor consumers; indirect effects)
- Monitor institutional links, collaboration, participation
- Analyze policy environment, which influences impact
- Develop smarter, more focused approaches to develop and test models

Source: La Rovere and Dixon (2005)

3. Assessment

This section outlines the origins of ILAC and presents stakeholder opinions on ILAC’s past and present objectives and activities, including lessons learned. It then presents stakeholder views on ILAC’s future objectives and activities.

²² The research and non-research support needs, which mega-programme and Center-specific research leaders will have, might need to be defined in more detail and prioritized beyond what has been done by external consultants and the Strategy team. This prioritization will influence how a Consortium PM&E function will evolve.

²³ Based on consultant’s experience with the SGRP/GPG2 project (e.g., system-wide data exchange via SINGER). See also EPMP of ICT-KM; recommendation to expand CGMap to improve access to Centers’ research results (Liebowitz and Field, 2009).

²⁴ Hazell and Hadadd (2001).

²⁵ The consultant’s observations and questions derive from document reviews, interviewee comments and own consulting experience with system-wide programmes or initiatives, CGIAR System Office Units and one Center’s management team.

3.1 ILAC's origins, objectives and activities

The ILAC Initiative grew out of a CGIAR conference in 2003 on IE, where the participants advocated shifting the PM&E approach:

- from being product-focused to being focused on people and institutions
- from using external expert reviews to conducting internal critical self-reflection
- from documenting successes to learning from failures

The donors supporting ILAC between 2003 and 2006 included the Rockefeller Foundation and Bioversity International (then IPGRI). In 2006, the ILAC coordination staff, donors and partners agreed to:

- move ILAC's scope of activities beyond the CGIAR, to agricultural innovation systems in which CGIAR research operates
- work on enhancing impact through partnerships for innovation (as opposed to focusing on IE *per se*), linking up with ILAC-relevant projects and support groups

Since 2006, ILAC has worked to achieve its objectives through four main types of activities:

- applied research and evaluation
- capacity development
- fostering leadership for pro-poor innovation
- communications and knowledge-sharing²⁶

ILAC's activities aim to effect changes in the behaviour of people involved in agricultural innovation, in the operations and culture of systems, networks and organizations engaged in agricultural research and development, and in the performance of research and development organizations. The changes hinge on sustained collective action towards poverty reduction, driven by the co-creation of knowledge²⁷.

Since early 2008, ILAC has worked hard to keep abreast of CGIAR Change Management Initiative developments and contribute to discussions on CGIAR performance management (including a new PM&E framework), IE and partnerships. In collaboration with GFAR, it organized a policy workshop on partnerships in February 2010 and has helped achieve consensus on a future set of integrated Strategic Common Services.

In 2010, ILAC will launch a 4-year project on 'Impact Evaluation Approaches for Agricultural Research for Development', funded by IFAD. The need for such a project was identified during the 'Rethinking Impact' workshop in 2008, organized by ILAC, the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA). The project will seek to increase understanding of how agricultural research contributes to poverty reduction, improved livelihoods and environmental sustainability in rural areas. It will involve conducting new IEs and providing new insights on the multi-stakeholder partnership dimensions of research. It will also seek to develop capacity among researchers and evaluators.

Most interviewees, when asked why ILAC was established, responded that it grew out of a desire to provide alternative approaches to IE that look more closely at poverty reduction, environmental impact and how to anticipate uncertainty and unintended outcomes in

²⁶ Information obtained from Watts and Horton (2008).

²⁷ Quoted from presentation by Jamie Watts on 'What is ILAC?'; see Hagmann (2009).

agricultural research²⁸. They noted that there was concern that the CGIAR did not appear to learn from its evaluation activities, and that these activities were not aimed at assessing the impact of agricultural research on poverty. The creation of ILAC brought together experts from two schools – IE and innovation systems – and was one of several attempts to encourage the CGIAR to move its focus towards learning and change.

When asked what ILAC was mainly about today, the interviewees said:

- IE and evaluation in general (e.g., IE for learning and feedback to research for development programs; alternative approaches; IE of collaboration; research on IE; changing the PM&E approach in the CGIAR)
- using learning to effect change (e.g., institutional learning; changing CGIAR culture; case studies; managing change processes; learning from mistakes)

Several interviewees thought that ILAC would become even more relevant to the ‘new CGIAR’. Some interviewees criticized the lack of clarity or information about what ILAC has achieved to date, and some of the means or activities by which it has pursued its objectives (e.g., using the case study approach, and not working at ground level to validate hypotheses). Responses to the survey questions on ILAC’s strengths and weaknesses are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Survey responses to Question 1 (ILAC’s strengths and weaknesses)

Answer options	Very strong / Strong	Weak / Very weak
Foster learning about how agricultural research and development can more effectively contribute to reducing poverty	65%	20%
Strengthen capacity needed for collaborative agricultural research and development	62%	22%
Generate new knowledge about agricultural innovation processes through applied research and evaluation	58%	24%
Improve researchers’ ability to work with a wide range of stakeholders	55%	24%
Foster leadership and policies to support agricultural research for poverty reduction	43%	39%

ILAC was generally seen to be strong in building capacity, generating knowledge and fostering learning. It was seen to be relatively weak in fostering leadership and policies.

A case of successful capacity-building is cited in a recent ILAC self-assessment of its influence on Bioversity. ILAC’s advisory services have helped to improve Bioversity’s professionalism in PM&E, and Bioversity staff have become more aware of PM&E data quality²⁹.

With regard to inter-Center capacity-building activities, the evaluation of a workshop on ‘Group Facilitation Skills for Participatory Decision-Making’ highlighted some valuable lessons learnt (see Table 4)³⁰. The course provides training in facilitator basics, group dynamics, leading effective meetings and ensuring sustainable agreements. The evaluation sought to establish how useful the participants considered the skills learnt, if and how they applied them subsequently and, if they did, what changes occurred. The participants’

²⁸ Out of 32 interviewees, 16 (ILAC partners, donors, CGIAR System Office Units) were asked: “What is ILAC mainly about today? Has it shifted from its original objective?” Six ILAC partners were asked: “Please describe, in your own words, why ILAC was established? Is its purpose still relevant today?”

²⁹ See Watts (2009a).

³⁰ See Sette and Watts (2009). The report is based on 44% of the training participants’ responding to an online survey.

comments indicated that, by offering the training workshop, ILAC had responded to a great need.

Table 4. Lessons learnt from the training course on facilitation skills

Strengths	Weaknesses
On-the-job use of what was learnt and more effective meetings conducted (e.g., more than 50% of the participants facilitated meetings other than their own; demonstrated use at the level of individual meetings implied self-confidence and the wish to try out what was learnt)	No follow-up to further develop skills and apply them to more complex situations (e.g., an advanced workshop, some form of help desk function, online exchange of experiences)
Passing on learning at a practical level to colleagues close to the participant	No train-the-trainer effect
High personal satisfaction in applying learnt skills on the job	Did not reach many in the target audience (i.e., 140 out of about 1,500–2,000 CGIAR staff who plan and organize meetings, collaborate with research partners etc. Out of the 140 participants, 12 people came from partner organizations)
	No explicit link with PM&E for pro-poor impact, or research for development more generally (e.g., link to participatory methods, IE techniques, and engaging grass-roots partners)
As a voluntary inter-Centre initiative, reached 250 CGIAR staff in 3 years (including through training organized subsequently by Centers	Did not establish a CGIAR standard for the target audience (i.e., 250 out of about 1,500-2,000 CGIAR staff who plan and organize meetings, collaborate with research partners, etc. Out of the 250, 110 were trained as a result of Centers' own investment and 12 came from partner organizations)

With regard to ILAC's activities overall³¹, at least 75% of the survey respondents considered that its current range of activities will continue to be needed by the new CGIAR (see Table 5).

Table 5. Survey responses to Question 4 (ILAC activities)

Answer options	Very much needed / Needed	Limited need / Not needed
Fostering networking and a community-of-practice	92%	8%
Providing training and technical assistance	88%	12%
ILAC website and resource centre	83%	17%
ILAC publications	80%	20%
Fostering policy dialogues (through 'Rethinking Impact' and other workshops)	78%	24%
Helping to develop PM&E systems and services	74%	16%

With regard to website and resource centre activities, a forthcoming ILAC report on website traffic shows that visits have steadily grown since 2005. In 2009, more than 20,000 people used the ILAC portal. Since a major upgrade in 2008, the number of downloads has increased by nearly 50%, the most popular download content being from the 'Tools for M&E' section³². The website has been an early adopter of several applications developed or sponsored by the CGIAR Information and Communications Technology and Knowledge Management Program (ICT-KM).

³¹ Question 4: "ILAC has carried out a number of activities, shown in the table below. Please indicate to what extent these activities continue to be needed by the 'new CGIAR' and its partners." Four comments were added to this question. Two asked if ILAC should be performing (all of) these activities in future; another emphasized the need for a broad debate of approaches, mainstreaming functions and clarity on common processes. Not all percentages add up 100%, due to 'don't know' responses. Placing the development of PM&E activities at the bottom of the 'needed' list does not tally with the respondents' views of what ILAC should be mainly about.

³² Sette (2010).

During the Learning Laboratory Workshop in September 2009³³, ILAC conducted a self-assessment exercise in which 21 participants discussed its strengths and weaknesses and made recommendations for the future, focusing on:

- the Learning Laboratory (e.g., small grants; technical assistance)
- training (e.g., Facilitation workshop)
- policy environment (e.g., ‘Rethinking Impact’ workshop; publications; CGIAR change-related activities; organizational learning capacity)
- communications (e.g., ILAC knowledge portal)
- IE (e.g., scoping study; project proposal; networking)

The workshop participants’ comments are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. ILAC self-assessment comments

ILAC activity	Strengths	Areas for improvement
Learning Laboratory	Keeps ILAC grounded in the realities of partnership, IE, and CGIAR system Allows for comparisons, learning across cases, time for reflection Provides technical assistance and outputs that contribute to the M&E of new programmes/projects Improves quality of M&E	Be a more continuous activity Be clear about applying lessons elsewhere in a systematic manner and who will do this Bring in other cases, to use as a ‘variable’ (control group) Deal with the need to allocate more time and effort to Learning Laboratory activities Ensure feedback from cases, to complete the work books Promote more constructive controversy online and via ‘cross-visits’, joint publications Enable specific cross-learning exchanges among Learning Laboratory cases Increase small grants to ensure they are adequate for their purpose
Training	Useful for facilitating partnerships, negotiation, conflict and change management Useful mostly beyond ILAC’s thematic areas Supports planning packages	Develop 1-2 hour sessions on influencing policy and facilitation Be more targeted and demand-driven, and base training on needs assessment among peers Try out a peer-to-peer approach Complement with training on management and organizational learning tools
Policy environment		Size of ILAC a possible problem; it is small in terms of what it wants to do
Communications	Provides knowledge and tools Has become one of the best sources of M&E information	Provide services for publishing papers and articles Provide information in Spanish Distribute responsibility for managing portal components among ILAC community Provide access to journals Improve the use of D groups Publicise the portal and make it more visible
IE		Increase interaction between IE and the Learning Laboratory (via ILAC web pages and the IFAD-funded IE project, see section 3.1)

During the Learning Laboratory Workshop, representatives of the seven case studies consolidated their lessons learnt about research partnerships into nine critical success factors and a 1-page summary of key lessons and challenges³⁴.

³³ Hagmann (2009).

³⁴ Fully documented in Hagmann (2009:43-48).

A common thread running through the success factors and lessons learnt was the need to invest in effective planning and communications with (potential) partners at the outset, so that research goals and agenda are shared, expectations from the partnership are made explicit, complementary competencies are identified, and the rules of cooperation and conflict resolution are agreed.

The review interviewees listed a range of lessons learned from ILAC's activities to date³⁵. Those most relevant to ILAC's future are given in Table 7³⁶.

Table 7. Lessons learned from ILAC's activities that are relevant to its future

Objectives and strategy	Major activities	Other
Lack of vision, but a demonstrated willingness to take on difficult questions	Has successfully linked into the larger IE world, which is of benefit to the CGIAR	Did not anticipate the challenge of CGIAR Change
The ILAC community is not engaged enough yet with what ILAC is and should be producing and where it should be headed	Cannot meet the demand for the services it offers	ICT-KM and ILAC perceived as separate initiatives within the same 'space', did not join forces
Took on a large 'spread-the-gospel' role with too few resources	Continues to provide a safe space in which to experiment with alternative IE approaches ³⁷	Underestimated resistance to change (e.g., learning not locked into evaluation practices)
Has tried to cover too many thematic areas	Continues to champion learning from failure	
Needs to find a different balance between strategic and operational work	Needs to demonstrate outcomes it has achieved or contributed to in order to increase its credibility, especially at the meta-level	
Needs to move from fringe to centre, making compromises, if necessary, in doing so	Its aim of 'institutional learning' remains a grey area (e.g., how to transfer learning into the CGIAR system)	
Consider placing ILAC at Center level with large social sciences units, to ensure greater interaction with PM&E professionals (instead of at Bioversity)	Needs to help Centers reflect about poverty reduction impact	

Interviewees' views on 'what ILAC should no longer work on and why' were fairly divergent, but several said that ILAC has taken on too large an agenda, should no longer do its own research (as opposed to synthesizing other peoples' research) and should no longer devote time to developing facilitation skills, although this was judged to be a good 'entry point'³⁸.

3.1.1 Conclusions

A recurring theme among the interviewees was that ILAC has taken on too many objectives and corresponding activities, given its size. This is partly because the CGIAR is not a system, but a loose network. For example, the ILAC-organized and funded facilitation workshop could be a standard, institutionalized staff development course across the system, and there could be dedicated system-wide IT support to inter-Center initiatives, such as ILAC. The

³⁵ Note that 6 (ILAC partners) out of 32 interviewees were asked this question.

³⁶ Note that 6 (ILAC partners) out of 32 interviewees were asked this question.

³⁷ An example is Participatory Impact Pathways Analysis (PIPA). For lessons learnt, see Mackay et al. (2007).

³⁸ Out of 32 interviewees, 12 were asked this question.

ILAC Team has compensated for its small size by building functioning networks (e.g., through its website users and the Learning Laboratory).

Some interviewees thought that ILAC needed to improve upon evaluating and learning from its own successes and failures, and to better document outcomes³⁹. Documenting outcomes is not easy because ILAC has a set of complex objectives revolving around change in institutional norms and behaviour; many institutional norms are informal, and behavioural changes need to be observed over time. If ILAC focused on fewer objectives, it would be easier to analyze the extent to which it has achieved its objectives and to clearly show the outcomes of its work, using the methods and tools it promotes and thus acting as a role model in the CGIAR⁴⁰.

An inter-Center initiative such as ILAC, which lacks a formal system-wide mandate, has a small team and is seen to be working on the periphery of the CGIAR system, will find it difficult to foster leadership and policies within the system. It depends upon its partners re-directing some of their time and effort away from their ‘regular job’, and this constrains what it is able to achieve. For example, Learning Laboratory participants point to the lack of time to engage in cross-project learning activities. These activities are probably not, or only partly, reflected in their research plans, budgets or individual performance reviews, but this is precisely what needs to change if ILAC is to develop and strengthen its influence in the CGIAR.

ILAC comes out strong on capacity-building aimed at collaborative research and working with different kinds of stakeholders. This is illustrated by the positive feedback on the Facilitation workshop and the use of the ILAC website. Demand for ILAC-led capacity-building seems to be greater than supply.

3.2 ILAC’s future

As shown in Table 8, most of the survey respondents considered ILAC’s objectives to be very relevant to the future of agricultural research⁴¹.

Table 8. Survey response to Question 4 (relevance of ILAC objectives)

Answer options	Extremely relevant	Extremely relevant / Relevant	Somewhat relevant / Not relevant
Improve the ability of researchers to work with a wide range of stakeholders	67%	89%	12%
Strengthen the capacity needed for collaborative agricultural research and development	49%	86%	14%
Foster learning about how agricultural research and development can more effectively contribute to reducing poverty	53%	84%	16%
Generate new knowledge about agricultural innovation processes through applied research and evaluation	40%	80%	19%
Foster leadership and policies to support agricultural research for poverty reduction	38%	72%	26%

³⁹ In an outcome mapping exercise in April 2009, the ILAC Coordination Team set itself the aim of gathering “evidence of effective interventions; develop skills in building this evidence; ... develop methods for gathering/analyzing evidence”.

⁴⁰ The reviewer has looked at several outcome self-assessments done by the ILAC Coordination Team and larger groups of ILAC partners and participants (e.g., workshop documentation, internal briefing papers), a 2005 external assessment based on stakeholder interviews, and ILAC-internal activity reporting and formal activity reports to the donor. Interviewees also expressed individual views about what ILAC has and has not achieved. Together, they represent valuable ‘raw material’.

⁴¹ Respondents used the ‘don’t know’ answer option only with regard to ‘Foster leadership’ (2%).

As shown in Table 9, more than half the respondents thought that, by 2012, ILAC should be engaged in all the thematic areas proposed⁴².

