

# SPIA Activities Update

*Prepared for SPIA 31 and SC 7 Meetings  
ICRISAT, Hyderabad, India, 26 - 30 March 2006*

This progress report provides a brief update on SPIA activities since SC 6 in September 2006 in Cali, Colombia. Conclusions emerging from the SPIA 31 meeting on Monday, 26 March will be reported verbally by the SPIA Chair at SC 7 on Thursday, 29 March. For reference, the original and a current draft revised 2006-2007 SPIA Workplan are provided as supplementary documentation.

## I. Recurring SPIA Activities

### 1.1. SPIA's role in the CGIAR PM System: Evaluating 3a and 3b impact indicators

SPIA summarized the 2006 3a and 3b impact indicator evaluation process, including lessons learnt and suggested areas for improvement/modification for next year on pages 10-14 of the SC document *Implementation of the CGIAR Performance Measurement System in 2005: Moving forward (October 2006)*. Some of the main points highlighted in that document were:

- Criteria/Indicators of the 3a performance measure should be refined for greater precision. SPIA should consider how the quality and relevance of studies and activities reported under indicator 3a can be more readily and clearly derived from the information and data provided by the Centers.
- Information/data for indicators of performance may be requested in the form of “check-off” lists (with supporting information/data/description) rather than relying on the submitted narration, in order to (i) make the evaluation process less subjective, and (ii) ease the report writing burden for the impact assessment focal points (IAFPs).
- A standard method of adjustment for size of Center should be developed, but for this to be meaningful, resources allocated to epIA activities must be provided by Centers.
- The weights applied across the four criteria used in the assessment of indicator 3a should be re-considered.
- SPIA suggests that the scores received by Centers in 2006 for 3b (covering the 2003-2005 period) will carry-over for the next two years until 2009 when the next assessment is undertaken (covering the 2006-2008 period).

These and other PM related points were discussed at the IAFP Meeting in Nairobi in October (see Sec 3.3 below). Indeed, a special session was devoted to this topic. In the session, Jim Ryan provided an overview of the 3a and 3b impact indicators – the criteria, indicators and weights currently used, highlighted some key observations from this year's exercise, and outlined potential improvements in the process for next year's exercise. He first clarified, however, that the PM indicator for impact is NOT a measure of the magnitude, extent or value (i.e., importance) of Centres' impacts. Rather, it focuses on Centers' capacity to measure the impacts of previous research through *ex post* impact assessments (epIAs) and to promote an impact culture. Several themes and issues emerging from the presentation were discussed:

(i) *Competitive nature of the exercise: Does the PM exercise provide a strong disincentive for cooperation among centres?*

(ii) *Status of ex-ante studies/outcome mapping in PM exercise: falling through the cracks.*

- (iii) *Precluding potential for innovation: Are the 3a criteria too restrictive? By defining epIA so tightly under the PM exercise, there is little room for innovation. What about work on innovation systems that allow us to get a better idea of processes and accommodate learning?*
- (iv) *Factoring in age, size and orientation of centres explicitly in the 3a criteria.*
- (v) *Status of the Challenge Programmes under the PM impact criteria.*
- (vi) *For the 3b impact indicator: re-submitting two epIAs in the following two years.*
- (vii) *Goal displacement associated with the criteria (17 sub-indicators are too many).*

After taking into account the discussion and general consensus that emerged on some of these points, SPIA modified the format of the 3a impact indicator (3b remains as is). A major objective was responding to requests from Center IAFPs to simplify and add transparency to the assessment of this indicator. For this reason SPIA developed a checklist replacing the narrative that was requested earlier, but essentially asking for the same information as requested last year. The revised draft guidelines for the current PM exercise were shared with Doug Pachico, Chair of the ADE and with all Centre/CP IA focal points for feedback on factual errors and areas that needed more clarification. Comments were very positive and SPIA, in the light of some suggestions from the IA FPs and the SC Director (reversing order of Criteria 2 and 3 and adding a footnote indicating that centres are not expected to provide information on all the sub-components necessarily), the 2006 3a impact indicator instructions were revised and finalized (see Appendix I).

