

## **SPIA Activities Update**

*Prepared for SPIA 30 and SC 6 Meetings at CIAT in Bogota, Colombia, 9-13 Sept, 2006*

This progress report provides a brief update on SPIA activities since SC 5. Conclusions emerging from the SPIA 30 meeting on 9 September 2006 will be reported verbally by the SPIA Chair at SC 6 on 13 September. For reference, the SPIA Workplan for 2006-2007 is provided as supplementary documentation.

### **I. Recurring SPIA Activities**

#### **1.1. SPIA's role in the 2006 CGIAR Performance Measurement (PM) System**

The revised guidelines and framework for the 3A and 3B impact indicators served as a basis for rating performance on impact in 2006. For indicator 3A, all SPIA members participated in evaluating and scoring the four components (criteria) and in establishing an overall 1-10 rating for each centre. For indicator 3B, SPIA members drew extensively on the evaluations and scorings of six external impact assessment experts in rating each IA case study and producing an overall score for the centre. The assessment results and scores were submitted to the Science Council task force for confirmation and submitted through the on-line CGIAR PMI System. (See Lessons Learnt paper for a detailed account of the methodology used for SPIA's evaluation and the major lessons derived from the 2006 PMI exercise).

Although much improved compared to last year's submission, there remains considerable variability in the type and quality of 3A-related information reported. Some centers followed the guidelines carefully and provided relevant information on the different indicators of the four criteria; others seem to follow neither the format nor the instructions provided. SPIA has rated the submissions on the basis of how comprehensive the information was in the context of the guidelines. Instructions and guidelines for each criterion should be carefully followed in future. SPIA provided centres with both the overall scores on the 3A indicator as well as those on each of the four criteria which were used to compile the overall score.

There was also considerable variation in the type and quality of epIA case studies submitted (3B impact indicator). Some studies focused only on research products and their initial outcomes. Further analysis of economic and other benefits using empirical data on level of technology adoption and changes in cost and productivity would have improved the quality of these assessments. Some studies confounded the effects of technology, efforts to promote it and partners associated with these efforts. Sometimes the specific role the Center has played in realizing the impact was not clear. On methodology, a few studies applied appropriate, rigorous analytical methods to assess the impact of technology (or extension approach or policy recommendation). These are studies published or sent for publication in professional journals. Others are rather weak in their analytical content and hence the impact assessments are not as credible. Presentation of the counterfactual scenario is a critical aspect of research impact analysis, but only some studies provided this explicitly. Clarity of analytical approach, data used and attribution of benefits to research would have provided a good basis for counterfactuals. Several of the submissions were not considered by SPIA to be epIAs at all.

For example reviews of past IAs, consultant evaluation reports, studies in progress, etc. do not constitute epIAs. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, there were a number of good and even some outstanding examples of high quality studies (CIMMYT, IRRI, IFPRI, ICRISAT, CIP, WorldFish) which could well serve as models of good practice in conducting epIAs. It is planned to publish SC/SPIA Impact Assessment Briefs of the six best studies from these centres, hopefully in time for AGM 2006. This responds to the continual requests from donors for more impact highlights to be made available.

Overall, SPIA was pleased with the consistently high quality and comprehensive nature of the 60 external peer reviews it commissioned (2 reviews per study, 2 studies per center, 15 centers). This provided a good basis to “objectively” evaluate the impact indicator evaluating quality and rigour of epIA studies. There is still a danger of “pairing” two reviewers who are consistently “far apart” in their scores – but this was not evident among the pool of this year’s reviewers. SPIA provided feedback to each of the centers on their case studies in the form of an overall summary evaluation extracted from peer reviewers’ comments. More detailed assessments for each criterion/question could be made available to individual centers, should that be helpful.

Some key points for consideration in revising/improving the guidelines for the 3A and 3B impact indicators next year were identified and will be discussed initially at SPIA 30 and subsequently at the IA Focal Point Meeting in Nairobi.

*Specific points for consideration for implementing 3a impact indicator next year:*

- 1) Re-word Criteria/Indicators of performance for greater precision;
- 2) Information/data for indicators of performance may be requested in the form of “check-off” lists;
- 3) Consideration should be given by SPIA for evaluating the quality and relevance - not just quantity - of studies reported under epIA, conferences, etc.;
- 4) In rating the submissions, a standard method of adjustment for size of centre will be developed;
- 5) The weights applied across the four Criteria will be re-considered.