Table 9. Survey response to Question 5 (future focus of ILAC)

Answer options	Yes absolutely	Yes, less important	No
Supporting improved PM&E practices in the CGIAR, including IE, as a support function to CGIAR research activities to improve their quality and relevance	71%	23%	6%
Supporting institutional learning within the CGIAR about research for development and the evaluation of its impact	63%	29%	8%
Encouraging the development and management of partnerships in CGIAR Centers for research for development programmes/projects	59%	29%	12%
Supporting institutional learning within and outside the CGIAR	55%	28%	17%
Encouraging pro-poor research for development within and outside the CGIAR	53%	30%	17%
Encouraging pro-poor research for development within the CGIAR	50%	35%	15%

When asked which of eight work areas ILAC should focus on (Question 7), most respondents said institutional and organizational learning (73%) and M&E (55%). Less than half saw the need to focus on collaborative research partnerships (43%) or pro-poor impact (39%), and less than a third thought it should focus on innovation systems research (29%), knowledge management (22%), research leadership development (14%) or research planning and targeting (8%).

The participants in the Learning Laboratory workshop considered that ILAC should focus on:

- impact evaluation⁴³
- policy environment issues
- building capacity for learning and change among the CGIAR’s research partners
- building the ILAC community’s knowledge about PM&E and self-assessment
- expanding its broker expertise and helping institutions refine their needs⁴⁴

When asked what ILAC should mainly be about in 2012, most workshop participants said ‘partnership’, ‘research for development’ and ‘institutional learning’. One participant summarized the responses as “partnership and organizational learning necessary to achieve pro-poor impact”. The participants also identified major services that ILAC should provide in a new CGIAR (see Table 10). They saw partnership (including inter-Center cooperation) and IE as cutting across all four recipient groups.

⁴² The 16 comments added by respondents reflect a wide range of opinions (e.g., “ILAC can have greater impact outside the CGIAR”) and qualifications (e.g., “not institutional, but learning in a wide range of contexts, interactive learning”).

⁴³ See the workshop documentation report, where the following further comments are documented (illustrative): Will become important in the CGIAR; an ILAC niche; become service provider for IA of partnership and other matters; focus training activities on impact evaluation/assessment.

⁴⁴ These responses were part of the self-assessment exercise referred to in section 3.1 of this report.

Table 10. Provision of services

To whom	Senior CGIAR decision-makers, and Centers	Leaders of research programmes/projects and meta-programmes	Researchers	CGIAR research partners
	Strategic alliances	Facilitate partner platforms		
			Create opportunities to engage in complex issues related to poverty	Knowledge sharing
	Equitable representation of Centers' objectives and interests in a centralized CGIAR	Provide partnership management training; facilitate interactions among partners; provide methods to analyze partners' abilities and capacities	Partnership mentoring	Partnership management training; training package, including training in facilitation and change management
	Mentoring for PM&E-for-learning	Programme planning and design support	Open up CGIAR to external, pro-poor actors	Provide a pool of experts
		IE for policy decision-making, and M&E	Facilitate institutionalization of participatory methods	Provide brokerage services (mentoring, expertise, technical assistance)
	Generate evidence for policy change			Generate evidence for policy change
		Clearing house, resource centres about ILAC thematic areas		→
	Provide self-assessment tools to compare Centers' performance			→

The participants' views matched the description of what a future ILAC 'Common Service' would provide, developed during a workshop in September 2009 on 'Future of Common Services in the new CGIAR'.

The participants also identified possible constraints to ILAC achieving the envisaged role, and solutions to those hurdles. These constraints matched those put forward by the interviewees⁴⁵ (see Table 11).

Table 11. Constraints to ILAC's future role

Constraints	Possible solutions
Continued relevance in the new CGIAR? Centers' and DGs' indifference; stakeholders' commitment	Influential champions (or watchdog)
Demonstrate relevance of ILAC to CGIAR science; how can ILAC generate this evidence outside its community; complex undertaking to show that ILAC makes a difference; show evidence of successful partnerships, pro-poor research	IFAD-funded IE project (see section 3.1) is good opportunity to show relevance; must be implemented strategically; develop a strong ILAC portfolio of cases and evidence

⁴⁵ Four interviewees (external experts) were asked about "Major hurdles a future ILAC must deal with".

Table 11. Constraints to ILAC's future role (contd)'

Constraints	Possible solutions
Be clearer about ILAC's niche and what is unique about ILAC	
Providing a lot of support and services is very different from doing impact studies	Develop a strong ILAC portfolio
Demand for expertise is high; how can this expertise be mobilized and the right people identified?	Networking and outsourcing; restructuring ILAC Bring in outside IE expertise via workshops and training
ILAC's small size; how to develop from this size to 20 ILACs in 2012	
Good body of knowledge and work exists, but time is needed to adapt this to specific contexts, programmes and projects	

The interviewees' views on what a future ILAC should contribute to meeting the challenges identified can be summarized thus⁴⁶:

- encourage and support learning, including inter-Center and cross-programme learning generated by PM&E activities
- deliver IE throughout the programme cycle by bringing together the CGIAR's PM&E resources and creating an enabling environment for PM&E-for-learning
- reach more research managers and researchers with a comprehensive set of services, including building capacity and brokering outside expertise
- assist in partnership formation, including making strategic choices and nurturing partnerships through collaborative PM&E

Their views differed most with regard to the relationship between a future SPIA and a future ILAC. Some saw the remit of the two units as separate, others as largely complementary.

The challenges and needs identified by interviewees are shown in Table 12. They have been rephrased as areas of work to which a future ILAC could contribute. They are matched with research questions put forward by survey respondents when asked to name the top three research questions that ILAC should address⁴⁷.

Table 12. Challenges and needs

Thematic area	Challenges and needs (interviewees)	Future research questions (survey respondents)
Research for development	How to: define realistic, comprehensive pro-poor impact aims at the outset, collaboratively; monitor progress towards those aims, to inform program/project decision-making; and assess post-programme/project achievements (including failure)	Better understanding and definition of poverty in agricultural environments How can scientific outputs effectively reduce poverty? (e.g., effective technology transfer methods)
	Make space and provide resources for cross-programme/Center learning about PM&E, including its role in decision-making How to practice cross-programme/project learning before, during and after programme/project implementation	Understanding the link between individual, group and organizational learning and performance management

⁴⁶ Ten interviewees gave answers to "What should ILAC focus on in the new CGIAR?" Seventeen interviewees responded to "What should a future ILAC in the CGIAR contribute to meeting the challenges and needs you identified?"

⁴⁷ Out of 55 survey participants, 32 responded to question 3 about research questions that ILAC should address in future.

Table12. Challenges and needs (contd)'

Thematic area	Challenges and needs (interviewees)	Future research questions (survey respondents)
	How to conduct participatory PM&E at the outset, and to better manage transaction costs later	
	Expectations and relationship management with donors at the planning stage	
Partnership	Develop research for development partnering competence with Centers/programmes, make it a 'learning issue'	Models, best practices, processes to engage or involve (pro-poor) stakeholders at different points during the research-to-development cycle
	Systematic approach to partnership needed (i.e., not for its own sake)	How well integrated should the CGIAR be with other actors in agricultural innovation? How to develop relationships of trust, to ascertain whether a partnership is effective and to create and maintain effective partnerships?
	How to foster inter-Center collaboration, given a history of competition	
PM&E, including IE	How to manage the links between P, M&E and IE	Role of external factors in programme/project planning, implementing and completion
	Design and provide methods and tools for PM&E-for-accountability and PM&E-for-learning	
	Ensure a learning-to-action link through PM&E throughout the programme/project cycle	Understand the benefits, limits and constraints of PM&E's possible impact on learning and change action How can decisions to divest of failures be made faster?
	Develop PM&E professionals and team-building (e.g., <i>ex ante</i> IE community of practice, network more generally)	
	Add to portfolio of PM&E approaches, methods and tools that can be tailored to program needs	
	Help research managers understand participatory PM&E, leading to learning and action, decisions	How to encourage debate and learning from failures?
	Ensure PM&E competence and resources in programmes/projects on the ground that can be flexibly deployed across projects	
	Help Centers build a range of PM&E competencies	
	Develop solutions and attract funding to strengthen CGIAR partners' PM&E competence and encourage policy-makers to attach more importance to PM&E	
	Develop generic and tailored solutions to transferring PM&E-generated findings, learning and knowledge into policy-making arenas	

It was not possible to compare stakeholder views about a future ILAC, described above, with the findings of a 2005 study on strengthening Institutional Learning and Change at IPGRI (now Bioversity International) and across the CGIAR, because the stakeholder recommendations referred to a CGIAR context before the Change Management Initiative was launched. So the “very tangible strategies for building ILAC within the CGIAR” provided by the informants relate to CGIAR institutions whose roles are about to change, such as the Science Council⁴⁸.

3.2.1 Conclusions

ILAC’s objectives and main activities remain relevant to the new CGIAR.

The priority need is seen as learning how agricultural research and development can more effectively contribute to reducing poverty. Although organizational learning seems to be well understood, institutional learning is less so. The latter requires extracting knowledge and evidence from past and current programmes/projects using PM&E approaches, methods and tools⁴⁹. Institutional learning should involve research partners.

Partnership is seen as an ILAC strength and an important component of its future work. Because this thematic area is potentially significant, ILAC needs to be clear about which partnership issues it will focus on. Several stakeholders see a comparative advantage in ILAC focusing on collaborative PM&E, including *ex ante* IE. A future ILAC could contribute to a ‘partnership relationship management’ network run by another entity in the new CGIAR. Stakeholders’ views on the challenges in the partnership area implied the need to strengthen system-wide competence in building and maintaining relationships with partners.

ILAC should expand the number of research projects it is involved in, engage with more Centers and thereby develop its knowledge base and expertise. It also needs to develop approaches and methods to transfer the learning generated from its portfolio of cases to other CGIAR research programmes.

Interviewee comments on the need for an integrated PM&E framework indicate a gap between the CGIAR’s Strategic Objectives and Strategy and Results Framework, on the one hand, and research programmes/projects on the other. The latter need to be planned so that they contribute to mission-level objectives⁵⁰. The CGIAR needs to invest in meta-level *ex post* IE across its research programmes (i.e., to determine the desired synergies among programmes in terms of outcomes).

The demand among CGIAR researchers for ILAC expertise and support is considered to be high but, given ILAC’s limited resources, does not appear to have been met. Adapting ILAC’s body of knowledge to specific contexts is a challenge. A future ILAC could develop a portfolio of services to address this demand, particularly with regard to adapting ILAC approaches, methods and tools to the specific needs of programmes/projects (this requires the clients knowing what they need, as the EPMR Panel recently pointed out with regard to Bioversity International⁵¹).

⁴⁸ See Love (2009:39); he interviewed 44 people for his 2005 study, of which six were also interviewed by this reviewer.

⁴⁹ Noted, for example, by the EPMR Panel, which evaluated Bioversity International in 2009. It noted the Center’s interest in “improving its institutional learning and knowledge management capacities”, based on ILAC and Bioversity staff at HQ and in the regions, who pointed to greater awareness of the importance of high-quality PM&E systems and processes (Flavell et al., 2009:75-6).

⁵⁰ The Strategy Team (CGIAR Change Process) has estimated the “expected contributions of mega-programmes to system level results criteria” (Braun 2009:37). It is not clear how this high-level description of research programmes’ combined contributions to reaching Strategic Objectives can be broken down and made operable at the level of programme PM&E, including research partners’ contributions.

⁵¹ “The Panel suggests that, to make more efficient use of ILAC capacities – including the existing networks worldwide – Bioversity should clearly identify its needs – for example in terms of learning and knowledge management, and in defining,

A future ILAC should focus on IE and using IE-generated knowledge to influence policy change and decision-making. This raises two questions:

- What is ILAC's comparative advantage in this area, particularly compared with SPIA, and how might they cooperate in future?
- How could ILAC help to involve policy decision-makers in CGIAR programmes/projects?

The findings from the consultations suggest that there are four main ways that a future ILAC could contribute to the new CGIAR:

1. ILAC's main purpose could be to influence how the CGIAR performs PM&E on its research programmes, so that the CGIAR demonstrably and sustainably contributes to alleviating poverty as far as it can⁵². Thus, ILAC would be acting at the heart of the CGIAR's vision, and therefore:
 - The CGIAR, both as a system and its constituent parts, would benefit from:
 - a long-term effort to learn from all pro-poor agricultural research experiences⁵³ to inform strategy development and improve future pro-poor research programmes
 - learning about the barriers to effective mobilization of science to support development and how to surmount them⁵⁴
 - realising the limits of CGIAR's competitive advantage in conducting pro-poor research and evaluating its impact, compared with other organizations and networks
 - In the long term, the wider world of agricultural research for development could benefit from new methods for evaluating pro-poor research
2. The CGIAR's pro-poor research will not happen without partners who complement its competitive advantages. Setting up and managing these partnerships is closely linked with PM&E because PM&E is a collaborative exercise, and partnerships themselves need to be monitored and evaluated. ILAC could help improve CGIAR partnerships by concentrating on particular aspects of establishing and managing them.
3. ILAC's activities will continue to include organizational learning and change management, which would be driven by PM&E approaches and methods that ILAC either supports (enabler role) or develops (piloter role). There are two points to note here:
 - Organizational learning and change involves all parts of an organization or a system. Change management can be of use in all parts of the CGIAR system, not only in the areas in which ILAC is active. External consultants have proposed that the CGIAR's change management expertise be anchored in a Strategic Human Resources unit in the Consortium Office that would encourage the exchange of learning and change experiences, approaches and methods used across the CGIAR, including those developed by ILAC
 - ILAC's activities will continue to involve knowledge generation and sharing. This is not the same as facilitating knowledge generation, documentation and sharing in an

monitoring and evaluation outcomes – so that the joint work with ILAC can contribute more effectively and in the medium term to strengthening the effectiveness of Bioversity outcomes and the quality of research process.” (Braun 2009:87)

⁵² Alternative description of core purpose: To support the CGIAR Partnership in forging the link between international agricultural research and poverty reduction impact.

⁵³ Similar to CGIAR PM&E professionals learning from ‘scaling up’ research to better understand output-to-outcome-to-impact processes and, in that context, the adoption constraints at the ‘meso’-level. See CGIAR Science Council (2006:14).

⁵⁴ Development action (e.g., policy formation and implementation). ‘Learning about barriers’ refers to the cross-programme study of knowledge systems (e.g., actors and organizations) that perform knowledge-related functions linking knowledge and know-how with action (see Clark, 2009).

entire system, across all its locations, departments and disciplines, a process that requires its own dedicated resources. Once such a unit was set up in the new CGIAR, it would become an important partner to ILAC

4. There appears to be both unmet and yet-to-be-awakened demand for ILAC expertise and support, and this expertise needs to be flexible enough to be adapted to specific programmes/projects. Some stakeholders clearly stated that a future ILAC should provide advice and support in designing and implementing PM&E approaches to pro-poor agricultural research⁵⁵. This would:

- require ILAC partnering with the CGIAR's PM&E professionals (probably including those involved in PM&E-for-accountability) to meet demand and offer a mix of traditional and new PM&E approaches and methods
- require dedicated skills and resources⁵⁶

Specifically, the stakeholder views indicated a demand for expertise and support services on:

- how to apply PM&E during programme/project implementation and after programme/project completion, based on experiences and learning within and outside the new CGIAR
- how to create and manage these PM&E partnerships, within and outside the new CGIAR

Beneficiaries of the PM&E partnerships would include meta-programme planning and management teams, meta-programme partners, and Centers' research activities that are not part of meta-programmes. The PM&E unit as a whole would support the interactions between the Consortium, the Fund Council and the ISPC within the context of a PM&E framework.

4. Institutionalization

ILAC is a system-wide initiative funded by two donors. It receives no funding from the budgets of Centers, research programmes or the CGIAR Secretariat. Participation in ILAC activities is voluntary (e.g., Learning Laboratory programmes) or by invitation (e.g., workshop participation). ILAC has attracted cost-sharing partners for some of its activities (e.g., co-organizing workshops, Center staff participation in its facilitation training workshop).

This section investigates how a future ILAC could be institutionalized in the context of the CGIAR Change Management Initiative. The option of *not* institutionalizing ILAC in the new CGIAR is not considered, because:

- most interviewees favoured some form of institutionalization
- maintaining a network of peers and a community-of-practice does not exclude the notion of institutionalization⁵⁷

⁵⁵ ILAC could in future only do research and generate knowledge about new PM&E approaches, methods and tools, or about how to improve them. That would lead to many CGIAR researchers reading ILAC publications, attending ILAC workshops and lectures and figuring out for themselves how to apply ILAC know-how in their particular case.

⁵⁶ A recommendation made by all System Office Units (see: Hagmann, 2009 and Accenture Development Partnerships, 2009).

⁵⁷ Some stakeholders saw risks associated with institutionalizing ILAC. In the September 2008 Learning Laboratory Workshop, the facilitator asked participants to agree or disagree with the statement: "Institutionalization of issues or things like ILAC is the best way to kill them." Ten disagreed completely or slightly, eight agreed slightly or completely, one was unsure.