The specific weights to sub-components/indicators and scoring procedures are currently being finalized....

## 1.2 Communication and Dissemination

### *CGIAR Impact Website*

The CGIAR Impact Website (<http://impact.cgiar.org/>) needs updating, particularly in regard to a bibliographic update of CGIAR Centre impact assessment material and in establishing an active 'news and events' site. Some assistance from FAO staff has been given very recently, but it still requires a dedicated effort. A new P-3 staff member has joined the SC Secretariat in December, Nega Wubeneh, and he 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 was discussed at the IAFP meeting in October. Instruction sheets on how to upload documents to the CGIAR Impact website were circulated to IAFPs, including details of user names and passwords. A content management system (found at <http://www.fao.org/eims/secretariat/cgiar/default.asp>) has been set up by SPIA to enable focal points to do this quickly and easily, in the hope that the site remains an up-to-date resource for researchers. A demonstration of how to do use the system was given by James Stevenson and questions were invited at the IAFP meeting in Nairobi in October. The initial upload, to be done by focal points, is to a secure site that is then accessed by SPIA, who check over the data entry before approving it to appear on-line.

The number of visits to the impact website shows an upward trend, especially since October, 2006. The average number of monthly hits for 2006 was 576 but the monthly hits for January and February 2007 were 787 and 668. A closer look at the key words and phrases used by the searches indicates that types of impact assessment; methodologies for assessment of impact of agricultural technologies on health, nutrition, environment and socio-economic impacts; counterfactuals; and attribution (causal pathways) are most commonly used. This will help guide SPIA in producing and making available information that is relevant to users.

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

As part of the expanded communication program, SPIA has contracted Green Ink to produce SC/SPIA “Impact Briefs”, short synopses of its key IA findings. These are concise (two-four pages in length) and are meant to be attractive to external audiences and are made accessible through the CGIAR Impact website. The most recent additions to the site are:

(a) *Policy-oriented research IA scoping study. (Brief N. 18) November 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/CG\\_SC\\_POR-final-cra%20APPROVED%20TO%20PRINT.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/CG_SC_POR-final-cra%20APPROVED%20TO%20PRINT.pdf)

(b) *NRM case study briefs: Natural Resources Management Research by the CGIAR: Evidence of Impacts (Brief N. 17) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/17\(Overview\)-Final\\_l-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/17(Overview)-Final_l-r.pdf)

(c) *NRM case study briefs: ICRAF: Fertilizer Trees: Rejuvenating soils in Southern Africa (Brief N. 16) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/16\(ICRAF\)-Final\\_l-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/16(ICRAF)-Final_l-r.pdf)

(d) *NRM case study briefs: CIAT: Participation Works: Evidence from Thailand and Vietnam (Brief N. 15) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/16\(ICRAF\)-Final\\_l-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/16(ICRAF)-Final_l-r.pdf)

(e) *NRM case study briefs: IWMI: Tracing the outcomes of research on Irrigation Management Transfer (Brief N. 14) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/16\(ICRAF\)-Final\\_l-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/16(ICRAF)-Final_l-r.pdf)

(f) *NRM case study briefs: CIMMYT: When Zero means plenty: the Impact of zero tillage in India (Brief N. 13) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/13\(CIMMYT\)-Final\\_l-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/13(CIMMYT)-Final_l-r.pdf)

(g) *NRM case study briefs: ICARDA: Fighting land degradation in the drylands: NRM technologies for crop-livestocking farming (Brief N. 12) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/12\(ICARDA\)-Final\\_l-r2.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/12(ICARDA)-Final_l-r2.pdf)

(h) *NRM case study briefs: WORLD FISH: Development and dissemination of integrated aquaculture-agriculture technologies in Malawi (Brief N. 11) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/11\(WF\)-Final\\_l-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/11(WF)-Final_l-r.pdf)