*Specific points for consideration for implementing 3b impact indicator in next round (2009):*

- 1) Need to re-iterate to Centers the importance of providing an adequate response to Question 1;
- 2) Information on Question 7 (externally reviewed, authorship) must be provided;
- 3) Submissions should be individual case studies of epIAs, and not books or lengthy manuscript;
- 4) How to score 3b in the next two years when no submissions will be asked for;
- 5) A suggestion was made at the last SPIA meeting that SPIA members should select from the PM 3b submissions the top-ranked epIA case studies for producing Impact Briefs;
- 6) Experiences with the PM exercise (3a and 3b impact indicators) will be the topic of a designated session at the upcoming IA Focal Point meeting in Nairobi in October, 2006.

## **1.2 Communication and Dissemination**

### ***CGIAR Impact Website***

The CGIAR Impact Website (<http://impact.cgiar.org/>) needs updating, particularly in regards to bibliographic update of CGIAR Centre impact assessment material and in establishing an

active ‘news and events’ site. A new P-3 staff member will be joining the SC Secretariat in December and will support SPIA activities such as these, including liaising with CGIAR centre staff to foster data entry and to facilitate the production of impact ‘briefs’ — short synopses of IA findings that are easily understandable and attractive to external audiences. CGIAR Centre staff need to be informed about how data can be entered and updated in the site, and appropriate incentives and modalities for data entry need to be established. This will be discussed at the SPIA IA Focal Point meeting in October.

The number of *visits* to the impact site has remained roughly the same since January 2006, averaging around 600 visits per month (with about 6,000 – 7,000 *hits* per month). This compares to about 3,200 *visits* to the GFAR site (at FAO) and about *visits* to the SC website (at CGIAR).

### ***Development of Impact Briefs***

As part of the expanded communication program, SPIA is producing on a regular basis SC/SPIA “Impact Briefs”. The impact briefs, short synopses of key IA findings, are concise (two pages in length) and are meant to be attractive to external audiences and made accessible through the CGIAR Impact website. The two most recent additions to the site are:

(a) “*Research Benefits Found to Heavily Outweigh Costs*”

<http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/SCBrief%20bfitcostan.pdf>

(b) “*How important are ex post impact assessment results for donor decisions?*”

<http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/SCBrief%20MemblnfNee.pdf>

SPIA is acquiring professional assistance from Green Ink in editing and packaging its full length study reports and designing and producing Impact Briefs. The following completed study reports and Briefs are under preparation:

- NRM IA green cover report and 7 + 1 case study Briefs;
- Africa impact study green cover report and Brief
- Policy-oriented research IA scoping study;
- Six Centre IA case study Briefs (from 3B submissions).

In due course, translations into French and Spanish will also be produced (for discussion at SPIA 30).

## **II. Completed or Soon-to-be Completed Initiatives**

### **2.1 Impact of the CGIAR on Poverty Alleviation**

The peer-reviewed manuscript edited by Michelle Adato and Ruth Meinzen-Dick has been approved for publication by the PRC of IFPRI. The former and current Chairs of SPIA have drafted and submitted a joint Foreword to the book, and the SC Secretariat will soon release the final installment (\$25,000) of an \$80,000 commitment that supported a range of dissemination and communication channels for this long-term project (policy briefs, discussion papers, CD roms seminars, workshops and staff travel to them), in addition to this final output -- the book. IFPRI has sent the manuscript to Johns Hopkins University Press for publishing. The SC Secretariat will be provided with 25 free copies of the book to the SC and IFPRI will distribute copies to key stakeholders of the System. SPIA will discuss with IFPRI the value and desirability of highlighting the main findings of the study at the forthcoming AGM 2006. The contents list of the book manuscript is given in Annex 1.

## 2.2 NRM Research Ex-post IA Study

*(The key results of this study were presented in the last SPIA Activity Update)*

This three-year project was completed in early 2006 but a number of carry-over activities related to publication and dissemination continue or have just been completed. A modified version of the white-cover report made available at AGM'05 was completed and sent to Green Ink for editing and publishing. Eight SC/SPIA impact briefs based on the 7 NRMR IA case studies and one synthesis report are being produced for distribution to donors at AGM '06 and put on the CGIAR Impact website. A book manuscript comprised of the full length IA case studies and various chapters including a methods review, a synthesis of results, lessons learnt and conclusions was submitted to CABI by the editors (Waibel and Zilberman) in August 2006. An updated book outline is given in annex 2. The book will be published in early 2007. SPIA members have been involved as co-authors of several chapters in the book and the SPIA Chair is writing the Foreword. FAO, on behalf of the SC Secretariat, negotiated an agreement with CABI that allows for reduced price buy back (250 copies) and permission to post the book in read-only format on the SC website and on CDs 6 months after publication.

## 2.3 Training Evaluation and Impact Assessment

The final report, including the SC Commentary, is now being printed. A short brief will be produced for distribution at AGM '06.