The online survey responses (to Question 6) showed that most respondents (55%) saw the future ILAC as a strategic unit integrated into the CGIAR system and its core functions, accountable to CGIAR management and researchers. Only 39% saw it remaining as a voluntary peer-to-peer network of individuals or units accountable to its membership, and only 6% saw it as a time-bound project with a set of limited activities, accountable to a donor and direct supervisors. Of the 31 people interviewed, all but two favoured ILAC being institutionalized⁵⁸:

- within the Consortium Office (10 interviewees)
- as a Strategic Common Service (4)
- in some form on the Funder side (5)
- as part of the Platform for Capacity-Building among partners in mega-programmes⁵⁹

Most interviewees wanted a future ILAC to play an enabler role, rather than a controller or piloter role (see Box 2):

Box 2. Roles defined

- Enabler: A service to managers, researchers and their programmes/projects
- Controller: A monitor and enforcer of agreed standards
- Piloter: A centre of expertise, conducting research and linking to expertise around the world

- 67% of those surveyed favoured an enabler role, as did 12 of the 27 interviewees
- many interviewees (9) proposed a combination of the enabler and piloter roles (this might be reflected among the survey respondents, 39% of whom favoured the piloter role); the reasons most often given for suggesting this combination were ‘to bring in know-how from outside the CGIAR and pilot it within the System’, to ‘find new ways of doing things’ and ‘to support the enabler role
- 72% considered the controller role the least desirable; only four interviewees suggested the controller role in combination with one or both of other roles, giving as their reasons the need for ILAC to ‘have some teeth’ or to ‘have some form of indicators and intra-system assessment, for learning purposes’

4.1 ILAC-in-PM&E

This subsection presents arguments for integrating ILAC into a future system-wide PM&E function, within the context of the PM&E-related challenges that the new CGIAR will face and that ILAC could help overcome. The proposals for the design of the Consortium and the Strategic Common Services are related to a future ILAC-in-PM&E function.

4.1.1 The need for a system-wide PM&E function

The need for a CGIAR-wide PM&E function stems from the long-term nature of the research conducted by the 15 Centers, which aims for impact in the even longer term. It also arises from the fact that the desired impact is unlikely to be achieved by any single mega-programme, and thus evaluators need to look at the combined impact, at different times, of several mega-programmes.

PM&E activities span longer timeframes than the programmes/projects they support. They address PM&E needs that differ depending on the stage of the programme/project. While maintaining a baseline (e.g., initial aims and desired impact), they support programmes/projects when the goal posts change, and often have to work with a changing array of partners over time.

⁵⁸ Two interviewees preferred ILAC to grow as a community-of-practice. Note that a few interviewees proposed several institutionalization options.

⁵⁹ See Braun (2009:82).

The focus of M&E and IE have changed and so have the methods and tools used, and this is likely to happen in the future. There needs to be some form of continuity, however, so that programmes/projects remember what they originally intended to achieve, what they actually did achieve and what impact there has been.

The new CGIAR will feature Consortium-with-Lead Center performance contracts and mega-programmes bringing together several Centers and partners. The Centers will probably work with more partners. PM&E approaches and resources will therefore no longer be driven by the Science Council or individual Centers, but instead will become multi-Center, partner-based joint efforts⁶⁰.

4.1.2 Challenges facing a system-wide PM&E function

The CGIAR needs to adopt a results approach in measuring its performance. The data relating to measurement and performance of results constitute the greatest weakness of its current PMS. EPMRs, the PMS, impact studies and strategic plans need to be adapted to “a results-based system that collects common results indicators on what they jointly judge to be key strategic objectives”⁶¹. The greatest need for adaptation might be at the cultural level: “Managing for results is meant to engage employees, partners and end-users in a learning-based approach that tolerates risks. It rewards knowledge from failure as well as risk, a long as evidence is used to improve performance.”

In future, IE needs to consider higher-level impact related to system-level goals and to investigate how various areas of research collectively contribute to such goals⁶². Such mission- or enterprise-level IE (e.g., multi-Center and multi-programme) will need to be based on well-designed outcome evaluations at the programme/project levels.⁶³ The Independent Review Panel also considered that the CGIAR needs to:

- demonstrate progress in meeting its goal of promoting environmental sustainability through IEs of natural resource management (NRM) research
- build the cross-cutting gender dimension into EPMRs and IE more generally

The proposed changes present an important opportunity to increase the CGIAR’s PM&E professionalism and to stimulate learning and attitudinal change, but seizing this opportunity will require scaling up the methods and results of previous work, which should be complemented by more thematic studies. All this needs to be integrated in a more systematic and institutional way at different levels in the new CGIAR⁶⁴.

A recent article summarizes the current and emerging IE needs in the CGIAR system⁶⁵:

- build the learning function of *ex post* IE
- develop and apply new IE methods to better accommodate all CGIAR research areas
- move beyond economic indicators that reflect the CGIAR’s Strategic Objectives, to make IE more comprehensive
- improve the use of *ex post* IE by the system, the Centers and donors
- help Centers improve the coverage and rigour of their IE efforts

⁶⁰ With wider and stronger partnerships, the CGIAR will move to ‘joint products’ (attribution). As in previous years, SPIA Focal Points raised the issues of better links between *ex post* IA and *ex ante* IA, greater collaboration with other evaluation groups, and strengthening NARS IE capacity (CGIAR Science Council, 2009).

⁶¹ See McAllister (2009:44).

⁶² See McAllister (2009:31).

⁶³ See Cooksy (2008).

⁶⁴ Conclusions of the EPMR Panel (Flavell et al., 2009:76).

⁶⁵ Kelley et al. (2008).

Although these needs relate to *ex post* IE, they imply that improvements are also needed at earlier evaluation stages, particularly when planning new research programmes⁶⁶.

IE issues highlighted at the October 2006 and November 2008 meetings of the CGIAR Center Impact Assessment Focal Points and Science Council's Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) included⁶⁷:

- the roles and responsibilities of IE professionals vary from Center to Center, and organizationally they work within the research programmes or, less often, within the DG's office
- IE professionals are funded by core resources (in a few cases via project funds)
- the discussion on the benefits and risks of the two organizational set-ups did not lead to consensus on a joint approach for all Centers
- there was no agreement on the definitions of *ex ante* and *ex post* IE
- financial constraints severely limit the ability of Focal Points to conduct long-term IE (several years after the end of a programme/ project)
- there was no consensus on how to organize system-wide networking within the Centers (have one IE Focal Point, or share this work among several people?)

Box 3. Online consultation on M&E in agriculture

A recent consultation survey of 272 people on current M&E practice in agriculture highlighted the following points:

- accountability to donors is strong
- beneficiary accountability and empowerment are weak; improve current M&E practice by better engaging with farmers and local partners
- M&E of agricultural projects is weak, particularly with regard to the capacity of implementing agencies and the incentives for them to invest in M&E
- need for better initial project planning and more capacity development with both non-M&E managers and M&E practitioners
- donors need to focus on multi-stakeholder M&E approaches to support learning
- need for more networking and sharing of good practice to learn how to select and use tools and methods that suit the context and cater for a multi-stakeholder perspective

Source: Lindstrom (2009)

The participants in the two meetings pointed to the following major needs:

- a more explicit poverty focus in *ex post* IE, which should be better integrated into learning, priority setting and change management
- clarity about the role of IE Focal Points (e.g., who leads and guides a Center's IE activities) and on SPIA's role as a facilitator of inter-Center IE initiatives
- more interaction among IE professionals within and outside the CGIAR

In a global survey in 2009 (see Box 3), 56% of the respondents described M&E in agriculture as weak or very weak. Of the 271 respondents, 56 were from academia, including the CGIAR Centers. Less than 50% of the respondents considered current M&E practice to be 'pro-poor' in that it generated wider lessons at field level (47%), provided good accountability to beneficiaries (28%) and empowered beneficiaries and built their capacity (26%). Most respondents said there was not enough funding of M&E activities.

On the plus side, almost 60% of the respondents believed that current M&E practice leads to practical improvements in individual projects, provides good accountability to donors and helps clarify internal strategy and policy objectives. They were almost equally divided on whether M&E professionals have enough opportunities to learn from each other and whether current M&E methods suit M&E goals. Only a few respondents (19%) thought that M&E plans tended to be well thought out; most (46%) did not.

⁶⁶ Kelley et al. (2008).

⁶⁷ CGIAR Science Council (2009) and CGIAR Science Council (2006).

The respondents saw donors, governments and agencies (including specific agencies, e.g., DFID, FAO, Gates Foundation, IDRC, USAID and World Bank) as the key actors in agricultural M&E. NGOs, researchers and the CGIAR were seen as less important in this area. Out of 170 respondents, 99 said there was a demand for an Agriculture Learning and Impacts Network, primarily for knowledge sharing; 40 saw a potential demand, depending on the approach taken.

In a recent survey, researchers both within and outside the CGIAR highlighted the challenges facing agricultural research⁶⁸, all of them relating directly to PM&E:

- need for policy-oriented research that can be easily converted into practical recommendations and field-level applications
- need for more participatory research that is demand-driven and bottom-up in its design
- designing research programmes that are more inclusive (i.e., that take account of the needs of vulnerable groups such as women, children and the poorest farmers)
- delivering appropriate knowledge products to the ultimate users of research – farmers – by facilitating meaningful interactions among a wide range of stakeholders.

4.1.3 Integrating ILAC in the CGIAR's PM&E function

The PM&E function is critical in translating the CGIAR's Strategic Objectives, which include pro-poor objectives, into comprehensive mega-programme PM&E (comprehensive also in the sense of aiming for larger, more complex outcomes and impacts). Several studies have highlighted the need for Centers to internalize a greater pro-poor orientation when setting their research agendas and conducting and evaluating their research⁶⁹.

Pro-poor research requires different and often more partners. Such partnerships are complex and need careful PM&E, as well as a focus on learning how to sustain them. PM&E will need to expand its scope to cover this process of planning, establishing, managing and learning from partnerships. The growth in CGIAR's partnerships will be driven by its poverty reduction objectives. Finding partners that complement the CGIAR's comparative advantages and meet the need to scale out and up has not been easy, nor has working with partners in conducting participatory research aimed at empowering the poor. Most partnerships to date have suffered from not taking the time to learn collectively from their mistakes.

ILAC's competence does not cover all aspects of managing partnerships. It will be necessary to engage other areas of competence in the CGIAR that deal with relationship management, external communications, and team building and development. ILAC, as well as SPIA and its Focal Points, are all concerned with how to build the learning aspect of PM&E and they should join forces. The PM&E function should ensure that the CGIAR (i.e., the Doer) learns from IE, including Funder-side IE. Finding the right ways and means to do so requires collaboration with other areas of competence in the CGIAR, including knowledge management and sharing, ICTs, organizational development, and staff training and development.

⁶⁸ See Meinzen-Dick et al (2009: 12-41). The Strategy Team grouped the key opportunities for agricultural research, raised by the survey respondents, into six categories: 14.3% of the key opportunities were classified as "organization of research"-related. When broken down in more detail, 8.6% of 407 survey respondents made suggestions under the "organization of research-general" category, 8.2% under the "integration of research" heading; 1.5% of the respondents explicitly mentioned the need for farmer participation.

⁶⁹ Hazell and Hadadd (2001:6); CGIAR Science Council (2006:16); CGIAR Science Council (2009:1,16).

4.1.4 ILAC-in-PM&E in the Consortium Office

Many interviewees (30%) saw the Consortium Office as the most appropriate home for ILAC in the future. A few interviewees (10%) considered the Funder-side a more suitable home. Among the survey respondents, 55% said ILAC should be organized as a strategic unit, integrated into the CGIAR system and accountable to CGIAR management and researchers. The interviewees raised several concerns, as shown in the SWOT analysis in Table 13.

Table 13. SWOT analysis

SWOT	Concerns and risks	Recommended positioning
<i>Opportunity</i>	Bring together PM&E-for-accountability and PM&E-for-learning in a complementary way Provide a central counterpart to Funder-side IE and position at system level to inform <i>ex ante</i> and <i>ex post</i> IE Stay firmly rooted in research programme realities and maintain peer-to-peer networking	Seizes the opportunity Seizes the opportunity Seizes the opportunity
<i>Threat</i>	ILAC's PM&E-for-learning approach is overpowered by PM&E-for-accountability and tainted by M&E policing, with resource allocation consequences PM&E cannot be delivered in a centralized way, so ILAC would need to be part of every mega-programme No network node in Doer-side CGIAR that could bring together the larger issues of building and maintaining partnerships No network node in Doer-side CGIAR that could bring together experiences and gather and develop knowledge about poverty	Becomes a risk, must be managed Avoids threat: enabling function, network Partially addresses: partnership and PM&E Does not address
<i>Strength</i>	Internal customer orientation, focus on interfaces (not on separate responsibilities) Enable mega-programmes and Center research managers to conduct PM&E with their partners, not to do it all for them	Makes possible Makes possible
<i>Weakness</i>	Doer-side PM&E is not in order Disparate PM&E community in the CGIAR Need to influence donors, who will influence the Consortium Office and the Centers CGIAR research partners represent a bottleneck with regard to PM&E competence and capacity	Will improve Will change Partially addresses Enables addressing in future

The main benefit of positioning ILAC-in-PM&E in the Consortium Office would be to ensure that PM&E-for-accountability and PM&E-for-learning become mutually reinforcing activities, for which the Doer-side should take responsibility. Positioning it in the Consortium Office would not prevent:

- placing ILAC, or parts of it, in a hub (e.g., Centers' Regional Offices)
- building and maintaining a community-of-practice

- influencing the Funder-side by cooperating with SPIA and other units with evaluation responsibilities

The consultants on the design of the Consortium, Boston Consulting Group (BCG), recommend setting up a Research Strategy and Performance unit in the Consortium Office⁷⁰. This unit would run the system strategy development and monitor the scientific performance of the mega-programmes in order to inform future resource allocation, report to the Fund and provide feedback to maximize CGIAR research development impact. In addition, it would facilitate system-wide discussion on policies and sharing of best practices.

The consultants on the Strategic Common Services, Accenture Development Partnerships (ADP), have identified seven key opportunities. The most relevant to ILAC's future, are to “develop and expand research support services” and to “standardise ways of working”⁷¹ (see Table 14). They recommend:

- starting with “standardizing ways of working” and “rationalizing the back-office”, thus helping to implement the proposed PM&E framework by providing standard processes across various functions such as project management, reporting and human resources (high value, easy to implement, low pain)
- in Year 2 (2012), reviewing the planning for “developing and expanding research support services” (low value, high pain, difficult to implement).

Table 14. ADP's recommendations relevant to PM&E and ILAC

ADP recommendations	What should be common across Centers	Additional common features
<i>Develop and expand research support services</i>		
Impact evaluation	Globally shared service = SPIA?	Center-specific
<i>Standardize ways of working</i>		
Proposal development: Common standards and shared best practices = mega-programme, Center proposals	Common standards	
PM&E: Common templates, standards, metrics and shared best practices = CGIAR PMS	Common standards	Common systems
Project tracking	Common standards	Common systems
Grant management	Common standards	Center-specific
Impact reporting	National / regional shared service	Center-specific

ADP recommends developing a Research Support Services model consisting of three main areas: Research Functions; Grant and Project Management and Knowledge Management; and Communication and Collaboration.

It also recommends creating two Common Research Platforms, for upstream and downstream research, but does not elaborate on this recommendation⁷². It might be referring to the distinction between ‘complex research’ and ‘linear research’ defined at the ‘Rethinking

⁷⁰ Boston Consulting Group (2009).

⁷¹ Accenture Development Partnerships (2009:11,18).

⁷² Accenture Development Partnerships (2009:27).

Impact' workshop in 2008. Linear research is relatively predictable and likely to address a single need (e.g., the molecular characterization of indigenous livestock breeds), whereas complex research is likely to require a collaborative and dynamic approach (e.g., developing options for sustainable water management). A recommendation from the 2008 workshop was to take this distinction into account when developing research management and evaluation procedures⁷³. If the CGIAR follows the recommendation, it will affect the way a system-wide PM&E function would be organized to provide services tailored to the two types of research.

With regard to the Research Support Services model, ADP proposed several governance models, including: Consortium/Center governed, Consortium governed, Center governed, Center co-governed (e.g., inter-Center, Consortium not involved) and a separate entity (created by the CGIAR, or by a third party to service the CGIAR).

The proposals put forward by BCG and ADP complement each other if:

- the development of the mega-programme portfolio strategy and individual mega-programme progress monitoring (both scientific content/advances and programme/project management) are interrelated and managed accordingly
- the SRF and M&E framework-based design and planning of mega-programmes (*ex ante* IE) is tied to them subsequently being monitored, their results assessed and ultimately their impact evaluated

4.1.5 Observations on the recommendations for ILAC-in-PM&E

- Following the BCG recommendations, ILAC-in-PM&E would be incorporated into the Research Strategy and Performance Unit in the Consortium Office.
- Following the ADP recommendations, ILAC-in-PM&E would be part of the proposed Grant and Project Management function, which includes proposal development linked to *ex ante* IE, as well as PM&E and impact reporting. It would cooperate with the proposed Knowledge Management function and the Communication and Collaboration function, especially the Strategic Knowledge Management unit (national/regional shared service). This would ensure knowledge generation, documentation and sharing about pro-poor research and partnerships within the CGIAR and with the system's partners.
- Both BCG and ADP place a future ILAC-in-PM&E in the Consortium Office, although ADP recommends various models for governing and organizing the Research Support Services function in the new CGIAR.