(i) *NRM case study briefs: CIFOR: From Infancy to maturity: research on criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management (Brief N. 10) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/10\(CIFOR\)-Final\\_l-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/10(CIFOR)-Final_l-r.pdf)

(j) *CGIAR and NARS research in SSA (Green Report synth. brief): Costs and benefits of CGIAR-NARS research in sub-saharan Africa (Brief N 9) October 2006*

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/09\(SSA\)-Final\\_l-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/09(SSA)-Final_l-r.pdf)

(k) Center IA case study brief: IRRI: *The impact of modern rice varieties on livelihoods in Bangladesh* (Brief N 8) October 2006

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/08\(IRRI\)-Final\\_1-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/08(IRRI)-Final_1-r.pdf)

(l) Center IA case study brief: CIMMYT: *Impacts of international wheat breeding in the developing World* (Brief N 7) October 2006

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/07\(CIMMYT\)-Final\\_1-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/07(CIMMYT)-Final_1-r.pdf)

(n) Center IA case study brief: WORLDFISH: *Improved Tilapia benefits Asia* (Brief N 6) October 2006

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/06\(WF\)-Final\\_1-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/06(WF)-Final_1-r.pdf)

(o) Center IA case study brief: CIP: *CIP's contribution to the genetic improvement of the potato* (Brief N 5) October 2006

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/05\(CIP\)-Final\\_1-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/05(CIP)-Final_1-r.pdf)

(p) Center IA case study brief: ICRISAT: *Spillover Increases Returns to Sorghum Enhancement* (Brief N 4) October 2006

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/04\(ICRISAT\)-Final\\_1-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/04(ICRISAT)-Final_1-r.pdf)

(q) Center IA case study brief: IFPRI: *Impacts of a "Food for Education" Program in Bangladesh* (Brief N 3) October 2006

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/03\(IFPRI\)-Final\\_1-r.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/activities/spia/pubs/03(IFPRI)-Final_1-r.pdf)

In due course, translations into French and Spanish will also be produced but there is no budget provision for this in 2007. The feasibility and timeliness of publishing these briefs in French and Spanish in 2008 will be discussed at SPIA 31).

## II. Completed Initiatives – Publication Follow-up

### 2.1 Impact of the CGIAR on Poverty Alleviation

Proofs for the book manuscript edited by Michelle Adato and Ruth Meinzen-Dick have now been corrected. The book is in the final production stage at JHUP. The complete reference is: Adato, Michelle and Ruth Meinzen-Dick, editors. 2007. *Agricultural Research, Livelihoods and Poverty: Studies of Economic and Social Impacts in Six Countries*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. See link at [http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/title\\_pages/9358.html](http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/title_pages/9358.html)

### 2.2 NRM Research Ex-post IA Study

Final Synthesis (green cover) report published and 8 NRM Impact Briefs produced and distributed at AGM '06. A final draft of the book manuscript "International research on natural resource management: Advances in impact assessment" was submitted to CABI by editors D. Zilberman and H. Waibel in early December 2006. SPIA members were involved in co-authoring several chapters in the book and the former SPIA Chair wrote the Foreword. A formal publishing agreement between FAO and CABI has been signed. The agreement 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 green cover report and a short Impact Brief were produced and distributed at AGM '06. Although the SC Commentary alludes to the possibility of a follow-up study, at this point, SPIA has no plans to undertake a follow-up study of the impact of CGIAR training on a selective basis.

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

The final green cover report and an Impact Brief were completed in time for distribution at AGM '06. A special luncheon session was also held at AGM '06 where the key results of the study were presented and discussed (see attached programme). At the IAFP meeting in Nairobi in early October, the IA focal points discussed the results and implications of the study, focusing in particular on whether a more in-depth analysis of adoption and impact trends in SSA was deemed useful. No clear consensus emerged as to whether a follow-up study should be undertaken, and if so, led by whom (SPIA or centres). The study authors – Maredia and Raitzer - plan to submit a shortened version of the study report to an appropriate journal.