The study earns high marks as a strategic review of training in the CGIAR. However, as the Panel itself acknowledges, for various reasons it was not able to assess the impact of the investments in training the system has made (currently some \$30 million annually) on the goals of the CGIAR. This is disappointing and raises the question of the value and desirability of undertaking a specific impact assessment of components of the program where the databases might allow such a study. Some of the country case studies in the Annexes to the main report would provide promising starting points. They cite assertions and anecdotal information on impacts, although causalities and attributions are not verified or documented for the most part. An important issue to be addressed in such a study would be the extent to which training by the CGIAR generates private benefits in the form of increased remuneration and advancement opportunities to the trainee, and what additional international public good benefits accrue over and above these to the institutions and the economy to where the trainee returns; and of course importantly to the poor. The high attrition rates of trainees after they return to their home countries and the recognition by NARS that investments in them can be lost to other institutions (see the Bolivia case in the Annex, p. 32), suggest that a large portion of the impacts of training might be private and not public goods. Of course the fact that countries might gain rather than individual NARIs in such instances does not imply that CGIAR investment in training is not appropriate from a NPG or IPG perspective. However these are researchable issues that deserve to be explored further by SPIA and the SC.

The case studies reported on by the Panel did not include any "strong" NARS. To the extent that training in the CGIAR has increasingly been research- and researcher-led, and most has emphasized host countries as pointed out by the Panel, then maybe the study has not adequately captured those NARS who have benefited most. The SC suggests this offers a further possible rationale for a follow-up study of the impacts of CGIAR training on a selective basis.

## 2.4 CGIAR and NARS Research in Africa: Evidence of Impact To-date

*(The following major results of this study were presented in the last SPIA Activity Update)*

The report attempts to identify, assess, and synthesize available evidence of agricultural research impact, so as to offer a systematic answer to the question: *Has CGIAR and NARS partner investments targeted towards Sub-Saharan Africa been justified by documented benefits to date?* To answer this question, the study first develops a comprehensive inventory of all SSA impact assessments of research outputs attributable in part to the CGIAR system. A smaller body of literature is identified to estimate aggregate areas of adoption. The review indicates that over 11 million hectares are currently planted to CGIAR derived germplasm in the region; but there are few cases apart from improved varieties or biocontrol where adoption of research outputs has progressed beyond tens of thousands of hectares. The study then takes a meta-analysis approach to quantify aggregate economic benefits stemming from CGIAR and partner NARS research in the region. The meta-analysis is based on twenty-two studies identified from the inventory that calculated aggregate rates of return for CGIAR and partner investments in SSA. The economic benefits reported by studies, grouped on the basis of its analytical rigour, are aggregated and set against total investment by the CGIAR and NARS to determine if the total investment to date can be justified by documented benefits under a range of assumptions.

As a result, the study finds that aggregate investment is justified under a fairly wide range of suppositions, provided that benefits continue at their reported levels beyond 2004 (“*ex post + ex ante*” scenario). The aggregate benefit cost ratios under this scenario range between 1.12 and 1.64. If only reported benefits up to 2004 are included (“*ex post*” scenario), the benefit-cost ratio falls to less than unity for one of the most conservative scenario of “substantially demonstrated” benefits. However, a number of studies only calculate a single year of annual research benefits when benefits have been observed to continue for a number of years, so this treatment is probably excessively conservative. Under all scenarios, the vast majority of documented benefits stem from a relatively limited array of activities. Biological control results in more than 80% of all benefits in all scenarios, and more than 90% of these biocontrol benefits are attributed to control of the cassava mealybug. Close to 20% of total benefits result from crop genetic improvement, and less than one percent result from all other activities.

The report thus shows that aggregate documented benefits well exceed investment in research in a region better known for its development failures than agricultural productivity growth. However, there remains significant scope to better illustrate the benefits from agricultural investments in the region. A substantial proportion of documented wide scale and long-term adoption of improved varieties has never been subject to rigorous impact assessment. For example, the included benefits from more than half of the 8.9 million ha planted to CGIAR-related varieties (i.e., about 4.7 million ha) represent benefits from only one year of adoption data. Appropriate methods are also currently being developed for other portions of the CGIAR portfolio. Thus, the report concludes that in time, even the most generous of the aggregate ratios reported here should prove to be an underestimate, provided that additional effort is invested in further assessment.

### *Recent Update*

After circulating the externally peer-reviewed revised draft report to all Center IA Focal Points to ensure that no relevant Africa impact study had been overlooked in the meta-

analysis, and after revising the report in the light of comments received from SPIA members, the authors finalised the report. A SPIA Foreword had been added to the report and sent to Green Ink for final editing and publishing. A short 2-page SC/SPIA Impact Brief is being produced. The decision to undertake a second phase to this study which would focus on developing an explanatory typology for adoption and impact potential in the African context, was deferred.