ADP's recommendations are not always clear. The difference between IE and impact reporting is not explained, nor is the notion of upstream and downstream research platforms. The recommendations understandably focus on CGIAR's internal standardization, but this throws up a few problems:

- The new CGIAR aims to engage more effectively with more partners, which implies that partners participate in proposal development. The major problem here is not the lack of common standards, but the willingness and capacity to invest in such participation. ILAC-in-PM&E would have an important role to play here, particularly with regard to joint *ex ante* IE.
- Making CGIAR-wide PM&E work better depends not only on common standards, but also on simpler methods and tools to document programme progress that do not change frequently. But improving PM&E-for-accountability, which is aimed at donors, should not

⁷³ See ILAC Initiative et al. (2008).

be a goal in itself. It should complement PM&E-for-learning, which is context-specific and aimed at all stakeholders, including donors.

- The recommendation to harmonize programme/project M&E at system and Center level does not explain why this is necessary, what should be harmonized and what the benefits would be. The real challenge is to link proposal development, *ex ante* IE, M&E during and after programme implementation, and *ex post* IE per programme and across programmes over time.

At programme level, the consultants' proposals on PM&E in the broader sense can be understood as a support function to the mega-programme management teams. These teams should carry the responsibility for M&E because they are ones who should be learning and using that learning to adjust the programme where necessary. The resources needed might change over time, for example, or schedules might need adjustment. The teams therefore need leeway to make decisions, and to do this successfully they need strong Consortium support.

The role of the mega-programme officers proposed by BCG seems to go beyond a support function. Their responsibilities include acting as 'honest broker' between research and donor interests. There are some problems with this concept:

- an 'honest broker' role is inappropriate in an organizational structure where the Consortium and the Centers it comprises (there is no Consortium without Centers) are the Doers (e.g., executive); CGIAR donors have Program Officers of their own and an Independent Science and Partnership Council to advise the Fund Council (e.g., legislative, which monitors the executive)
- a 'facilitator' role focusing on issues and learning across mega-programmes, and bringing Centers and non-CGIAR partners together for that purpose, is far better suited to the system approach and pro-poor partnering culture envisaged for the new CGIAR
- with regard to PM&E, the major challenge is for Centers and their partners to agree on standards, approaches and methods and to enable mega-programme researchers (the doers) to apply them; constantly managing that process is itself a huge task for the mega-programme officers

The ADP's Research Support Services model does not explicitly refer to a centre of expertise focused on research partnerships. This would need to be woven into the model design, because:

- developing research partnerships to set up mega-programmes or smaller Center-based projects should begin during the proposal development phase
- setting up and managing partnerships requires dedicated PM&E approaches and methods
- the approaches for sharing knowledge with partners is likely to differ from that for inter-Center knowledge sharing

Although ADP's recommendations focus on common ways of working (standards, best practices, back-office systems), a new Research Support Services function for the new CGIAR should also:

- support increased and different kinds of partnerships (at system and mega-programme level)
- facilitate more collaborative and learning-oriented approaches to research proposals, and facilitate mega-programme management and implementation
- encourage more comprehensive and participatory IE in order to determine pro-poor impact in collaboration with partners, participants and beneficiaries

These three aspects of a support role better reflect the new CGIAR's aim to be more concerned with work culture, staff mindset and developing relationships of trust than with templates, software and common standards.

4.1.6 Challenges in establishing ILAC-in-PM&E

- *The CGIAR debate about evaluation is not focused on links and collaboration:* The guiding question for developing a PM&E approach should be: 'How can those who direct the CGIAR's portfolio of research, manage mega-programmes and conduct research within those mega-programmes learn to do a better job?' This implies that learning needs to take place at the senior decision-making level (Consortium, Funders Council) and at Doer level (Centers, mega-programmes), as well as across these levels. The Change Management Initiative, however, has been concerned so far with how to separate responsibilities for research planning, in-project M&E and *ex post* evaluations⁷⁴.
- *No coherent approach to PM&E:* ADP noted that: "Currently, Centers do not have a common approach to plan, monitor and evaluate research projects"⁷⁵. The CGIAR's own efforts (e.g., via the Science Council, SPIA, individual agreements with donors per project) have remained at the level of a loose network, apart from the EPMP and Center-Commissioned External Review (CCER) processes and the PMS initiated in 2003. All Centers must abide by the PMS, which assesses a Center's results in terms of outputs, outcomes and impact⁷⁶. How well each Center performs can affect their annual funding from the World Bank.
- *Measuring impact is intrinsically difficult:* The 2009 SRSS saw only a limited role for innovation systems-focused research in the CGIAR's IE activities, and recommended that these activities be reoriented towards:
 - *ex ante* IE, to prioritize research, not bureaucratic requirements
 - more long-term, larger scale and selective *ex post* IE, based on methodological innovations and involving more external researchers
 - setting up a larger-scale centre of excellence on IE (how to achieve it through research prioritization and the design of project implementation, and how to measure it both *ex ante* and *ex post*)

The SRSS noted that measuring impact is difficult, because change stems from the activities of a multitude of non-CGIAR actors, whether or not they are CGIAR partners in a particular research effort. Nonetheless, social science research's contribution to achieving impact, through agricultural productivity growth due to germplasm improvement, is universally accepted. This impact has been achieved mainly indirectly (e.g., midstream adjustment of conducting research). The CGIAR has expanded into research fields beyond agricultural productivity (e.g., NRM, markets research) and has started aiming for benefits that are difficult to value quantitatively (e.g., enhanced security, status of women).

- *CGIAR lacks a critical mass of social scientists:* ILAC has highlighted this expanded research agenda, especially the more explicit emphasis on poverty reduction, and thus the CGIAR's range of innovations and impacts has grown. ILAC is viewed as having loosely

⁷⁴ See Embracing Change newsletter: "ExCo emphasized the importance of a learning system across the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms while ensuring expertise, independence, and efficiency", 16 November 2009. http://www.cgiar.org/changemanagement/embracingchange/embracing_change_november16_2009.html

⁷⁵ Accenture Development Partnerships (2009:28).

⁷⁶ The CGIAR PMS also measures 'Potential to Perform' indicators (institutional, financial health) and stakeholders' perceptions (every 3 years). The research results-relevant indicators were piloted in 2005.

organized the critics of technology-centered models of innovation within the CGIAR. Their main tenet, that institutional arrangements foster technological change and learning and thus drive development, is shared by many in the CGIAR⁷⁷. Many productivity improvements associated with CGIAR research have taken place because an innovation systems approach was adopted, although it was not labelled as such. While the continued benefit of ILAC in changing researchers' mindset is recognized, the CGIAR lacks the necessary critical mass of skilled social scientists who could make major methodological advances in an area that has largely fallen out of favour with the mainstream research community and does not seem relevant to policy and policy-making processes. Nonetheless, there are several researchable questions within the innovation systems domain that could generate important international public goods (IPGs) (e.g., cost/benefit of different partnership models; most effective stimuli for different classes of change agents under different conditions).

The effort to establish long-term impact assessment (covering periods of 10 years or more and covering programmes, not projects) has been largely trumped by the push towards near-term development impact, with the result that insufficient resources have been assigned to long-term impact evaluation.

- *Exploratory nature of scientific research not acknowledged:* Overall, the CGIAR's approach to IE does not reflect the exploratory nature of scientific research. Major breakthroughs in science occur over long periods, are difficult to predict and are often due to factors beyond researchers' control. Much is learnt from 'failures'. The CGIAR does not reflect these complexities in its IE work because donors insist on short-term and measurable development outcomes and have taken over the Centers' role of strategic research prioritization. Also, PM&E staffing at Centers tends to be low and poorly connected, resulting in many low quality *ex post* IEs studies, with very little *ex ante* work being done at all (e.g., on expected returns of investment). Other problem areas include:
 - In terms of its research agenda, the CGIAR is trying to do too much too fast in areas in which it is not particularly strong. It is not organized to generate big successes in the social sciences because its focus is on the agricultural sciences and natural resources. Its social science activities should become more focused and should interact more closely with the biophysical sciences
 - The CGIAR's social science efforts are fragmented, mainly because the Centers are revenue-driven, rather than mission-driven, enterprises and therefore do not concentrate on issues where a Center, or the system, has comparative advantage and critical mass
 - CGIAR social scientists seldom get involved in the international research community; their activities tend to be short-term and transactional, funded by specific projects
 - There are no incentives for inter-Center cooperation, and therefore research findings are seldom integrated and synthesized

These challenges tally with those identified by the interviewees. Two further challenges were highlighted during these stakeholder consultations:

- Although PM&E-for-accountability and PM&E-for-learning can be complementary, the governance context, which favours PM&E-for-accountability, could represent a hurdle in establishing ILAC-in-PM&E. A 'policing' role does not suit the ethos of ILAC approaches

⁷⁷ The many open-ended comments by scientists involved in the Strategy Team's 2009 online consultation attest to this. Relevant comments were grouped under these headings: "Research translated into Policy/Practice and Shared with the Public", "Improve upon Needs Assessment and Objective/Impact/Role Definition", "Participatory and Transparent Research Methods", "Shift focus to Beneficiaries and Researchers on the Ground (Bottom-Up, Regionally Based)", "Promotion of Interdisciplinary, Long-term and Multicultural Research and Policy Innovations". See also section 5 of this report.

and methods. Currently, the CGIAR's PMS for rating Centers' research and management performance is used by the World Bank to make resource allocation decisions to Centers. Several stakeholders have expressed concern about the policing role of SPIA, and donors would like to see a mechanism by which resource allocation decisions can be made on the basis of the future mega-programmes' performance

- Although CGIAR research managers and researchers are keen for advice on mainstream and non-mainstream PM&E approaches and methods, there is a history of conflict among CGIAR evaluators about the definition of impact. This could hamper integrating the different PM&E approaches in an ILAC-in-PM&E. If the emphasis were placed on serving the needs of the researchers' clients, however, this conflict could be diffused.

4.2 Other options for positioning ILAC in the new CGIAR

This subsection presents alternatives to positioning ILAC within the new CGIAR and evaluates their strengths and weaknesses.

4.2.1 Independent Evaluation Unit

One proposal of the CGIAR Change Management Initiative is to establish an Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), housed in a non-CGIAR organization, to tap into knowledge and trends outside the CGIAR and periodically evaluate the CGIAR and its programmes. It would be overseen by the Fund Council, and would aim to:

- evaluate the effectiveness of research
- promote mutual accountability between Doers and Funders
- promote learning from evaluation among policy-makers, researchers, research managers and partners⁷⁸

Currently, there is no information on the IEU's role in promoting learning from evaluation and how it would be organized. How the unit would differ from the SPIA and how they might cooperate also remains to be defined⁷⁹.

Linking a future ILAC to the IEU would be seen as a mechanism for strategically influencing donors, which some stakeholders endorse because they believe that the CGIAR system is more likely to react to change driven by donors. If ILAC were integrated into the IEU, it would no longer be able to provide the advisory and support services to CGIAR research programmes for which there is great demand. Instead, it would become an evaluative research unit, probably focused mainly on *ex post* IE at meta-programme level.

4.2.2 Strategic human resources

Some of ILAC's activities reflect the strategic human resources (HR) role common in many public and private sector organizations, both in terms of approaches, methods and tools (e.g., organizing workshops) and in the underlying interest in cultural changes (in attitudes and behaviour).

Table15. ILAC and human resources

ILAC activities	Strategic HR services
Training workshop	Business-driven training and development
Learning Laboratory project	Facilitate cross-divisional or cross-project learning

⁷⁸ CGIAR Secretariat (2009a:14).

⁷⁹ An 'Independent Evaluation Workshop' took place on 20 January 2010 in Washington D.C., USA

Table 15. ILAC and human resources (contd)'

ILAC activities	Strategic HR services
Generating and sharing knowledge about research for development, pro-poor IE, partnership	Knowledge management functions are often organizationally placed in a CIO (manage information) or strategic HR (learning)
Advocating changes in how research programmes/projects are set up and run, and in job profiles	Organizational development (project and line management matrices, career paths, team structures)
Encouraging change in the mindset of researchers with regard to participatory approaches, partnerships, pro-poor impact	Change management initiatives aimed at culture change

ILAC would be involved in organizational learning activities in its area of expertise, and would be able to advise mega-programme managers on partnership selection and management. It would continue to focus on anchoring poverty reduction in CGIAR research planning and implementation, as well as through effective partnerships.

This represents a separate area of expertise to that of a strategic HR function. A future Consortium Strategic HR and Change Management (SHR&CM) unit, however, together with the Centers' HR teams, would be able to complement ILAC's advisory services to mega-programmes and individual Center programmes by providing advice on:

- governance and organizational structure of mega-programmes
- attracting and retaining the required expertise
- changes aimed at improving staff collaboration in mega-programmes
- administration and organization of staff training activities
- cross-mega-programme learning about organizational and staff issues (leadership, motivation, recognition, etc.)

A future ILAC could provide support to a future SHR&CM unit, which is supposed to take on some of the challenges related to implementing CGIAR change in 2010-11. The system-wide change management challenges, however, go beyond the scope and capacity of a future ILAC, as recommended.

With regard to the Consortium's HR role and the HR common services, the external consultants do not:

- explicitly state the need to transform the current Center-based CGIAR into a multi-Center, multi-partner one, or comment on what role the Consortium should play here
- give the proposed strategic HR role an organization development mandate of any kind, even though the governance and organizational challenges of managing a portfolio of multi-Center mega-programmes will be an enormous task and will affect Centers' organizational structures⁸⁰

The ADP report does, however, mention some of the structural constraints to moving to a multi-Center, multi-partner organization (e.g., reporting lines, staff performance management, people doing the same job in a mega-programme but being paid differently).

⁸⁰ See Accenture Development Partnerships (2009): "Strategic HR supporting cross Centers in collaboration with Center leadership and HR teams" and "Strategic HR and Leadership – Establishes People Strategy at CG level to support business objectives. Plan and execute cross Center strategic HR initiatives ... to increase efficiencies through common standards and policies in key HR areas ...". BCG proposals focus on attracting and retaining the best talent. No mention is made of organizational development challenges.

4.2.3 Knowledge management

A third option is to combine the ILAC and ICT-KM functions. The EPMR panel has recommended working together synergistically⁸¹, which could apply to all future Consortium-based functions that support research programmes. ICT-KM is a good example of a classic corporate support function that services the core business (e.g., CGIAR research) and other corporate support functions (e.g., PM&E). There is no convincing logic to merge ILAC with ICT-KM, however. Instead, there are significant opportunities for cooperation at the levels of processes, methods and tools.⁸²

The EPMR panel believes that a future CGIAR CIO could lead in developing new ways to share services across the ICT-KM domains and by leveraging external partnerships. The ICT-KM strategy should focus on knowledge ‘collection’ and ‘connection’, and should aim to contribute towards building a continuous learning culture (80% people, 20% technology). The panel has recommended:

- integrating CGIAR research results into CGMap (i.e., to have a one-stop shop for research plans and results)
- including ICT-KM indicators in the PMS
- improving upon connectivity-focused projects (e.g., Global Advanced Research Networks; Desktop Videoconferencing)
- improving PM&E-for-learning across all ICT-KM activities by setting up a more formal, systematic approach to quality control (e.g., use project management software; apply quantifiable outcome metrics)

This highlights the need for effective cooperation between the CGIAR’s PM&E and knowledge-sharing professionals and their network of Center-based partners. The key question is how to organize this.

It is worth noting here the initial findings of a research programme, ‘Link Knowledge with Action for Sustainable Development’, in which several Centers are participating and which is not only concerned with agricultural research⁸³:

- it is a misconception that knowledge generated by basic research can simply be turned into solutions for specific contexts
- some knowledge systems are more effective than others in harnessing science to promote development (those that aim for fundamental understanding and stem from use-oriented research; those that successfully manage the tension between exciting research and finding solutions for a particular context; and those that evaluate research in terms of fundamental advances in understanding and its application in a specific solution)
- in the knowledge-to-action chain, knowledge is too fragmented among different partners, who act at different points in the chain (missing nodes need to be identified; partnerships should be driven by a supply-chain perspective that holds partners accountable for the integration of knowledge to create comprehensive solutions)
- learning is hampered by a lack of forums where the exchange of experiences can take place, and by a tendency to hide failures rather than learn from them (create ‘safe spaces’ for exchanging experiences; provide incentives to document and learn from failure)

⁸¹ “The ICT-KM Program should work synergistically with the Institutional Learning and Change (inter-Center) initiative, as each could contribute to the other.” Quoted from Liebowitz and Field (2009:39).