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

The report was edited and finalized in November '06, but the green cover document not published and distributed until recently due to a printing error/delay. An Impact Brief, however, was produced and circulated at AGM '06. Plans are now underway to submit a shortened version of the scoping study report to the new journal *Evidence and Policy*.

## **III. Major Initiatives in the Pipeline in 2007**

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

The scoping study concluded that a more credible set of studies documenting CGIAR POR influence and impact further down the impact pathway was both desirable and feasible and outlined several options for undertaking a second phase involving both centre case studies and new methods development (since the latter was perceived to be at least partly responsible for insufficient evidence generated to date). The results of the scoping study and the various options for the main study were presented and discussed at the IA Focal Points meeting in Nairobi. Issues were discussed such as relative priority to methodological challenges in attributing influence vs. empirical challenges in documenting impact from policy changes, use of demand-led vs. supply-led approaches or hybrid (scissors approach), importance of establishing the counterfactual and learning vs. accountability objectives (latter was emphasised). Some attention was given to what the relevant criteria should be in selecting PORIA case studies for the second phase (demonstrable impact achieved, cherry picked cases, less complex impact pathways, cross section of centres work).

A RFP was sent out by the SPIA Chair in early November to all Centres and CPs soliciting PORIA case study proposals. 10 clearly defined criteria for selection were given with an emphasis on “rigour, originality and feasibility of the research plan to provide credible estimates when measuring impacts or establishing influence”. 14 proposals from 11 Centres were received, from which SPIA members and consultants identified the 7 most promising:

- Bioversity: *Impact of In-Trust Agreements between FAO and the CGIAR centres*
- CIFOR: *CIFOR's influence on policy and practice in the pulp and paper sector*
- ICARDA: *Fertilizer use on barley in Syria*
- IFPRI: *Transfers out of poverty*
- ILRI: *Dairy marketing in Kenya & East Africa*
- IRRI: *Pesticide use & Philippine farmer health*
- WorldFish: *Community-based fisheries management in Bangladesh*

SPIA is providing intellectual support in the form of guidance from IA experts and some financial incentive (\$15,000 for each case study) to help support Centres efforts.

A 2-day planning workshop was held at IFPRI HQ in late February 2007 to review the methods proposed for documenting influence and impact from POR in each case study and to agree on a timeframe for completing the studies. A broad range of topics were discussed in the context of the proposals presented. The program and a brief summary of the deliberations can be found in Appendix II.

SPIA is fortunate to have Bruce Gardner (Univ of Maryland) providing intellectual leadership and coordination for the overall study, helping to push the methodological frontiers of impact assessment for POR in identifying novel methods for the case studies. SPIA also realizes a more multidisciplinary approach is required, drawing on the fields of sociology and political science, to better capture the complexities of policy making processes, and thereby improve the ability to assess influences, outcomes, responses and impacts. Hence, Rob Paarlberg (political scientist, Wellesley College) and Carol Weiss (sociologist, Harvard University) are also involved in this project. All three consultants attended and actively participated in the planning meeting in Washington DC and all three will be assisting SPIA in providing guidance to the case study leaders on their detailed workplans (due 15 March).

The proposed timetable for completing phase II of the study is as follows:

- SPIA call for proposals: 7 November (completed)
- Deadline for submissions: 15 December (completed)
- Notification of awardees: 20 January (completed)
- Workshop on methods: 20-21 February (completed)
- Detailed case study workplans with full methodology details submitted: 15 March
- Consolidated project leader/consultants' comments back to study leaders: 10 April
- Progress report submitted to SPIA: 30 May
- First draft report submitted to SPIA: 15 August
- SPIA comments sent back to centers\*: 15 September
- Revised draft reports submitted to SPIA: 30 October
- Final Workshop (results presented): 15 November
- Selected case studies presentation at AGM: December
- Publication in special issue (e.g., Food Policy): 2008

\* SPIA to assess the need and timeframe for a second workshop in early September after reviewing the first draft reports. If a workshop is deemed useful, Rome (IFAD, Bioversity, FAO) or some SE Asia venue (3 case study leaders located there) will be considered.