## **2.5 Scoping Study on the Impacts of CGIAR Policy-oriented Research (POR).**

Shortly after SPIA 29, the scoping study draft report was circulated to key stakeholders including Dr Ammar Siamwala (Thailand), Dr. Carol Weiss (USA) and Fred Carden (IDRC, Canada). Fred Carden provided extensive comments on the document and was able to meet with Tim Kelley and James Stevenson in Rome in June. Fred Carden is an advocate for the Outcome Mapping approach and is somewhat sceptical of the possibility of assessing “impacts” of policy research, preferring to concentrate on what researchers do, rather than what ultimate ‘impacts’ their work has. He identifies attribution as the biggest problem when attempting impact assessment of POR and urges caution on quantifying economic impacts all along the length of the impact pathway – from POR to impact. He believes donors need to be educated about what is and is not feasible, and adjust their (unrealistic) expectations accordingly. SPIA’s position is that the attribution challenge is best addressed by decomposing the assessment into two separate components: demonstrating the contribution of POR to policy (influence), and assessing the impacts of policy change (impact). The idea that bridging the attribution gap in the middle of these two areas of study is unrealistic is currently being considered by SPIA with respect to plans for the main phase (see below).

SPIA has revised and restructured the scoping study report and submitted it to Green Ink for editing and publishing. A SC / SPIA Impact Brief will also be produced.

The report itself identifies the number, type and characteristics of the 25 CGIAR POR impact assessments published to-date and provides an evaluation of what has been achieved by the centres thus far. Some useful studies have been identified that document impact, e.g., rice policy in Vietnam and two studies in Bangladesh, and that document influence, e.g., the criteria and indicators for forest management, ASB programme and policy research in Malawi. Nevertheless, the majority of the IAs of CGIAR POR focused on diffusion. Given that the primary rationale for the study was to demonstrate accountability for the large investments made, this would seem to imply that a focus only on intermediate products such as outcomes, influences and policy responses is insufficient. Although documenting these elements is challenging enough, the report concludes that additional efforts must be devoted to moving further down along the impact pathway from research to the impact on ultimate goals of the CGIAR related to poverty alleviation, food security and environmental protection and enhancement. Thus, a major conclusion reached by SPIA in this scoping study is that given the total investment to date in POR by the CGIAR, conservatively estimated at over \$800 million, the range and number of POR impact assessments, particularly those that go beyond mere ‘diffusion’ to examine ‘influence’ and ‘impact’, seems inadequate. This is especially so when compared to crop germplasm improvement impact assessments. Having said this, SPIA recognizes the higher degree of difficulty and methodological challenges inherent in attempting to document impact from POR. The report provides several options for the consideration of SPIA in a second phase to remedy the deficiency in the number and scope of POR IAs to date. These will be considered in consultation with the IA focal points at the planned meeting in October, 2006.

### III. Initiatives in the Pipeline for Commencement in 2006 and 2007

As in the previous workplan and budget, SPIA will focus on one major assessment each year in addition to several other smaller, desk-type studies, and one or two scoping papers to bring new major topics into the pipeline for future years. Based on the outcomes of discussions from the last SPIA meeting and developments since then, SPIA plans to focus on the following studies in 2006 and 2007, subject to further deliberation at SPIA 30:

- First priority (in 2006-07) will be given to the ‘CGIAR policy-oriented research impact assessment’ study (main phase);
- High priority to the IA Focal Point Meeting (October 2006) and Development of Strategic Guidelines (see description below);
- Priority to an exploratory study of the ‘CGIAR agricultural research benefit diffusion and impacts in South Asia’;
- The two study proposals ‘Developing improved understanding of perceived (but undocumented) impacts’ and ‘Towards a Demand-Led Ex-Post Evaluation Strategy for Meeting Internal Learning Needs in the CGIAR’ will be taken up as scoping studies to begin in 2007.
- As SPIA decided not to undertake a stand alone IA of participatory research at the SPIA 29 meeting in Cotonou, it has been decided, in consultation with SPME, that the forthcoming review of the Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) would include a review of the literature on the impacts of participatory research as a component of the PRGA review.