⁸² The head of ICT-KM and the ILAC Coordinator have conducted a ‘synergies’ exercise, which came to a similar conclusion. ICT-KM and ILAC have collaborated in the past.

⁸³ Clark (2009).

- in the development and scientific research worlds, too, ‘knowledge’ and ‘agenda setting’ translate into power. Research findings alone do not convince those responsible for action; there is a need for organizations and individuals who span the boundaries across the different cultures of scientific research and policy-making

These findings are relevant to the future of ICT-KM and ILAC-in-PM&E in the new CGIAR, but in different ways. While ICT-KM might provide solutions to better share data, information and knowledge in multi-partner programmes, a future ILAC would use collaborative PM&E methods to help CGIAR research managers encourage partners in jointly developing impact pathways.

4.2.4 Capacity-building

Several interviewees recommended that ILAC become part of the proposed Platform for Capacity-Building among mega-programme partners so that these partners no longer represent a bottleneck in IE. Other stakeholders favoured a future ILAC focusing on CGIAR internal capacity-building. The strengths and weaknesses of this institutionalization option are summarized in Table 16.

Table 16: Advantages and disadvantages of ILAC being part of the Capacity-Building Platform

Advantages	Disadvantages
Fits well with challenge of building research partners’ PM&E competence	Could stretch ILAC’s capacity. Its focus should be on building capacity within the CGIAR, in particular with the new mega-programmes
Could attract donor attention to alternative approaches to PM&E and the critical role that partners play in pro-poor impact by putting research partners first, without whom the CGIAR cannot hope to achieve impact	Moves ILAC’s attention away from the challenge of bringing together mainstream and non-mainstream PM&E approaches and methods in the CGIAR
	The CGIAR’s capacity-building community is fragmented and dispersed, and it might take longer than planned to set up the Platform
	PM&E would be only one of many areas of work the Platform would engage in. It should be easier to bring together the CGIAR’s PM&E community via a central, system-wide PM&E function (which is needed in any case)

As the CGIAR undergoes the changes agreed to at the AGMs in 2008 and 2009, the advisory and support services provided by a future ILAC will be needed, first and foremost, by CGIAR research managers and scientists.

4.2.5 Innovations mega-programme

The SRSS proposed that, as part of the measures to re-focus CGIAR social science activities, a mega-programme on Stimulating and Evaluating Innovations (SEI) should be set up, aimed not only at stimulating innovations, but also at system-level *ex ante* and *ex post* IE. The mega-programme should “advance the methodological frontiers in these areas” in order to improve the impact of CGIAR research⁸⁴.

The SRSS recommended that the programme be based at a CGIAR SEI centre of excellence and reinforce SPIA’s present functions by emphasizing the development and application of more rigorous, selective and multi-dimensional *ex post* IE, freed from the Center-level conflicts of interest and donor pressures that currently hamper *ex post* IE work. The

⁸⁴ CGIAR Science Council (2009:68-9).

programme should also house a small initiative to stimulate innovations in agriculture and NRM directly and to identify the institutional arrangements needed for this. This initiative would design ways to establish how different partnership models and processes affect technology development, dissemination and impact, and would probably encompass ILAC and a scaled-down version of IFPRI's Knowledge and Innovation and Capacity Division (formerly ISNAR).

The proposals for an SRF and a portfolio of mega-programmes do not refer to this SEI mega-programme recommendation in its documents. There also seems to be some overlap between SEI and SPIA, the proposed IEU and the ISPC⁸⁵.

It is unlikely that positioning ILAC in this SEI mega-programme would provide the range of PM&E advisory and support services for which there is CGIAR researcher demand. As in the case of the IEU option, ILAC would become partner to complex evaluative research. Also, ILAC's competence does not lie in direct involvement in conducting agricultural research, which the SEI option would imply.

4.3 Conclusions

The conclusions focus on two main issues: ILAC's future role and how to institutionalize it; and key partners.

4.3.1 ILAC's future role and how to institutionalize it

The most effective way to anchor ILAC's core purpose is to connect it to Doer-side PM&E in CGIAR research programmes/projects to forge the link between international agricultural research and poverty reduction.

A future ILAC should play an enabler role, primarily, by providing strategic advisory and support services to research programme/projects (mega-programmes and Center-led programmes). These services should:

- be based on a portfolio of complementary PM&E-for-accountability and PM&E-for-learning approaches, methods and tools brought together by ILAC and other PM&E professionals working at system-level
- include advice on how to effectively engage research partners in PM&E throughout a research programme/project cycle
- be developed and delivered through a CGIAR-wide community-of-practice nurtured by ILAC

ILAC should also play a piloter role that complements its enabler role. This would involve brokering knowledge and expertise from outside the CGIAR and piloting new PM&E approaches and methods in cooperation with research programmes/projects⁸⁶. Because experts within and outside the CGIAR disagree about how to conduct pro-poor PM&E, it is very important that the new CGIAR creates 'safe spaces' for the exchange of views and experiences and has the capacity to evaluate the different approaches in terms of its needs.

⁸⁵ See CGIAR Secretariat (2009b): "ISCP's specific tasks will be: 1. Commission and oversee evaluations of the scientific quality, relevance, partnership arrangements and likely development effectiveness of the investment proposals submitted " and "help increase the rigour and the reach of impact assessment studies within the CGIAR by commissioning, in partnership with the Consortium, *ex post* impact assessment of the development effectiveness of CGIAR investments."

⁸⁶ The IFAD-funded IE project is a good example of ILAC's piloter role.

4.3.2 ILAC's key partners

The ILAC-in-PM&E role is firmly on the Doer side, but it should include routinely working with those responsible for Funder-side IE. The most important long-term CGIAR partners of the Consortium PM&E function would be:

- Center-based PM&E professionals and their networks in NARS and research partners for joint service delivery and partner capacity-building and learning
- Funder-side SPIA and IEU, for managing the PM&E process at all stages and providing the basis for strategic, system-level decision-making
- Strategic Common Services, which ILAC would benefit from, but also contribute to by:
 - applying concepts and methods developed and provided by a Knowledge Management and Sharing unit
 - providing input into staff development and training services provided by an HR unit
 - drawing on the expertise of a Gender and Diversity unit to improve gender-responsive PM&E and provide advice on conducting research in a multi-cultural environment
 - applying the standards and using the infrastructure, tools and services provided by an IT unit
 - drawing on the expertise and services of an Intellectual Property team
 - using the support of a Communications team to facilitate information exchange and knowledge transfer in pro-poor research and PM&E networks, within and outside the CGIAR
 - cooperate with the Internal Audit unit on relevant qualitative audit approaches

5. Main conclusions

The external MTR of ILAC, focusing on the Initiative's future in the new CGIAR) and based on stakeholder consultations and document reviews, produced the following set of conclusions.

1. *It reconfirmed big picture presented in the CGIAR review and change documents*

The challenges, trends and identified comparative advantages all point to:

- the growing complexity of interrelated research areas
- the greater number and diversity of actors in international agricultural research for development

The CGIAR will need to better harness its multidisciplinary talents and capacities, whatever research agenda it decides to focus on. Research partnerships will become more important in the CGIAR's efforts to handle the growing complexity. The more competitive nature of international agricultural research for development requires the CGIAR to act as a system.

2. *Partnerships will become more central, with implications for PM&E, learning and capacity development (see also point 9)*

The long-term nature of most international agricultural research represents an ongoing donor and partner relationship management challenge. With the move towards longer-term, more complex mega-programmes, this challenge will grow.

Learning from PM&E activities, at different stages and by different components of the CGIAR system, needs to be translated into action at different levels (system, mega-programme, project, Center). Pro-poor research requires different and, often, more partners. These complex partnerships require careful planning and monitoring.

Just as important is spending time and effort on learning how to sustain partnerships. PM&E will need to expand its scope to cover the ‘process’ dimension of setting up, managing and learning from partnership experiences.

National partners, and research partners more generally, need CGIAR support to build their PM&E capabilities, which are critical to achieving a bigger, long-term picture of research impact. Building these capabilities requires significant CGIAR investment, just as partnering in general does.

3. ILAC’s objectives and major activities remain highly relevant to the CGIAR’s future

The need for learning about ‘how agricultural research and development can more effectively contribute to reducing poverty’ is paramount. Such learning requires extracting knowledge-for-action from programmes/projects, including past programmes via PM&E approaches, methods and tools and should involve research partners.

CGIAR researchers’ demand for ILAC expertise and support is considered high and has apparently not been satisfied because of ILAC’s limited resources. A future ILAC will need to expand the number of Learning Laboratory-type research for development projects it deals with and to develop approaches and methods to take the learning generated from these ‘cases’ to other CGIAR research programmes.

Adapting ILAC’s body of knowledge to a specific context is seen as a challenge. A future ILAC would need to develop a portfolio of services that addresses this demand, particularly in terms of providing the support to adapt ILAC approaches, methods and tools to the specific needs of a programme/project.

4. ILAC and SPIA (and other M&E specialists in the CGIAR) should collaborate better

ILAC, SPIA and SPIA’s Focal Points all are concerned with IE and using IE-generated knowledge to influence policy change, decision-making and how to build the learning aspect of PM&E. They should join forces, although there are practical and cultural hurdles that need to be addressed and overcome.

5. Integrating PM&E for pro-poor impact implies linking the P with the M&E, as well as expanding the methods and tools for PM&E

ILAC is concerned with pro-poor impact of agricultural research for development. No-one will know about impact without it being explicitly aimed at the *ex ante* stage, and assessed *ex post*. ILAC represents an expansion of the CGIAR’s current PM&E scope, methods and tools.

6. ILAC’s comparative advantage in the domain of partnerships is working with PM&E for collaborative research for development

‘Partnership’ is seen as an ILAC strength and an important work component of a future ILAC. Because this thematic area is potentially huge, ILAC will need to clearly delineate which partnership issues it wants to focus on. Several stakeholders see a comparative advantage in ILAC focusing on collaborative PM&E, including *ex ante* IE.

7. Among the alternative options for the future positioning of ILAC, the strongest is to integrate it within a consolidated Consortium PM&E function

In this role, ILAC (and the entire PM&E function) would play an enabling role, which supports mega-programme leaders and project lead scientists involved in Center-led research programmes.

Critical long-term CGIAR partners of the Consortium PM&E function will be:

- Center-based PM&E professionals and their networks of PM&E professionals in NARS/research partner organizations, for service delivery, capacity-building and learning partners ('connectors to the ground')
- Funder-side SPIA and IEU, for managing interrelationships at all PM&E (including *ex ante* and *ex post*) stages and providing the basis for strategic, system-level decision-making
- Strategic Common Services: i.e., the future CAS-IP (for IP as an IPG, and for research partnerships), ICT-KM (for knowledge-sharing), HR/Change Management (for turning learning into organizational change, providing relevant training) and Internal Audit (for informing IE investigative scope).

There are several obstacles to achieving this positioning (see section 4.1.7), including:

- the debate within the CGIAR about performance, assessment and evaluation is not focused on linkages and collaboration
- the CGIAR lacks critical mass of social scientists
- inter-Center cooperation (in PM&E as well as in integrating and synthesizing research findings) is not incentivized.

The last two conclusions go beyond the scope of this review, although a future ILAC, as recommended, could make a useful contribution in tackling the two challenges.

8. The CGIAR lacks a unit or network focusing on understanding poverty dynamics, including an 'observatory' function of bringing relevant outside knowledge into the CGIAR.

9. Although partnership will become more important in the new CGIAR, so far there are no plans to create a 'relationship management' centre of excellence or system-wide consulting support to help research managers and researchers effectively build and maintain complex partnerships.

6. Recommendations

Some of these recommendations are within the decision authority of ILAC and its current donors, and some need to be addressed by CGIAR leadership and senior management, notably those concerned with the future functions of the Consortium Office.

6.1 Strategic recommendations

The overall *strategic recommendation* is that a future ILAC should become part of a central or system-wide PM&E unit, anchored in the Consortium Office and serving as an enabling Strategic Common Service provided for mega-programme managers, Center-led research programme/project managers, other system-wide platforms and DDGRs.

More specifically, it is recommended that:

- a central PM&E-for-accountability function is merged with PM&E-for-learning (ILAC) to ensure that the two aspects of PM&E are addressed, mutually reinforcing and well coordinated
- ILAC-in-PM&E's staff cooperate as peers with PM&E staff in Centers and mega-programmes, so that centrally provided services are firmly based on field-level realities⁸⁷
- a third staffing layer of roving regional consultants is added to the central and Center-based layers

It was outside the scope of this review to determine where the resources for a future central PM&E-for-accountability function could come from⁸⁸.

A future PM&E network, connecting the Consortium Office PM&E unit with Center counterparts and other PM&E professionals worldwide, could be organized as shown in Table 17.

Table 17: Components and responsibilities of a PM&E network

	Key role and responsibility	Resourcing needs driven mainly by	Reporting to	Funded by
<i>Center</i>	Support managers of mega-programmes and Center-led research programmes/projects in practising PM&E	Number of mega-programmes and Center-led programmes/projects requiring support; number of IEs being conducted	Center DDGRs	Budgets of mega-programmes and Center-led programmes/projects (and Center institutional budgets?)
<i>Regional</i> ⁸⁹	Support PM&E staff in selected Centers at peak periods	Demand from several Centers in a region and need for partner capacity-building	Head of central PM&E	Consortium budget or annual fixed fee from all Centers in a region
<i>Central</i>	Develop PM&E standards, methods, tools, and ensure PM&E-for-learning applied by CGIAR's PM&E staff	Breadth and depth of enabling services to be provided to Center's PM&E units Liaison with Funder-side IE Learning, knowledge development and external networking Input into Consortium-led strategic planning with Centers Cooperation with other Strategic Common Services	Consortium CEO	Consortium budget

The services provided by a future ILAC should be guided by the following principles:

- *Interact with researchers on a peer-to-peer basis.* Changes in mindset and behaviour cannot effectively be enforced top-down or encouraged bottom-up
- *Provide tailored services.* Beneficiaries of the service need to know what kind and quality of support they can get and on what terms. Not all beneficiaries will need the same mix or

⁸⁷ Similar to the current arrangement of SPIA Focal Points and CAS-IP Focal Points in Centers.

⁸⁸ Up to now, 'central' PM&E has been performed by the CGIAR Secretariat's PMS staff and by the SPME. The external consultants (BCG) have made relevant staffing estimates in their report.

⁸⁹ Similar to the logic behind the SRSS recommendation to "organise a Regional Systems Analysis Mega-Program", to complement Center-specific social science research teams in investigating aggregate, larger-scale, more strategic issues concerning agricultural development, by "contextualizing CGIAR research within the ecological and human systems, within which it takes place." CGIAR Science Council (2009:65).

level of services, although they should in future apply CGIAR-wide PM&E standards. This will require negotiating the range and levels of service

- *Ensure there is time for learning.* Transferring advice and expertise to researchers, and learning generated from programmes, will play an important role
- *Follow a subsidiarity approach.* Do not do what others can do better and are willing to do, and empower those working directly with clients with adequate powers for action and decision-making

The major differences between the current and future ILAC, as recommended, are shown in Table 18.

Table 18: Major differences between the current and future ILAC

Category	Current	Future	Needed to achieve envisaged future
<i>Governance</i>	Accountable to donor, staff report to the host Center manager	Responsible to Consortium CEO	Senior management backing (Alliance recommendation; Consortium Board decision) to change governance
<i>Funding</i>	Two donors	Central fund	Business case for establishing ILAC-in-PM&E function
<i>Remit</i>	Voluntary inter-Center initiative	Central Common Services role mandated by Consortium Board	Move from fringe to centre, be given defined authority, and establish rules of cooperation with Centers' units (e.g., possibly Service Level Agreements, or similar, with CGIAR research programmes)
<i>Staffing</i>	Three full-time staff, two part-time advisors	To be discussed; probably, more staff will be needed, at least at regional level	Fill staffing and skills competencies gap
<i>Non-people resources</i>	Determined by project agreements with donors	Annual budget for these resources	Business case (see above) to be based on defined authority, remit and cooperation with Centers' units; increased budget?
<i>Cooperation with other Common Services</i>	Ad hoc, on own initiative, voluntary	To be discussed; (most likely) coordinated delivery of Strategic Common Services	Overall design and organizational structure of future common services; Consortium Board decision

6.2 Operational recommendations (transition phase)

The key pre-conditions for a smooth transition phase (2010-11) relate to the system and Doer levels:

- System (CGIAR Partnership) level
 1. How pro-poor impact is anchored in the SRF and reflected in the portfolio of mega-programmes will inform PM&E approaches and methods and thus the scope of the future ILAC-in-PM&E function
 2. Senior CGIAR decision-makers need to be clearer about Doer- and Funder-side roles with regard to IE (the role and functioning of the IEU was the topic of a January 2010 workshop)

- Doer (Consortium, Centers) level
 3. There needs to be more clarity about the role of the Consortium Office in relation to the Centers, especially with regard to the Common Services (which would include ILAC-in-PM&E)
 4. There also needs to be more clarity about how the mega-programmes, which will be the main internal clients of a future ILAC-in-PM&E function, will be run, what they will do themselves and which Common Services they might need

The responsibility for dealing with these four pre-conditions lies mainly with senior CGIAR decision-makers. These decision-makers might be open to bottom-up influence, and ILAC and others should seize this opportunity. Until there is greater clarity on the third and fourth pre-conditions it will be difficult to develop a sound business case for ILAC-in-PM&E (although it could be possible to work on a set of assumptions, as in BCG's approach to estimating the size of the Consortium Office and Board⁹⁰).