No decision has been taken on whether to publish the case studies in a professional journal or in a book as a group but the various outlets for publishing were discussed at the planning meeting:

- 1) SPIA 'green cover' report (where case studies are summarized) and 7 case study Briefs (2-4 pages) and 1 synthesis Brief [following the NRM IA study model] – this is a requirement.
- 2) Centre publications (full length study) – this is strongly advised.
- 3) Journal – special issue where intro, methods, individual case studies and synthesis articles would be published, e.g., in Food Policy, or New Directions in Evaluation, or book – either of these would be feasible and highly desirable from SPIA's perspective.

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

*See previous SPIA Activities Update for the background and rationale to this study*

Since the last SPIA meeting the following has been completed:

- the background and rationale for the study, and the overall study terms of reference (scope, geographic focus and approach / methodology) have been defined;
- the ToR for the study leader finalized and candidate approached (Peter Hazell accepted);
- literature review commenced: Nega Wubeneh (productivity/environment/labour) and Jenny Nasr (nutrition/health).

The proposed workplan of the study is tentatively as follows:

1. Prepare and share with SPIA a preliminary annotated outline of the report (March 2007);
2. Survey the literature, contact resource persons and identify studies for review (March, 2007)
3. Convene a small meeting with key CGIAR Centre scientists at an appropriate location (possibly in India, or by video- or tele-conference) to access “grey literature” and to interact with acknowledged experts on the subject.
4. Conduct the review, gather data/information for the assessment (April – May 2007)
5. Summarize results and evidence of outputs, uptake, outcome and impacts and share the progress report with SPIA for feedback (last week of July 2007)
6. Submit final draft report to SC Secretariat (August 15 2007)
7. Peer review completed and report finalized (end of September 2007)

### **3.3 Impact Assessment Focal Point Meeting**

The IA Focal Points Meeting (IAFPM) jointly organized by SPIA and the IAFPs on October 5-7 in Nairobi 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. Since that time most of the IA Focal Points are new to the system and SPIA’s membership has changed. There also has been a renewed focus on impact assessment by the donor community and a change in the external environment, with the introduction of the performance measurement system. These developments reinforce the continuing need for accountability on the part of the centres and SPIA, the need to revalidate their respective roles and responsibilities in ensuring it, and formulate appropriate strategies and tactics accordingly. SPIA has a number of ongoing studies and is planning some new initiatives, where the centres are pivotal. The meeting provided a forum to jointly monitor and design these.

ICRAF hosted the IAFPM. IA Focal Points from 13 Centres and 4 CPs attended the meeting each giving brief presentations to update the group on current and future IA activities at the centres/CPs. SPIA members Jim Ryan, Mywish Maredia and Flavio Avila chaired many of the sessions. Donor representatives and guest experts were also invited.

The broad objective of the meeting was to advance impact assessment of international agricultural research. For its part, SPIA wished to review past experiences of the centres, draw lessons and plan for the future by focussing especially on a number of topics such as:

- SPIA strategy and update
- Performance Measurement Impact Indicator 3a and 3b
- Policy-oriented research impact assessment study
- Non-economic measures of impact
- Role of IA: Accountability vs. Learning
- Africa Impact Study – follow-up
- Discuss other topics as flagged by IA Focal Points, e.g., outcome mapping, future collaboration, scaling up, institutionalisation of IA, and data sharing

The agenda for the meeting had been identified in consultation with the focal points. The meeting was valuable on a number of fronts, including helping build 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 obtaining commitments to do so, identifying how and where SPIA and the centres can together better communicate the results of IA in the CGIAR, and identifying how we can improve the performance measurement system. (See the IAFPM Synthesis Report for a Summary of the Sessions and list of participants.)

Several other items which arose during the course of the meeting requiring some follow-up action included: organizing joint professional conferences, producing a regular IA newsletter, strategy for going beyond the IAFPs, raising the poverty profile in ep IA (sharing databases on indicators), and scheduling the next IAFPM - dates and venue.