#### 3.1 CGIAR Policy-oriented Research Impacts/Influence (main study)

The overall conclusions from the scoping study indicated that, while good examples of effective diffusion and influence of CGIAR research on national and international policies exist, a more credible set of studies documenting influence and impact further down the impact pathway is both desirable and feasible. Thus it was decided to undertake a second phase to this study. This second phase may involve a series of case study IAs in cooperation with CGIAR Centres and some focal group meetings with policy makers and other selected users of policy research, as well as some other means to document more rigorously the impact pathways and to the extent possible the impacts of POR in the CGIAR. Three options (or combinations) are now being considered by SPIA in undertaking a second (main) phase of this study:

- a. select from the existing set of 25 PORIA supply-side studies two or three that document ‘influence’ and seek to extend those analyses to include ‘impacts’, i.e., quantify economic and non-economic benefits associated with the documented policy changes;
- b. undertake new studies (probably one or two) using multi-disciplinary demand-side perspectives that seek to identify and document the influence/impact of CGIAR POR work as well as other providers of research and advocacy in significant policy changes that have occurred in the past;
- c. identify one completed CGI / IPM supply-side impact assessment for which success depended critically on a specific science policy or facilitation of a regulation (e.g., cassava mealy bug) and attempt to attribute part of the already estimated overall benefits achieved to the supportive POR that was required, i.e., identifying the technologically- and policy-attributable impacts of the successful research;

SPIA is currently reflecting on the feasibility and desirability for each of these options. One possibility would be to select one or two cases from each option (a) to (c). However, there may also be more value to one of these approaches than the others. This requires further reflection and advice. With assistance from a senior consultant (Bruce Gardner) who will provide intellectual leadership and coordination for the second phase, SPIA will in due course outline specific options for the next stage of this study and finalize these at the SPIA – CGIAR IA focal point meeting in October 2006. Part of his ToR entails pushing the methodological frontiers of impact assessment for POR and related empirical application, i.e., reviewing the conceptual and methodological literature and proposing novel methods for new case studies and selecting from options (a) through (c) for empirical application. With respect to option (a), of the 25 POR case-studies identified in the scoping study, 7 in particular were identified for more detailed consideration for extending to impact. James Stevenson reviewed these 7 candidates and provided a brief written analysis. This was discussed with Bruce Gardner during his visit to Rome in July, 2006, and James Stevenson was subsequently tasked with collecting and summarizing the relevant methodological literature.

A strategic issue to consider is to what extent the main phase of this PORIA should involve a multidisciplinary approach. Should sociologists, political scientists, and historians complement economists in order to better capture the complexities of policy making processes, and thereby improve our ability to assess influences, outcomes, responses and impacts? If so, is this best done in a demand- and/or supply-driven approach? Regardless, there is a need for better qualitative interview/elicitation/survey approaches and empirical/statistical analyses of these in future. Perhaps these other disciplines have useful experience in using such techniques and can enhance IA capacities in the centres as a spillover to being more heavily involved in PORIAs in a second phase? Jim Ryan, Bruce Gardner and James Stevenson have exchanged literature by possible candidates and SPIA will be looking to hire a consultant to provide expertise in the area of political science or history.

Plans are underway to present case-study options for consideration at the Impact Assessment Focal Point Meeting at ICRAF, Nairobi in October 2006. The main phase TOR include provision for a planning meeting with case-study leaders and invited experts in December 2006, a review workshop in August 2007, with a planned completion of the main phase by the end of November 2007.

### **3.2 CGIAR & NARS Research in Africa: Development of an Explanatory Typology for Adoption and Impact Potential (Phase II)**

Although SPIA and SC members consider that this study has considerable merit, there was discussion at the SPIA 29 / SC 5 over whether SPIA or Centres themselves were best placed to undertake this follow up study. No definitive decision was taken in this regard but SPIA has decided to defer action on this study given the current agenda. This could be revisited in consultation with the centres after the publication of the “green cover” report of phase I later in 2006.

### **3.3 Impacts of Participatory Research (PR) in the CGIAR (scoping study)**

As indicated above, in consultation with SPME, SPIA has decided to include a literature review of studies of the impact of PR as a component of the PRGA review. This review will assess: (i) whether there is sufficient evidence of the added value of PR over conventional

methods of conducting research and if not, (ii) whether it would be worthwhile and justified for SPIA to conduct an in-depth assessment of the impacts of participatory research in the CGIAR. The PR impact component of the PRGA review will review the literature that has been produced in and outside the system on participatory research impacts. If the PRGA review finds that additional primary studies of PR impacts is justified, then SPIA will have to resolve a number of methodological issues in order to be able to move ahead with such a study, either in 2007 or 2008, depending on availability of resources.