With regard to the transition phase, the *operational recommendations* fall into five broad areas.

1. ILAC should aim for a scope of work during the transition phase as described in Table 19. To what extent this scope of work goes beyond ILAC's current budget resources remains to be established. Also, the scope of work might change once the dialogue between ILAC and the CGIAR's PM&E community has begun.

Table 19: ILAC's scope of work during the transition phase

	2010 (and 2011?)	2011 or 2012
<i>Client scope</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5-8 Centers' research programmes/projects (including current Learning Laboratory 'cases') ▪ New mega-programmes set up in 2010 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Offer a portfolio of PM&E methods, tools and advisory/support services to all Centers ▪ Offer them to new mega-programmes ▪ Consider offering them to NARS and research partners
<i>Focus of PM&E support</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Ex ante</i> IE for mega-programmes and Center-led programmes starting a second stage ▪ Outcome evaluations for completed programmes ▪ Other support determined by demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as for 2010 ▪ Additional work to be discussed
<i>Building competence and capacity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan and run the IFAD-funded IE project (see section 3.1), combining it where possible with providing an enabling service to Centers ▪ Jointly plan the Consortium PM&E function 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Run the IE project, with the focus on what can be learned from past programmes/projects ▪ Investigate how to link IE to the policy-making world (attract a Champion for this?)

⁹⁰ See Boston Consulting Group (2009:80).

Table 19: ILAC's scope of work during the transition phase (contd)'

	2010 (and 2011?)	2011 or 2012
<i>Delivery</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide an enabling service on selecting appropriate approaches and methods and on applying them and documenting the experience ▪ Provide resources (roving consultants in regions) ▪ Provide central technical backstopping to Center PM&E staff and the programmes they support ▪ Nurture community-of-practice on PM&E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as for 2010 ▪ Expand range of advisory and support services ▪ Change the <i>modus operandi</i>, and add capacity (to be discussed)

2. ILAC should take the lead, at least initially, to develop an integrated PM&E function in the Consortium Office by planning a multi-phase, participatory organizational change process, initiated by a 'Kick-off Event'. The process would aim to establish a common strategic direction and develop consensus among all stakeholders about how to organise PM&E within the new CGIAR. It should involve three phases:

- Phase 1: Bring together the PM&E community: Who do we want to be and what do we need to do?
- Phase 2: Consult internal CGIAR clients: What do you really need?
- Phase 3: Consult CGIAR's research partners: What do you really need?

An initial step in the change process might be for ILAC to commission a study of a small number of research programmes/projects that have used a comprehensive range of mainstream and alternative PM&E approaches and methods⁹¹.

A second step could be for ILAC to bring all the CGIAR's PM&E professionals together. This Kick-off Event could take place after closure of the GCARD Conference (end March 2010) and before a new Consortium CEO is hired (ca. September 2010). Alternatively, the new CEO's support and possibly participation in the Kick-off Event could be sought. The event should aim to:

- shape in detail the future Consortium PM&E role and function, based on identified research programmes' PM&E needs, the principles of Consortium/Center cooperation, major competence and knowledge gaps, future resource needs at system and Center level, and agreement how to proceed with setting up the CGIAR PM&E function
- build trust among all parties that need to cooperate on implementing PM&E activities and create a PM&E community-of-practice
- produce recommendations for decision or action to be considered by the Consortium Board and CEO

The event should focus on building a CGIAR-wide network of PM&E professionals. A follow-up would be to engage with CGIAR research managers and researchers about how to build their PM&E competence. The event should include input-providers with regard to

⁹¹ An equivalent activity is proposed in the IE project (see ILAC, RMIT and RIU (2009:5) "... a desk study will be carried out with the purpose of compiling and synthesizing existing impact evaluations in agricultural research that employed key elements of the approach being developed by the project."

Consortium design, nature of mega-programmes and the status of One (Financial) System (e.g., relationship with accountability-focused M&E). People responsible for Funder side IE should be observers; and they should be included as counterparts when discussing key connection points between Doer- and Funder-side IE.

In preparation for the Kick-off Event, a team-building exercise might help to diffuse conflicts between proponents of traditional and alternative PM&E approaches.

3. The activities described above will require dedicated resources beyond those needed for ILAC's current work. Additional funding is needed, which either the Change Initiative Fund (CIF) or the current ILAC donors might provide. It would help if ILAC's two current donors met to discuss this MTR and the possibility of increased (joint?) funding during the transition phase.

4. The organizational change process described above might profit from a small, informal strategy group which could review a 1-2 year action plan for ILAC's transition phase and guide its implementation⁹². The group should include CGIAR senior decision-makers (who would act as senior sponsors of ILAC's institutionalization and as a link to the Consortium Board and CEO), donors and representatives of organizations from which the CGIAR could learn. ILAC should consider whether to link this group to the Steering Committee of the IFAD-funded IE project.

5. ILAC should encourage the System Office Units to continue their work, in collaboration with ILAC, on defining a set of integrated Strategic Common Services, following up on the workshop in 2009 on 'The Future of Common Services in the New CGIAR' workshop. Several recommendations in this MTR refer to the future cooperation between ILAC-in-PM&E and other common services.

⁹² The IFAD-funded IE project will benefit from a Steering Committee comprised of leaders from the CGIAR, eminent experts, project donors and associated organizations. It will review and advise on the annual work plan and budgets. See ILAC, RMIT and RIU (2009:26,89).

Annexes

Annex 1. Online survey

MTR Survey ILAC 2009					
ILAC Objectives					
1. Based on what you know about ILAC's objectives and activities since 2003, where do you see ILAC's strengths or weaknesses? One answer per objective					
	Very strong	Strong	Weak	Very weak	Don't know
Improve the ability of researchers to work with a wider range of stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Foster learning about how agricultural R&D can more effectively contribute to reducing poverty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Generate new knowledge about agricultural innovation processes through applied research and evaluation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strengthen capacity needed for collaborative agricultural R&D	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Foster leadership and policies to support agricultural research for poverty reduction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments:	<input type="text"/>				

MTR Survey ILAC 2009

2. The Institutional Learning and Change Initiative was established in 2003 to meet several objectives, as shown in the table below. To what extent do these objectives remain relevant for the future of agricultural research? (One answer per objective)

	Extremely relevant	Relevant	Somewhat relevant	Not relevant	Don't know
Improve the ability of researchers to work with a wider range of stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Foster learning about how agricultural R&D can more effectively contribute to reducing poverty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Generate new knowledge about agricultural innovation processes through applied research and evaluation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strengthen capacity needed for collaborative agricultural R&D	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Foster leadership and policies to support agricultural research for poverty reduction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

3. If you consider the 'Fostering learning' and 'Generate new knowledge' objectives above to be at least 'somewhat relevant', which top 1 to 3 research questions should ILAC in future address? Please describe the research questions in the space below.

MTR Survey ILAC 2009

4. ILAC has carried out a number of activities, shown in the table below. Please indicate to what extent these activities continue to be needed by the 'new CGIAR' and its partners. (One answer per activity)

	Very much needed	Needed	Limited needs	Not needed
Providing training and technical assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fostering networking and a community of practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ILAC publications (briefs, newsletter, working papers)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ILAC website and resource centre (M&E tools, library)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing evaluation and impact assessment methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fostering policy dialogues (Rethinking Impact Workshop and others)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helping to develop planning, monitoring and evaluation systems and guidelines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

MTR Survey ILAC 2009

5. What should ILAC be mostly about, in the near future (ca. 2012)?

Please tick one of the columns for each row.

	Yes, absolutely	Yes, but less important	No
Encouraging and supporting pro-poor research for development within the CGIAR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encouraging and supporting pro-poor research for development within and outside the CGIAR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encouraging and supporting the development and management of partnerships in CGIAR Centres research for development programmes and projects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supporting improved planning, monitoring and evaluation practices in the CGIAR, including impact evaluation , as a support function to the CGIAR's research activities, to improve research quality and relevance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supporting institutional learning about research for development and the evaluation of its impact, within the CGIAR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supporting institutional learning about research for development and the evaluation of its impact, within and outside the CGIAR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

MTR Survey ILAC 2009

6. With the CGIAR Change process unfolding, it is currently not clear if organisational 'homes' for a cross centre initiative like ILAC will be set up and how they will be structured, across the Consortium and the Centers. We would like your ideas about how, ideally, ILAC should be organised in future.

- As a time bound project carrying out a set of limited activities accountable to the donor and direct supervisors
- As a strategic unit integrated into the CGIAR system and its core functions and processes, accountable to CGIAR senior management and researchers
- As a voluntary, peer-to-peer network of individuals and/or Center units (perhaps with a small coordination team) accountable to its membership

Comments:

7. Which three of the following areas of work best express what ILAC should focus on (select three)

- Collaborative research partnership
- Institutional and organizational learning
- Research planning and targeting
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Knowledge management
- Innovation systems research
- Pro-poor impact
- Research leadership development

Comments:

MTR Survey ILAC 2009

8. It is important for ILAC to be clear about how it should relate to others in a future role. Which one of the following three possible roles should ILAC play in the future? Please identify which option you consider the 'most', which 'moderately' and which one 'least desirable'.

	Most desirable	Moderately desirable	Least desirable
Enabler: As a service to managers, researchers and their project/programmes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Controller: As a monitor/enforcer of standards which have been agreed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Piloter: As a center of expertise, which carries out research and links to expertise around the world	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Personal information

9. I consider myself to be a(n)... Please select one of the following options.

- ILAC partner
- Participant in ILAC activities
- User of ILAC outputs

10. I consider myself to be a(n)... Please select one of the following options.

- Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation professional (including impact assessment)
- Human Resources professional

Other (please specify)

11. I consider myself to be a(n)... Please select one of the following options.

- Manager
- Researcher

Other (please specify)

MTR Survey ILAC 2009

12. Please use this space to make any additional comments about the ILAC Initiative.

13. Would you like to be informed about the results of this survey?

Yes

No

Annex 2. Telephone interviews: interviewees and questions

Table 20. Interviewees (32)

Full Name	Position	Organization
Andy Hall	Researcher	UN University, INTECH
Anne-Marie Izac	Chief Alliance Officer	Alliance of the CGIAR Centers
Boru Douthwaite	Innovation and Impact Director	Challenge Program on Water and Food
David Raitzer	Impact Assessment Scientist	IRRI
Derek Byerlee	Chair	SPIA CGIAR Science Council
Dindo Campilan	Regional Leader for South, West and Central Asia	International Potato Center
Don S. Doering	Program Officer	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Douglas Horton	Consultant	ILAC Honorary Fellow
Emile Frison	Director General	Bioversity International
Enrica M. Porcari	Chief Information Officer and Leader	ICT-KM Program, CGIAR
Fred Carden	Director	International Development Research Center (IDRC)
Graham Thiele	Leader, Impact Enhancement Division	International Potato Center (CIP)
Javier Ekboir	Consultant	
Jemimah Njuki	Senior Research Fellow	International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
Jeroen Rijniers	Senior Policy Officer	ILAC Donor Contact, Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation - DGIS
John McDermott	Deputy Director General	International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
Jonathan Wadsworth	Senior Rural Livelihoods Adviser	Department for International Development (DFID)
Leslie J. Cooksy	Associate Professor; Current President American Evaluation Association	School of Education and the Delaware Education Research
Maarten van Ginkel	Deputy Director General-Research	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)
Maria Iskandarani	Technical Specialist	CGIAR Secretariat
Nadia Manning Thomas	Knowledge Sharing and Uptake Specialist	International Water Management Institute (IWMI)
Patti Kristjanson	Leader, Innovation Works	International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

Table 20. Interviewees (32) (contd)'

Full Name	Position	Organization
Peter J. Matlon	President	Programs for a Green Revolution in Africa (ProGRA)
Robert Chapman	Manager, Planning, Evaluation and Learning Unit	Bioversity International
Roelof Rabbinge	Chair	Science Council, CGIAR
Shambu Prasad	Associate Professor	Xavier Institute of Management
Shantanu Mathur	Grants Coordinator	ILAC Donor Contact, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Sirkka Immonen	Secretary	Special Panel on Monitoring and Evaluation (SPME), CGIAR Science Council
Theo Van de Sande	Senior Policy Researcher	Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation - DGIS
Vicki Wilde	Program Leader/ Gender & Diversity Program	CGIAR Gender & Diversity Program, CGIAR
Victoria Henson-Apollonio	Senior Scientist and Manager	CGIAR Central Advisory Service on Intellectual Property (CAS-IP), CGIAR

Table 21. Interview questions

Questions asked of 32 interviewees	Donors (4)	CGIAR senior decision-makers (5)	ILAC partners (6)	CGIAR services (6)	External experts (4)	CGIAR managers (2)	PM&E specialists (4)
Please describe, in your own words, why ILAC was established? Is this purpose still relevant today?			X				
What is ILAC mainly about (its core purpose)?	X		X	X			
What is your interest in ILAC? Why did you or are you providing funding to ILAC?	X						
To what extent will your interests in ILAC still be valid in the new CGIAR after the changes have been implemented?	X						
Which lessons learnt from ILAC's past and present are most relevant to ILAC's future in the new CGIAR?							
What should ILAC focus on in the new CGIAR? What should a future ILAC contribute (scope, competence, services) to meeting the challenges and needs you identified? What should ILAC mainly be about in the new CGIAR?	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Are there areas of work that ILAC should no longer be involved with in the future? If so, why? Who else in the new CGIAR should pick up that work?			X	X			
Given your previous responses, which competencies and capacities should ILAC strengthen or acquire?			X				
How should a future ILAC complement your competencies, services and capacities?				X			
It has been suggested that ILAC should be institutionalized in the new CGIAR. What does the word 'institutionalized' mean to you? How would you know if ILAC were successfully institutionalized?	X						

Table 21. Interview questions (contd)'

Questions asked of 32 interviewees	Donors (4)	CGIAR senior decision-makers (5)	ILAC partners (6)	CGIAR services (6)	External experts (4)	CGIAR managers (2)	PM&E specialists (4)
ILAC management ... has articulated an argument that ILAC should be linked to the CGIAR's core planning, monitoring and evaluation functions, based on the historical roots of the initiative, the capacities and orientation of most of the people involved with ILAC, the apparent needs and gaps in the area of PM&E in the CGIAR and the leverage that these activities have in terms of driving the research agenda. What advantages and disadvantages do you see?	X	X	X	X		X	X
(To be able to deliver those contributions) how could ILAC be structured and organized in the new CGIAR (with a Consortium, mega-programmes with performance contracts, Central Fund)?	X	X	X	X		X	
If ILAC were institutionalized in the CGIAR, should it play a role more as enabler/controller/piloter?	X	X	X	X		X	X
A more 'institutionalized' ILAC will have to make a transition from its present state into a future state (part of the Consortium, linked to one or more mega-programmes, etc). What is the role of the donor in terms of helping ILAC make this transition? Do you have concrete suggestions for transitional management, bridging funding, or other mechanisms that could help facilitate transition?	X	X					
In the new CGIAR, what will be the greatest cross-mega-programme, cross-Center challenges and needs with regard to research for development (pro-poor)? What are the greatest challenges in terms of ensuring that research makes the greatest possible contribution to development (pro-poor)?		X			X	X	
What will be the greatest cross-mega-programme, cross-Center challenges and needs with regard to partnership at CGIAR system and mega-programme levels?		X				X	

Table 21. Interview questions (contd)'

Questions asked of 32 interviewees	Donors (4)	CGIAR senior decision-makers (5)	ILAC partners (6)	CGIAR services (6)	External experts (4)	CGIAR managers (2)	PM&E specialists (4)
What will be the greatest cross-mega-programme, cross-Center challenges and needs with regard to PM&E, including IE? What are the current challenges and needs in terms of PM&E, including IE in research organizations that want to deliver on development goals?		X			X	X	X
From which organizations that have set up 'learning and change' or evaluation functions, and developed such competence, should the CGIAR learn to shape this area of work?					X		
What are the major hurdles a future ILAC must deal with what?					X		
How does your Center organize to manage the functional areas of PM&E, partnership and/or research for development?						X	
Does your Center's approach represent a model for Center-based competence units, with which ILAC should in future interact? To what extent?						X	
Is it feasible that some or all aspects of your unit's/Center's competence and services take on a role as a common service to the CGIAR in your area of competence, servicing future mega-programmes and Center-led research activities?						X	
Please tell me about your current job responsibilities (P, M, E; <i>ex ante</i> IE, <i>ex post</i> IE, focal point for SPIA, other) and where your unit is placed in the Center's organization							X
With regard to PM&E at your Center and within the CGIAR overall, what improvements or changes are you hoping for in the context of the ongoing CGIAR change process?							X
Do you know about any efforts to develop a system, cross-Center, PM&E competence within the CGIAR? If so, what are they?							X