### **3.4 Strategic Guidelines for Conducting ex post IA in the CGIAR**

The annotated outline of the Strategic Guidelines document was revised after the SPIA 30 Meeting in Cali to reflect issues and discussion points raised by SPIA members. The revised outline was then circulated to the IA Focal Points prior to the IAFPM as a basis for discussion at the meeting.

In a special session on the topic at IAFPM, Mywish Maredia provided the background to this initiative: A document describing appropriate IA Strategic Guidelines for the CGIAR is something which the group in the 2000 SPIA/IAFP meeting recommended be developed over time, as more and different kinds of impact assessments were completed in the System. With the NRMR IA initiative and PORIA scoping study completed, it is an opportune time to move ahead to finalize the Guidelines, parts of which already have been developed. A potential structure for the document was outlined, and two organisational tools for creating the impact pathways that are implicit to all epIAs were demonstrated: a cascading series of matrices, and a large flow diagram. While these matrices and flow diagrams were found to be helpful, there were concerns about their complexity, and practitioners should not feel that they had to cover every impact for each step. An observer urged SPIA to think about how all the impacts add up, stating that donors may want to reduce epIA findings to just one or two numbers, and that the document’s main role is to show how to achieve this kind of result. The issue of double counting was also raised. Other topics discussed related to the primary audience for the Guidelines (mainly CGIAR) and the need to re-structure the outline<sup>1</sup>.

The group agreed that SPIA’s plan to commission a senior consultant to write the main body of the text was the best way to proceed. Tom Walker, an individual with wide and deep experience in the practice of IA, was recently identified by SPIA for this purpose and he has agreed to complete a first draft by the end of May. The draft will follow the structure of the revised annotated outline which has benefited from comments and suggestions coming from the IAFPM. The document will be about 50-60 pages, with the bulk of discussion in Sections 3 (25-30 pages) and 4 (15-18 pages) and the balance in Sections 1 (2-3 pages) and 2 (7-9

---

<sup>1</sup> CIMMYT (and CIP) is also preparing an IA guidelines document but one focused more on field application and targeting mainly biological scientists within the commodity centres of the CGIAR. It was the consensus view that the two documents are complementary and operating at different levels: the audience for the SPIA-initiated strategic guidelines are IA professionals and practitioners while the audience for CIMMYT’s manual is biological scientists and fieldworkers. Thus, there was broad support for both the SPIA and CIMMYT (and CIP) initiatives.

pages). The document should complement other IA manuals and guidelines such as those being prepared by CIMMYT and CIP.

Focal points would be invited to collaborate in the development of the strategic guidelines as the consultant progresses, and this could be done on a self selection basis – those that are motivated and able to participate in the process are welcome. Perhaps a ‘drafting team’ comprised of the consultant, 1-2 CG centre representatives, and a SPIA member (MM) may be formed to review and revise the draft guidelines. It is the intention of SPIA that, ultimately, this document should have wide ownership across the Centres.

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

A literature review of the impact of PR and its partners was carried as a component of the PRGA review. This IA review was undertaken by a consultant, James Stevenson and focused on assessing the evidence of impact of PR to date. The review resulted in a report “*Impact assessment of participatory research: A literature review with a focus on plant breeding and natural resource management*” which was used as input into the PRGA program review team. The ToR for the impact study was to review the literature on impact assessment of PR that has been produced by the PRGA program and its partners and others, assess the extent to which impacts from using PR approaches have been rigorously evaluated and specify methodological issues to be taken into consideration in assessing the impact of PR research. The desk study should help SPIA in determining: (a) whether there is sufficient evidence of the added value of PR over conventional methods of conducting research and, if not, (b) 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 first stage of the review involved assembling IA documents from the PRGA program, other sources in the CGIAR, and sources external to the CGIAR. The PRGA program supplied a listing of 124 references perceived to be of potential importance to the study. Of these, 104 documents were omitted because of problems related to availability and lack of empirical IA on PR. Of the 20 remaining, only ten satisfied minimal levels of the criteria that SPIA has used to evaluate the quality of IA in the CGIAR. These criteria include (1) the research is original and well described, (2) the counterfactual is realistic and well-stated, (3) attribution and assumptions are realistic and well-stated, and (4) distance down the impact pathway is as far as is reasonable. In a second round of elicitation, studies were canvassed from the other CGIAR Centers. References to 110 documents were posted. Of these, only nine were kept for detailed appraisal mainly because many Centers had taken a very liberal interpretation of what constituted empirical IA on PR. These 19 studies were complemented by studies that were external to the CGIAR. These were taken directly from literature searches and included only a handful of studies in addition to three that surveyed the effects of participation in fields outside of agricultural research in the broader developmental literature.