### **3.4 CGIAR Research Benefit Diffusion & Impacts in South Asia (Phase I desk study)**

South Asia is the region of the world with the greatest number of poor people. Clearly agricultural research has had highly successful productivity effects in the region, but poverty, hunger and malnutrition persists to a degree uncharacteristic of any other region that benefited strongly from the Green Revolution. There is a great deal of material on the impacts of the CGIAR and agricultural research in South Asia available through the centres and done by others. However, a lot of attention in this region (positive and negative) has focused mainly on the Green Revolution crops--rice and wheat. It is therefore highly timely to conduct a comprehensive and integrated assessment of overall impacts of CGIAR activities in the region to: 1) identify cross commodity effects. For example, by investing heavily in rice and wheat improvement did South Asia create a negative bias towards the development of coarse grains, and did this bias have an adverse impact on the food, income and nutritional security of the poorest of the poor. 2) assess (positive and negative) impacts of increased productivity in wheat and rice system beyond increased incomes and food production, and 3) evaluate impacts of improved agricultural technology on different target groups (rural vs. urban; irrigated vs. dryland, etc.).

The vision of SPIA is to see the South Asia impact study addressing these issues/ challenges and evolving in to two phases. Phase I would be exploratory and a desk study that would define the key knowledge gaps, which would be addressed in a more in-depth assessment in Phase II. The overall outcome of this regional impact study would be a comprehensive documentation of the impacts of CGIAR research in South Asia to date with the objectives of: a) Providing a systematic assessment of how CGIAR system investments have performed in terms of achieving its goals, b) Identification of knowledge gaps and researchable questions that will help provide such systematic assessment of impacts, and c) Improving the understanding of the opportunities for, and impediments to, agricultural technology enhancement as a strategy for achieving CGIAR goals viz., poverty alleviation, food security and environmental sustainability. We believe this study will relate to accounting for CGIAR investments in the South Asia region, both to the donors who fund the research and to regional members and clients in the regions.

SPIA is currently seeking input from people with expertise and experience in that region to design the phase I of this proposed study. One of the outcomes of this consultation process will be the development of the Terms of Reference that spells out the scope of this study, including its focus/approach.

### **3.5. Impact Assessment Focal Point Meeting and Strategic Guidelines Development**

The planned IA Focal Points meeting being organized by SPIA on October 5-7 arose primarily from a felt need by many of the CGIAR focal points to get together to review methodologies and approaches to IA, since it had been more than six years since the previous

meeting. In that time there has been a growing interest on the part of CG investors in impact assessment, many new IA staff appointed at the centres, the introduction of the performance measurement system and a number of new initiatives that SPIA has been engaged in or is planning that require centre involvement. These provided the major rationale for the meeting.

ICRAF is hosting the IA Focal Point Meeting in Nairobi. IA focal points from all 15 centres and 4 challenge programs have been invited to give brief presentations to the meeting, updating everyone on current and future IA activities. SPIA members Jim Ryan, Mywish Maredia and Flavio Avila will chair these sessions. Donor representatives and guest experts have also been invited. An agenda for the meeting is given in Annex 3

The overall objective of the meeting is “Advancing Impact Assessment of International Agricultural Research”. SPIA wishes to review past experiences of the centres, draw lessons and plan for the future by focussing especially on a number of topics described in the attached draft agenda. These have been identified in consultation with the focal points. The more specific objectives of the meeting include building up our knowledge of “best practices” in IA to include in a strategic guidelines document by sharing experiences, identifying where centres and SPIA can work collaboratively on key aspects of IA and obtain commitments to do so, identify how and where we can together better communicate the results of IA in the CGIAR, and how we can improve the performance measurement system.

James Stevenson and Tim Kelley are working on developing the outline of the Strategic Guidelines document, in consultation with Hans Gregersen, Mywish Maredia, Flavio Avila, and Jim Ryan. The proposed outline will be presented at the Impact Assessment Focal Point Meeting in October, and subsequently revised, before the process of commissioning a senior consultant to write the main body of the text begins.