Table 21. Interview questions (contd)'

Questions asked of 32 interviewees	Donors (4)	CGIAR senior decision-makers (5)	ILAC partners (6)	CGIAR services (6)	External experts (4)	CGIAR managers (2)	PM&E specialists (4)
What do you know about the ILAC Initiative, which was set up in 2003? What engagement, if any, have you had with it?							X

Annex 3. Telephone interviews: selected consolidated responses**Table 22. Challenges and needs identified for three thematic areas**

Thematic area	Mainly in donor domain	Mainly in CGIAR (Doer) domain	Mainly in partner/beneficiary domain
Research for development		How to maintain ethos of mega-programme approach; Doers' ability to manage research over the long term along the research-to-development continuum	
		How to assure synergies between mega-programmes, where truly beneficial	
	Donors want to see results in 3 years or so. Researchers make unrealistic proposals	Better understanding of dynamics of rural poverty, how agricultural research can connect into them: become clearer about CGIAR's potential contributions to poverty reduction (e.g., improving incomes is not the same as pro-poor).	Limited ability of policy-makers and donors to understand and deal with long-term timeframe of agricultural research, its upstream nature
		Researchers do not engage in 'guerrilla tactics' to get a solution developed through their research into farmers lives. Researchers seldom able to relate existing research findings to particular development challenges	National partners must invest more in agriculture, people going into agriculture and extension, to ensure any bang for the buck. CGIAR cannot and should not do much extension Delivery of solutions to farmers must be informed by prevailing realities
		How we do our research is a key question. We must start with the users, ultimately provide solutions genuinely wanted by the poor	Limited ability of users to themselves think of possible uses
		Pro-poor Strategic Objectives, SRF: new CGIAR strategy needs to be shared; so far, only a small group of people worked on it	
		Talent pool is shrinking, less available to the CGIAR as a whole	

Table 22. Challenges and needs identified for three thematic areas (contd)'

Thematic area	Mainly in donor domain	Mainly in CGIAR (Doer) domain	Mainly in partner/beneficiary domain
	Current funding practices, donor dynamics encourage Centers to assume development role; 'virgin grant proposal' problem	Funding will remain a major challenge. About 30-50% maximum of core funding for a mega-programme to be expected	
		Mindset change needed: from 'the poor' to 'clients', away from 'I know what's best for them' mentality	
		Significant disincentives to disclose failures, prevents valuable learning	
Partnership	Donors are partners too	No systematic partnership with development actors, despite existing CGIAR Strategy for it Ensure CGIAR attracts the right partners, must be results-driven, not aim in itself. There will be different kinds. Use sensible criteria to select How to link with the private sector, which will be doing more of the research in future. Opportunity for cross-Center learning	CGIAR needs to support its partners to do the job Nobody is concerned with the potential partners capacity, capability to deliver. Must face the nature of most of our partners: poorly managed, poorly structured organizations not incentivized to partner
		Work better with traditional partners and be able to work with new ones. CGIAR is good at research partnerships, not research-for-development partnerships. CGIAR needs able staff, who can work on the interface between the two	Include partners as co-authors Out- and up-scaling requires working in different regions, countries Challenge to make national partners understand that they will benefit, even if research project does not take place in their country
		CGIAR needs to be flexible, use any appropriate delivery channel	
		Partnering requires time and effort, over several projects and years. Need to invest in that effort	
		Partnering is also an attitude, should be suffused throughout a Center CGIAR must go through a major cultural change, move away from Center-centric, lead partner role to realization that only with partners can the CGIAR have impact on the ground	

Table 22. Challenges and needs identified for three thematic areas (contd)'

Thematic Area	Mainly in donor domain	Mainly in CGIAR (Doer) domain	Mainly in partner/beneficiary domain
PM&E, including IE		<p>Strong Consortium, with powers to orchestrate and standardize PM&E, providing basis for resource allocation decisions and incentivize better performance</p> <p>Find better balance between accountability and simplicity</p>	
		<p>Need for integrated framework. Currently, programmes do not build on one another; each one set up with different partners. External evaluations should build on internal ones. If programme not making progress at the lower level, nothing to add up at the higher level. Misconception that IE is different to evaluation of process, outcomes</p> <p>No inherent conflict between PM&E-for-accountability and PM&E-for-learning, but conflict between evaluators around definition of impact</p> <p>Programmatic performance monitoring needs to take place at broader level, mega-programme, mega-programme subcomponents, Center level. Unit of study often incorrect (e.g., impact at mission-level goals requires meta-analysis, combinatory effect of several programmes)</p> <p>Ensure M&E of interrelationships between mega-programme</p> <p>External monitoring and review by peers must continue</p>	
		<p>How will mega-programmes be set up and managed, how will their research be planned?</p> <p>CGIAR needs new culture of working together, of research leadership. Lead-Center approach has disadvantages</p>	

Table 22. Challenges and needs identified for three thematic areas (contd)'

Thematic Area	Mainly in donor domain	Mainly in CGIAR (Doer) domain	Mainly in partner/beneficiary domain
		<p>CGIAR's PME, OE, IE activities and resources need to be merged, have more leverage. Key is not separation of powers, but integration (quality, continuity, quality, timeliness). Better link M&E, OE and IA to strengthen each component</p> <p>In new CGIAR, will PM&E people become more detached from research managers, programmes? Risk of moving into new kinds of silos with mega-programmes</p> <p>Too many research managers and researchers do not see the benefit of better planning and assessment</p> <p>Avoid going for a central unit, on which all work is dumped. Researchers need to involve themselves in PM&E. Centers and mega-programmes must help their researchers use outcome mapping and other tools</p>	
	<p>Donors concentrate on evaluation of current, future projects, lack of resources for long-term tracking of past projects</p> <p>Most donors cannot re-use the information generated by long-term IE</p>	<p>Do better planning at the outset, manage for results, make sure relevant data is collected, to be used later. CGIAR is not good at managing data over the long term (e.g., from findings, to extension, to impact)</p> <p>Long, late evaluative research tends to get divorced from decision-making. Doer and Funder have become committed to what they are doing</p> <p>Longer-term process of IE at meta-level must be consistent with SPIA</p>	
		<p>Participatory <i>ex ante</i> IE and <i>ex post</i> IE must take place</p> <p>Greater cooperation during planning stage. Centers should learn from private sector <i>ex ante</i> IE equivalent</p> <p>Manage projects so that partners get most out of it, see what they have contributed to</p> <p>Focus on 'participatory' has lost sight of need for decision-making</p>	<p>No more IE and PM&E without national partners</p> <p>Partners' capacity for PM&E is low</p>
		<p>Future PM&E (IE) should encompass traditional and non-mainstream</p>	

		<p>methods. Variety of methods needed. Alternative methods should be marketed as being different. More efforts needed to address challenge of predictable, unpredictable aspects</p> <p>Respond to emerging paradigm of intertwined causes (complexity). Econometrics cannot replace experimentation</p> <p>CGIAR must deal with very complex systems. Key question: Which parts of them do they need to engage with?</p> <p>Centers' receptiveness to social sciences needs to become more systematic (in their planning, priority setting)</p>	
	Making effort to track over the long term what has been funded should be separate to deciding whether to continue funding	<p>Make sure there is learning, systematic approach needed, apply lessons when planning new programmes</p> <p>Need to connect measurement with decision-making in timely fashion</p>	
		How knowledge and information generated by agricultural research can be linked to policy decision-making, although two different worlds. One way of doing this is having many research partnerships at many levels	

Table 23. Interviewees' views on what a future ILAC should contribute to meeting the challenges and needs they identified

Role	Thematic areas	Corporate positioning within the new CGIAR
Very strong function across the whole system, able to do independent work	<p>Help CGIAR become a learning organization at all levels, including DGs, with complete openness, as far as ideologies are concerned</p> <p>Focus on learning from the past, facilitate this within the system</p> <p>Real learning must be based on cross-programme, long-term frames, include what non-CGIAR actors are doing (e.g., large-scale studies)</p> <p>Inter-Center learning about how the CGIAR can have more impact, based upon framework, platform</p> <p>Respect the fact that learning is already going on, every day, within the CGIAR; tap into it</p> <p>Complexity of how change actually occurs and what is science's part in it</p>	<p>Consortium</p> <p>As a standing facility, similar to a virtual SOU in a more transparent way</p> <p>In future, avoid SOUs competing for funds from the same donors</p> <p>Internal instrument of the system</p>

Table 23. Interviewees' views on what a future ILAC should contribute to meeting the challenges and needs they identified

Role	Thematic areas	Corporate positioning within the new CGIAR
ILAC needs to connect with senior leaders and research managers	<p>How we should work together within the CGIAR, targeted at senior decision-makers and research managers</p> <p>Design and monitor institutional well-being. Be involved in how the CGIAR is run as a place, where people want to work</p> <p>Shift focus onto CGIAR-internal organizational learning and change, help promote learning culture and readiness for change, also by bringing in outside know-how</p>	
Not part of SPIA, which assures independent, external meta-analysis IE, consistent over time, to inform Funders' strategic decision-making	SPIA and ILAC should have a role in the 'learning community'	Merge with / associate with Funder-side (SPIA/ISPC). They are largely complementary
<p>Focus more on what is going on outside the CGIAR, work on the fringes to effect change</p> <p>Work more with donors, create a coalition, some are moving in the right direction</p>	<p>Educate donors about timeframes for effective international agricultural research</p> <p>Encourage donors themselves to encourage frank reviews; donors do not want to keep fooling themselves and one another</p> <p>Influence ISPC to conduct IE to improve learning in the system, also how ISPC assesses how Centers do their IE</p>	Could be housed outside the CGIAR, but should not be
<p>Service mentality, exhibit results orientation, no longer advocate</p> <p>Reach more people</p> <p>Provide comprehensive service, create demand for insights, which CGIAR researchers find useful</p> <p>Balance supply/push with demand/pull</p> <p>Focus on capacity-building in the CGIAR (outside partners: later)</p> <p>Broker outside expertise</p> <p>Networker par excellence</p> <p>More practice, less acquired knowledge/academics</p>	<p>Embrace how others define research for development, help researchers do such research faster and cheaper (not better; would mean risk of becoming expert again), provide methods and tools for researchers to understand what the poor want and need. Pick up on the daily learning happening in the CGIAR</p> <p>Researchers embrace innovation system principles, but are concerned about transaction costs; need support here</p> <p>Strategic communications</p> <p>Facilitate participatory planning with beneficiaries, partners</p> <p>Provide service at research design and post-project stages (OE/IE) in collaboration with Centers' socioeconomic units, of publishable quality; facilitate design of new mega-programmes</p> <p>Design mechanisms for knowledge exchange across projects, programmes, Centers and partners (e.g., Technology Fair, to kick off collaborations)</p>	

Table 23. Interviewees' views on what a future ILAC should contribute to meeting the challenges and needs they identified (contd)'

Role	Thematic areas	Corporate positioning within the new CGIAR
<p>Unify CGIAR's PM&E activities and resources, to have more leverage</p> <p>Support community-of-practice for project planning, coordination, M&E</p> <p>Work at system level to create enabling environment (IE standards, HR policies, donors, etc.)</p> <p>Work with a few Centers intensively</p>	<p>Space for collegial exchange about evaluation (process, outcomes, broader context)</p> <p>Both <i>ex ante</i> and <i>ex post</i> IE provide service at design and post-project stages, cooperate with Centers' socioeconomic units; <i>not</i> about PM&E-for-accountability, others should do that</p> <p>Increase IE professionalism; IE is meaningful to a broad set of stakeholders, from NGOs to hard-nosed traditional donors; indicators, methodologies, get them into mega-programme performance contracts</p> <p>How to achieve and how to show pro-poor impact; focus on adoptability (predictive), not adoption</p> <p>Provide solutions to ineffective CGIAR <i>ex post</i> IE</p> <p>Design research process, monitor if it is actually happening, assess learning from it; was it a good process?</p> <p>Help Centers implement learning from CCERs</p> <p>Maintain and develop this domain of knowledge; more empirical evidence on how ILAC helps to improve performance; demonstrate results</p> <p>Keep up with outside experts, the literature; encourage controversial dialogue with leading figures from the outside; ILAC as conduit to bring their ideas into the CGIAR</p> <p>Commission some research, experiment with new methods</p>	<p>Consortium, to be able to inform <i>ex ante</i> and <i>ex post</i> IE</p>
	<p>Partnership: P, M&E, linkage between research and development; partnership <i>not</i> as a separate topic from PM&E</p> <p>Qualitative innovation systems approach to partnership formation and nurturing</p> <p>Get national partners onboard re: PM&E, IE</p> <p>Help research managers clarify what their theory of change is, and their impact pathway; make these monitorable so they can bring in the right kind of partners</p> <p>Help make strategic choices about partnership, as a catalyst</p>	<p>Consortium Capacity-Building Platform</p>

Table 23. Interviewees' views on what a future ILAC should contribute to meeting the challenges and needs they identified (contd)'

Role	Thematic areas	Corporate positioning within the new CGIAR
	Planning and monitoring (system-wide function has not existed up to now) Future M&E will still be quite control-oriented, but should have better indicators for unexpected, unanticipated dimension of agricultural research	
	How to bring in the private sector; inter-Center learning about this	
Make a choice where to focus on (Centers, programmes, projects)		
Change name because ILAC implies a threat: Are we not learning? Why do we have to change?		
		See if a mega-programme lends itself as a platform for ILAC
	Take on the debate about how innovation takes place, its evolutionary and changing nature; greatest changes come from people engaged in research and learning, which is not reflected in CGIAR's current PM&E	

Table 24. Responses to whether ILAC should take on an enabler, controller or piloter role

	Donors (4)	CGIAR senior decision-makers (5)	ILAC partners (6)	CGIAR services (6)	External experts (4)	CGIAR managers (2)	PM&E specialists (4)
Enabler	3	3	3	3	Not asked		
Controller					Not asked		
Piloter					Not asked		
Enabler + piloter	2	2	2	2	Not asked	1	2
Enabler + controller			1*		Not asked		1
All roles				1	Not asked	1**	
Don't know			1				

* Interviewee comment: Have some leverage

** Interviewee comment: Controller must not dominate

Table 25. Responses to how ILAC should be institutionalized in the new CGIAR*

	Donors (4)	CGIAR senior decision-makers (5)	ILAC partners (6)	CGIAR services (6)	External experts (4)	CGIAR managers (2)	PM&E specialists (4)
Consortium	2	2	1	4	1		
Funder-side	1	1		1			1
Capacity-Building Platform				3			1
Split into different functions		1					
Innovation mega-programme						1	
Community-of-practice			1				1
Independent, outside CGIAR			1		1		
Common service				1	1		
Not necessarily linked to PM&E		1	1				
Not sure			1			1	
Not in my remit to say	1						

* Some interviewees made several proposals

Table 26. Responses to the question: “From which organizations that have set up ‘learning and change’ or evaluation functions, and have developed such competence, should the CGIAR learn to shape this area of work?”

Person / Institution	Area of competence/knowledge	Reason
John Mayne	Independent advisor on public sector performance, World Bank International Program for Development Evaluation Training	Independent advice, network, familiar with ILAC, proposed by interviewee, lecturer
Rick Davis	Independent M&E consultant, Gates Foundation and ALNAP as clients	Independent advice, network, familiar with ILAC, on the ground, potential capacity development partner?
IBM Research, Global Innovation Outlook	IBM’s vehicle for collaborative innovation	2007 Africa Report, Report on Water, Energy & Environment, proposed by interviewee
Practical Action (NGO)	Use simple technology to fight poverty and transform poor peoples’ lives; adoption, extension, impact; \$40m budget	Learning culture, difficulties with realising this in the field, proposed by interviewee
CARE International	Evaluation culture	Proposed by interviewee
IDRC	Progressive donor approach to evaluation	Proposed by interviewee
DFID	Progressive donor approach to evaluation	Proposed by interviewee
Gates Foundation	Spend more than other donors on managing, measuring, communicating results, want grantees to set quantifiable goals, OK to fail to reach them	New CGIAR member, major donor to CGIAR, concern with effectiveness / impact, proposed by interviewee
Engineers-without-Borders	Network of national members, to assist members to develop capacity to help poor communities	Change, partnership, Appropriate and Sustainable Technologies Database, proposed by interviewee
ALNAP	Network to improve humanitarian performance through learning and accountability	Learn from their failures, run a learning network, proposed by interviewee
Keystone Accountability, CEO David Bonbright		
ODI (UK)	Tbd	Proposed by interviewee
US Government Agencies’ Inspector Generals	Set PM&E standards, independent status, make sure that evaluation happens and the right time and is planned for at the outset (process responsibility; not doing all this themselves)	Proposed by interviewee

Annex 4. Strategic Common Services: output from ‘The Future of Common Services’ workshop, September 2009

During this workshop, the representatives from CAS-IP, Gender & Diversity, ICT-KM, ILAC, Internal Audit and CGIAR Strategic Communications came to the following conclusions.

They would like to offer a set of *strategic and corporate services* essential to the high performance of the new CGIAR, which at a minimum should cover the services (see numbered, below) and certain new kinds of Strategic Common Services (see alphabetical list, below).

CAS-IP: Intellectual Property

1. Provide tools (e.g., License – Central) to the mega-programmes, Centers, partners, to assist in negotiations and transactions
2. Provide capacity-building to (on public-sector IP management) Centers, partners, mega-programmes through internships, strategic workshops, web portal, blog) to increase effectiveness and equity to partnerships Both 1 and 2 build standard practices (with IAU)
3. Provide communication channel on IP practices and issues within the CG system to increase awareness and sharing (based on research/experience)
4. Provide strategic advice/plans to Centers, Consortium, mega-programmes, to increase effectiveness of partnerships and to implement policy (with ILAC)

ICT-KM CIO: Information/Communication/Knowledge Technologies

1. Joint purchasing (software, information products such as journal subscriptions) for Consortium and Centers, to foster standards and savings
2. ICT strategic services, including delivery services (with IAU)
3. Support collaboration to provide tools; facilitate training; support consortium, Centers, partners; workshops to foster collaborative work
4. Ensure availability of research outputs/products (Centers, partners, Consortium): systems, tools, standards, storage
5. Ensure access to research outputs: data/information management, system, tools (with CAS-IP)

IAU: Internal Audit

1. Independent, objective assurance and advisory services, which bring a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluate + improvements for effective governance, risk-management + control, in order to achieve management objectives (with all other common services):
 - a. advise on and promote international standards of good governance, risk management frameworks, accountability, control procedures relevant to CGIAR operations, by drawing on internal + external best practices (with ICT-KM, CAS-IP, G&D)
 - b. audit processes and units, to validate conformity with established policies or best-practice benchmarks
 - c. work with other specialists, review the practices and systems to manage specific risks and identify/provide advice on significant gaps
 - d. promote an environment (through advice, capacity-building, audit work) of high ethical standards with regard to management of financial, human, physical and intellectual assets

ILAC: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

1. Identify and mobilize resources to support PM&E, partnerships and organizational learning (with Science Council, CGIAR Secretariat)
2. Develop policy, standards and guidelines for PM&E, partnerships and organizational learning and support their application in the CGIAR’s research work
3. Make information related to PM&E partnerships and organizational learning available and accessible (publications, portal, conferences and meetings) to improve practice (with Capacity Development, ICT-KM, G&D)
4. Strengthen capacity (training, coaching, and technical support) to use PM&E methods to work in partnerships to stimulate organizational learning for improving research impact
5. Identify and make available methods for PM&E, including IE, to improve accountability and learning
6. Carry out research to test or develop methods to assess needs and to assess effectiveness and impact, and draw lessons from collaborative research for development
7. Identify expertise in ILAC topics within and outside the CGIAR and promote knowledge sharing, networking, collaboration to improve performance of individual

G&D: Gender and Diversity

1. Fellowship programme for women delivering pro-poor agricultural research and development in Africa and Asia (in future, AWARD might include men, too)
2. Global database of some 9,000 women in agricultural and management: potential candidates for staff, boards, review teams, scholarships
3. World-class training series on cross-cultural communications / partnerships, mentoring, women's leadership, dignity, science writing and proposal writing, etc. (with ICT-KM, ILAC)
4. Institution-strengthening series to support gender responsive research and development: training, policy, action planning, M&E
5. Coaching series for managers/teams working in multi-cultural research organizations
6. Inclusive workplace model policies and practices
7. Global clearinghouse on cutting-edge gender and diversity work

Strategic communications

1. Provide an umbrella communications strategy that unites the system in communicating our vision: 'Towards speaking with one voice'
2. Institute global media/thematic campaigns that show how the CGIAR is delivering on our vision, our relevance to major development issues; emphasize issues over institutions and unite the system (with G&D and ILAC)
3. Coordinate communicators across CGIAR: cultivate community of practice to foster a system mindset; deliver capacity-building both inside and outside the CGIAR, to enhance ability to effectively communicate our relevance results and vision (e.g., media training; with ICT-KM)
4. Foster partnerships to broaden our outreach and amplify our voice(s) (with ICT-KM)
5. Institute strategic/targeted campaigns in collaboration with resource mobilization colleagues to mobilize donors to achieve the US\$ billion by 2015
6. Improve internal communications about our governance priorities and procedures – why they matter and how they are beneficial. Vibrant internal communications are vital

Which additional new Common Services should the new CGIAR consider implementing and using?

- A. HR, as part of a larger Organizational Development unit: standards, administration/back office, value add/strategic services
 - a. Do only this HR piece at first: staff/career development within the CGIAR system, including executive development for the CGIAR and NARS
- B. Set up a thematic/issues-oriented resource mobilization coordination function, to nourish the mega-programmes
 - a. Establish peer review function of CGIAR publications, proposals to donors, etc. to “stabilize funding situation”, ensure quality and relevance of CGIAR outputs
- C. Provide research support services across mega-programmes (statistics, GIS, surveying, biometrics, analysis); relates to CGIAR change objectives with regard to impact, cost-effectiveness, quality and relevance of research
 - a. Data management, Database management, manage large data sets
- D. Have a consolidated PM&E service that pulls together all the PM&E functions/requirements across the CGIAR
- E. Partnership management coordination, with respect to partners in mega-programmes and Common Services
- F. Training service (full cycle from needs assessment to evaluation and follow-up)
- G. Turn research findings (methods, processes) into learning objects: outward-focused service that uses capacity development resources and methods
- H. Encourage and facilitate entrepreneurial use of research products: outward-focused capacity development

Annex 5. Documents reviewed and cited

Accenture Development Partnerships (ADP) (2009). *Consultancy on Common Administrative, Financial and Research Support Services in the new Consortium of the CGIAR Centers: Key Findings and Recommendations*.

https://sites.google.com/a/cgxchange.org/alliance/shared-administrative-financial-and-research-support-services-in-the-new-consortium-of-cgiar-centers/CGIARSharedServicesFindingsandRecommendations-ALLIANCESTRATEGYREPORT_FINAL_10Nov09_v3.pdf?attredirects=0&d=1

Bioversity International (2008). *Annual Technical Report: Institutional Learning and Change Initiative (ILAC) – Innovating for Sustainable Poverty Reduction*. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.

- Boston Consulting Group (BCG) (2009). *Design and Establishment of the Consortium of CGIAR Centers: Final Report*. <http://alliance.cgxchange.org/consortium-design-and-establishment-phase-ii/FinalReport-DesignofConsortiumofCGIARCenters-Updated13Oct09.pdf?attredirects=0&d=1>
- Braun, J. v., D. Byerlee, et al. (2009) *Towards a Strategy and Results Framework for the CGIAR*. Washington DC: Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). <http://alliance.cgxchange.org/strategy-and-results-framework-and-mega-programs/TowardsaSRFfortheCGIAR11-17-09.pdf?attredirects=0&d=1>
- CGIAR Alliance Office website <http://alliance.cgxchange.org/welcome>
- CGIAR Secretariat (2009a). *M&E Framework for the New CGIAR (draft)*. Washington DC. http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco17/exco17_m&e.pdf
- CGIAR Secretariat (2009b). Framework for the CGIAR Fund. Chapter 3: 25-38. http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/cg_fund_framework_dec8_2009.pdf
- CGIAR Science Council (2006). *Advancing Impact Assessment of International Agricultural Research*. Synthesis Report. Rome, Italy, Science Council Secretariat. http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Impact_Assessment/IAFPM_synthesis_doc_1_2_DecRyan.pdf
- CGIAR Science Council (2009). *Defining and Refining Good Practice in Ex-post Impact Assessment*. Synthesis Report. Rome, Italy, Science Council Secretariat. http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Impact_Assessment/IAFPM_2008_for_web.pdf
- CGIAR Science Council (2009). *Stripe Review of Social Sciences in the CGIAR*. Rome, Italy, Science Council Secretariat. http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Systemwide_and_Ecoregional_Programs/SSSR_for_web.pdf
- Change Steering Team (2009). *CGIAR Change Management Retreat and Stakeholders Consultation*. Washington DC, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). http://www.cgiar.org/changemanagement/pdf/CM_retreat_stakeholderconsultation_SummReport_Sept18_2008.pdf
- Clark, W. (2009). Linking knowledge to action for sustainable development. *Science Forum 2009*. Wageningen, The Netherlands. <http://www.scienceforum2009.nl/Portals/11/Clark-pres.pdf>
- Cooksy, L.J. (2008). *Enhancing the Use of Ex post Evaluation of Outcomes and Impacts in the CGIAR*. Rome, CGIAR Science Council. http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Impact_Assessment/epIA_Learning_Summary_Report_FINAL.pdf
- Embracing Change (newsletter). An update on implementation of CGIAR reforms. November 2009 Issue. http://www.cgiar.org/changemanagement/embracingchange/embracing_change_november16_2009.html
- Embracing Change: blog for sharing views and news on the CGIAR change initiative <http://cgiarchangemanagement.wordpress.com/>
- Flavell, R., T. Ammour et al. (2009). *Report of the Sixth External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of Bioversity International*. Rome, Italy, Science Council Secretariat.
- Hagmann, J. (2009). *Outline of the Workshop Process*. ILAC Learning Laboratory Meeting, Nairobi, Kenya. http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/LLab_meeting_Nairobi_Outline.pdf
- Hazell, P. and L. Hadadd (2001). *Agricultural Research and Poverty Reduction*. Discussion Paper No. 34. Technical Advisory Committee. Washington DC, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/2020dp34.pdf>
- Kelley, T., J. Ryan, et al. (2008). Enhancing *ex post* impact assessment of agricultural research: the CGIAR experience. *Research Evaluation* 17(3): 201-212.
- ILAC (2008). Comments on 'Enhancing the Value and Use of Ex post Evaluation of Outcomes and Impacts in the CGIAR'. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.
- ILAC (2008). Participatory Impact Pathways Analysis (PIPA) documents produced (e.g. network analysis, problem tree, timeline, etc). Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.
- ILAC Initiative, PRGA Program, et al. (2008). *Suggested Actions for CGIAR Leaders*. Rethinking Impact: Workshop Brief No 2. Rome; Cali, Colombia; Nairobi, Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative, CGIAR Systemwide

Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis from Technology Development and Institutional Innovation (PRGA Program), International Livestock Research Institute.

ILAC (2009). *Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Review of the ILAC Initiative*, Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.

ILAC, RMIT and RIU (2009). *Impact Evaluation Approaches for Agricultural Research for Development*. Project Proposal.

La Rovere, R., Dixon, J. (2005). *Report on the Impact Assessment Workshop held at CIMMYT, Mexico, May 3-6th*. http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/reports/REPORT_ITA_Workshop_3-6_May_2005.pdf

Liebowitz, J. and L. Field (2009). *External Review of the Information and Communications Technology and Knowledge Management Program (ICT-KM) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research*. Rome, Italy, Information and Communications Technology and Knowledge Management Program (ICT-KM).

http://ictkm.cgiar.org/document_library/program_docs/External_Review_09/ICT-KM%20External%20Review%2009.pdf

Lindstrom, J. (2009). *What is the State of M&E in Agriculture?* Findings of the ALINE online consultation survey, Institute of Development Studies (IDS) and Keystone Accountability.

http://www.alineplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/ALINE_online_survey_report.pdf

Love, A. J. (2009). *Strengthening Institutional Learning and Change at IPGRI and Across the CGIAR*. ILAC Report. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.

Mackay, R., B. Douthwaite, et al. (2007). Participatory Impact Pathways Analysis and Priority Setting. *CGIAR Priority Setting Compendium*, D. Raitzer.

McAllister, E. (2008a). *Bringing Together the Best of Science and the Best of Development*. Synthesis Report. Independent Review of the CGIAR System. Washington, DC, CGIAR Secretariat.

http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/agm08/agm08_independent_review_synthesis_report.pdf

McAllister, E. (2008b). *Independent Review Panel - Report 2008*. Presentation at the Annual General Meeting of the CGIAR, Maputo, Mozambique. http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/agm08/agm08_independent_review_presentation.pdf

Meinzen-Dick, R., D. Gollin, et al. (2009). *Draft Report Analysis of the Questionnaire for Elicitation of Key Opportunities for International Agricultural Research*. CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) Committee.

https://sites.google.com/a/cgxchange.org/alliance/documentation-for-the-development-of-the-cgiar-strategy-and-mega-programs/ScientistElicitationDraftReport_StrategyTeamversion.pdf?attredirects=0&d=1

Sette, C. (2010). *ILAC Website Traffic Report Period January to December 2009*. Website Traffic Report Series. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative

Sette, C. and Watts, J. (2009) *Group Facilitation Skills for Participatory Decision-Making: Report of a Follow up Outcome Evaluation*. Workshop Evaluation Report Series, Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.

Sierra, K. (2009). *Transition Management Team Journal Update #10*. Washington DC, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). <http://cgiarchangemanagement.wordpress.com/2009/09/21/tmt-journal-update-10-from-cgiar-chair-katherine-sierra/>

Watts, J. (2008). Comments on the Social Science Stripe Review sent to ILAC virtual discussion group. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative

Watts, J. and D. Horton (2008). *Institutional Learning and Change: An Initiative to Promote Greater Impact through Agricultural Research for Poverty Alleviation*. ILAC Working Paper 5. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative. http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/working_papers/ILAC_WorkingPaper_No5_ILAC_Watts.pdf

Watts, J. (2009a). *ILAC Initiative Contributions to Bioversity International*. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative

Watts, J. (2009b). Comments on the Social Science Stripe Study sent to the Science Council via Mauricio Bellon. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative

Watts, J. (2010). ILAC inputs and activities related to CGIAR Change Process. Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative

Annex 6. Reviewer’s Biographical Details

Victor Kommerell is an independent change management consultant and facilitator based in Hamburg, Germany. He has worked with the System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (Global Public Goods Project, Sustainability Plan) and Bioversity International (Priorities and Strategies Committee). Previously, he led strategy and organizational change management programmes and projects in international public sector and private sector organizations. He holds a Political Science BA from Middlebury College, Vermont, USA, the Certificat d’Etudes Politiques from the Institut d’Etudes Politiques, Paris, France, and a Political Science MA from New York University. He can be reached at victor@kommerell.com.

Acronyms and abbreviations

ADP	Accenture Development Partnership
AGM	Annual General Meeting
ALINe	Agriculture Learning and Impacts Network
ALNAP	Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance
BCG	Boston Consultant Group
CAS-IP	Central Advisory Service on Intellectual Property
CCER	Center-Commissioned External Review
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIF	Change Initiative Fund
CIMMYT	Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maíz y Trigo
CIO	Chief Information Officer
CIP	International Potato Center
DDGR	Deputy Director-General Research
DDG	Deputy Director-General
DFID	Department for International Development
DGIS	Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation
DG	Director-General
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GCARD	Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development
GFAR	Global Forum on Agricultural Research
GPG2	Global Public Goods - Phase 2
HR	human resources
IAU	Internal Audit Unit
IBM	International Business Machines
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
ICT-KM	Information and Communication Technology – Knowledge Management
IDRC	International Development Research Center
IE	impact evaluation
IA	impact assessment
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
ILAC	Institutional Learning and Change
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IP	intellectual property
IPG	international public good

IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research
ISPC	Interim Science and Partnership Council
IT	information technology
ITA	Impacts Targeting and Assessment
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
KM	knowledge management
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NARS	national agricultural research system
NGO	non-governmental organization
NRM	natural resources management
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OE	outcome evaluation
PIPA	Participatory Impact Pathways Analysis
PM&E	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
PMS	Performance Measurement System
PRGA	Participatory Research and Gender Analysis
RIU	Research Into Use
RMIT	Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
RST	Review Support Team
SEI	Stimulating and Evaluating Innovations
SGRP	System-wide Genetic Resources Programme
SHR&CM	Strategic HR and Change Management
SINGER	System-wide Information Network for Genetic Resources
SOU	System Office Unit
SPIA	Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SPME	Special Panel on Monitoring and Evaluation
SRF	Strategy and Results Framework
SRSS	Stripe Review of the Social Sciences
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TMT	Transition Management Team
TOR	Terms of Reference
US Gov	United States Government
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

The use of the term ‘impact evaluation’

The word ‘impact’, alone or in combination, is much used in CGIAR documents. ‘Impact evaluation’ (IE) is used in this report in contrast to the more specific term ‘impact assessment’, which can take place at the outset of a programme/project or several years after it has ended. Use of the broader term IE in this report was guided by how the results of research programmes are described – “outputs, outcomes, intermediate impacts and ultimate CGIAR-goal-related impacts⁹³” – and because, generally, these results are associated with different phases of a programme lifecycle and research-to-development chain, as well as with a wide variety of assessment and evaluation approaches and tools. In the CGIAR, the different kinds of results are associated with particular roles and responsibilities (e.g. Science Council/SPIA; intermediate and ultimate impact; ex post IE).

⁹³ See Kelley, Ryan and Gregersen (2008). A non-CGIAR expert interviewee had recommended using the term ‘outcome evaluation’, instead of IE.