## **Annex 1 – Contents list of the forthcoming poverty book manuscript**

### **Agricultural Research, Livelihoods and Poverty: Economic and Social Impacts in Six Countries**

**Michelle Adato and Ruth Meinzen-Dick, editors**

#### **CONTENTS**

- |     |                                                                                                                                                                                                        |      |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1.  | <b>Introduction and Overview</b><br>Michelle Adato and Ruth Meinzen-Dick                                                                                                                               | 1-1  |
| 2.  | <b>Studying Poverty Impact Using Livelihoods Analysis and Quantitative Methods: Conceptual Frameworks and Research Methods</b><br>Michelle Adato, Ruth Meinzen-Dick, Peter Hazell, and Lawrence Haddad | 2-1  |
| 3.  | <b>Rice Research, Technological Progress, and Impacts on the Poor: The Bangladesh Case</b><br>Mahabub Hossain, David Lewis, Manik L. Bose, and Alamgir Chowdhury                                       | 3-1  |
| 4.  | <b>An Integrated Economic and Social Analysis to Assess the Impact of Vegetable and Fishpond Technologies on Poverty in Rural Bangladesh</b><br>Kelly Hallman, David Lewis, and Suraiya Begum          | 4-1  |
| 5.  | <b>The Impact of Agroforestry-Based Soil Fertility Replenishment Practices on the Poor in Western Kenya</b><br>Frank Place, Michelle Adato, Paul Hebinck, and Mary Omosa                               | 5-1  |
| 6.  | <b>Assessing the Impact of HYV Maize in Resettlement Areas of Zimbabwe</b><br>Michael Bourdillon, Paul Hebinck, and John Hoddinott with Bill Kinsey, John Marondo, Netsayi Mudege, and Trudy Owens     | 6-1  |
| 7.  | <b>The Impact of Improved Maize Germ Plasm on Poverty Alleviation: The Case of Tuxpeño-Derived Material in Mexico</b><br>Mauricio R. Bellon, Michelle Adato, Javier Becerril, and Dubravka Mindek      | 7-1  |
| 8.  | <b>National and International Agricultural Research and Rural Poverty: The Case of Rice Research in India and China</b><br>Shenggen Fan, Connie Chan-Kang, Keming Qian and K. Krishnaiah               | 8-1  |
| 9.  | <b>Agricultural Research and Urban Poverty in China and India</b><br>Shenggen Fan                                                                                                                      | 9-1  |
| 10. | <b>The Impacts of Agricultural Research on Poverty: Synthesis of Results and Implications for Future Directions</b><br>Ruth Meinzen-Dick and Michelle Adato                                            | 10-1 |

## **Annex 2 – Annotated outline of Natural Resource Management (NRM) research book**

### **The Impact of NRM research: lessons from the CGIAR (Revised CABI Book Title)**

#### **Preface**

Hans Gregersen, SPIA former chair

*(short description of SPIA's work, the rationale for impact assessment and the history of the study on NRM research impact including the role of NRM in the CGIAR relative to research on Crop Genetic Improvement; 3pp)*

#### **Part I: Introduction**

Ch 1: Editors Introduction. What is NRM?

David Zilberman and Hermann Waibel (editors)

*(NRM: Management and Natural Resources Policy, definition of NRM and specification of NRM research in agriculture globally, not only CGIAR; features of NRM research; issues in impact assessment of NRM research; literature review, Pearce, Barbier, Swinton and others, what is the purpose of the book, who is the audience, what does it have to offer? 10 pp)*

Ch 2: The history of NRM research in the CGIAR and its impacts

Hans Gregersen and Tim Kelley

*(this chapter would explain the evolution of NRM in the CG, why and how it has emerged, what its current status is, the major NRM programs and the budget share by Centre, etc; it would also talk about the concept of INRM, why it has emerged and what it could add to NRM, 10 pp.).*

Ch 3: Productivity enhancement and NRM

David Zilberman, Prabhu Pingali, Leslie Lipper and Hermann Waibel,

*(This will be the conceptual and theoretical framework of the book presented in a formal manner using a necessary of mathematics; the chapter will address the relationship between agricultural production, natural resource management and environment; it will look at the implications of agricultural inputs on environment and natural resources; it will discuss natural resources are sources of outputs (e.g. fisheries), heterogeneity, aggregation, output supply, input demand, supply of environmental services and natural resource demand will be treated in a theoretical manner and by making use of examples: some examples will make reference to the cases studies, some will drawn on other CGIAR NRM projects (e.g. the cassava mealy bug research) some examples will also be drawn from the Shifera/Freeman/Swinton NRM book, a distinction will be made between micro and macro projects in NRM.)*

#### **Part II: Recent NRM cases studies: what do they tell us?**

Ch 4: Overview and summary

David Zilbermann and Hermann Waibel

*(summarizes and compares the studies using a common framework, like the one we started in Hannover and further developed at the IRRRI workshop, David's summary comments of Hannover and the Los Banos workshop; and the revised synthesis of AGM 05 report, 25 pp)*

Ch 5 – 11 : the seven case studies by the Centers

Authors: Case study leaders (limit number of authors to five per study)

*(the structure of the chapters should be consistent, i.e. the research product, the IPG nature, the CG contribution, adoption, farm level impact, economic impact and rate of return, uncertainty, complimentary success stories; 25 pp each)*

### **Part III: Lessons learned and the way ahead**

Ch 12: Lessons from the case studies

David Zilberman Hans Gregersen, Tim Kelley and Hermann Waibel

*(this chapter highlights the lessons learned from the NRM impact case studies; what are the methodological challenges, why some components were missing, implications for policy of NRM within and outside the CGIAR , where are the challenges for increasing the impact of NRM research for development, relationship with PGI research, etc; 20 pp).*

Ch 13: Economics and Impact Assessment of NRM research: The way ahead

David Zilberman, and Hermann Waibel

*theoretical and formal analysis of how NRM can be treated in an economic framework in future impact assessment and what conclusions can be drawn from it, second part of the chapter will have recommendations of how to do good NRM IA and serve as guidelines for future work, with strong connection to economic theory, 20 pp)*

### Annex 3 - Draft Agenda for the IA Focal Point Meeting in Nairobi (5-7 October 2006)

Draft of August 14<sup>th</sup> 2006

<b>THURSDAY 5<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER</b>	
8.30	<b>1) Welcome</b> Jim Ryan (SPIA/SC Chair) and Dennis Garrity (DG ICRAF)
8.35	<b>2) Introduction</b> Jim Ryan (15 mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme outline – Opening out for suggestions on revisions</li> <li>• SPIA background and update</li> </ul> Frank Place (ICRAF IA Focal Point, 5 – 10 mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Welcome and logistics</li> </ul>
9.00	<b>3) Presentations by centre focal points</b> Chair: Mywish Maredia WorldFish – Madan Dey WARDA – Aliou Diagne IWMI – R. Maria Saleth IIRI – Debbie Templeton IPGRI – Jamie Watts ILRI – Ade Freeman IITA – Steffen Abele
10.45	Coffee
11.00	Chair: Flavio Avila IFPRI – Jock Anderson ICRIAT – Jupiter Ndjeunga / Cynthia Bantilan ICRAF – Frank Place ICARDA – Kamel Shideed CIP – Charlie Crissman CIMMYT – Roberto LaRovere / John Dixon CIFOR – David Raitzer CIAT – Nina Lilja
13.00	Lunch
14.00	Chair: Jim Ryan Sub-Saharan Africa CP – Adrienne Martin Harvest Plus - J. Meenakshi Generation CP – Carmen de Vicente
15.00	<b>4) Performance Measurement Impact Indicators 3a and 3b</b> Chair: Jim Ryan Presentation: Tim Kelley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria and indicators used</li> <li>• Evaluation process</li> <li>• Areas for improvement</li> <li>• General discussion</li> <li>• Identifying key topics for break-out groups</li> </ul>
16.15	Coffee
16.30	<b>5) Strategic guidelines for conducting ex-post IA</b> Chair: Phil Pardey Presentation: Mywish Maredia <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objectives / Purpose</li> <li>• Outline of project contents</li> <li>• General discussion and feedback</li> </ul>
18.00	Close

<b>FRIDAY 6<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER</b>	
8.30	<b>6) Policy-oriented research impact assessment</b> Chair: Jim Ryan Presentation: Bruce Gardner (supplemented by David Raitzer) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed 4-6 centre case studies</li> <li>• Modalities / timetable</li> <li>• Discussion</li> </ul>
9.30	<b>7) Break-out into 3 groups for discussion on items 4, 5 and 6</b> (Coffee break at 11.00)
12.00	<b>8) IA for Accountability and Learning</b> Chair: Meredith Soule Panel discussion: Jamie Watts (IPGRI), David Raitzer (CIFOR), John Dixon (CIMMYT), Debbie Templeton (IRRI), Frank Place (ICRAF) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topics to be identified</li> </ul>
13.00	Lunch
14.00	<b>9) Measurement of non-economic impacts</b> Chair: Prabhu Pingali Presentation: Sergio Salles Filho MM's framework for non-economic impacts inc. latent genetic diversity in common cultivars, and other issues relating to new SPs
15.15	<b>10) Impact webpage / Impact Briefs</b> Chair: ? Presentation: Jim Ryan / Tim Kelley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centre uploading</li> <li>• Role for SPIA in quality control?</li> </ul>
16.00	<b>11) Reporting back by break-out groups</b> Chair: Jim Ryan
18.00	Close
<b>SATURDAY 7<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER</b>	
8.30-12.30	<b>12) Open session on topics suggested by IA focal points</b> Inter-centre / NARS / other partner collaborations (WARDA, ICRISAT, IITA, ICRAF) Maintenance research (CIMMYT) Outcome mapping approaches (ILRI) Institutionalisation of funding / sharing information for IA (IPGRI) Scaling-up approaches (ICRAF) Measures of relevance and importance of impacts in performance measurement? CIE impact study of training?