The PRGA IA model described in Johnson et al. (2001) was used as an organizing construct for the review. This arrayed the potential incremental benefits of participatory elements of research projects as:

- Enhanced economic benefits from the project technology
- Enhanced human capital among the beneficiaries
- Enhanced social capital in beneficiary communities
- Feedbacks to the formal research process
- Reduced costs of research.

Each of the studies was described and evaluated in terms of what it implied for the impact of PR. Methodological strengths and weaknesses of each study were also noted.

The review concluded:

1. There is good evidence in some cases of greater impact of Participatory Plant Breeding (PPB) in comparison with conventional plant breeding, through a combination of either higher adoption rates and/or higher adoption ceilings. There is also good evidence that research costs are lower for PPB.
2. In contrast to PPB, the evidence that Participatory NRM research is more productive and cost-effective than conventional NRM research is not persuasive.
3. The major contributions of the PRGA program have come in providing the conceptual basis for carrying out IAs, rather than in the actual implementation of IA studies. The papers describing the types of participation (Lilja and Ashby, 1999) and impact hypotheses (Johnson et al. 2001) provide great clarity on how to assess the impact of participation at all the different stages in research. However, this good start was not built on and so the evidence base is weaker than it might have otherwise been.
4. The importance of planning for IA from the design stage of a research project is reflected in the fact that there are a number of instances in which our ability to learn from particular studies is constrained by a lack of baseline information.
5. More technical expertise on assessment teams is necessary to introduce innovative methodology to enable wider social and environmental benefits to be addressed, esp. for NRM. The main methodologies of IA in agricultural research are based on [a] central impact pathway that has an increase in productivity as the first step in a chain. This may not be the most appropriate conceptual model for best representing the impacts of NRM.

SPIA will need to consider carefully the validity of these conclusions – based on the analysis presented – and study the potential implications of this study, in particular, whether it has answered the questions outlined in the first paragraph above.

### **3.6 Towards a Demand-Led Ex-Post Evaluation Strategy for Meeting Internal Learning Needs in the CGIAR (scoping study)**

*Refer to SPIA 30 Meeting Minutes for the background of this study...* At SPIA 30 members agreed this was a potentially useful and timely initiative that should be discussed at the IAFPM in October and with evaluation professionals at the AEA meeting in November to assess interest, feasibility and value. A copy was also given to Osvaldo Fienstein (SPME member) for his input. During the IAFPM (session on IA for accountability vs. learning<sup>7</sup>) the SPIA Chair indicated SPIA would be initiating a study to assess how information from epIA studies can be most effectively used in research planning (project proposal was circulated to IAFPs prior to the meeting). Due to time constraints, there was only limited discussion on this proposal. However, several centres had expressed an interest in this earlier, particularly Bioversity. Osvaldo has provided some relevant comments and Bioversity was particularly interested in getting involved. In the meantime Flavio has revised the proposal (and changed the title) which will be discussed at the SPIA 31.

**Appendix I**

**3A Impact Indicator Proforma – 2007 PM Exercise**

**I. Criterion 1: epIA studies/Advancement of epIA methods (70%)**

A. Please provide the full citation of all epIA studies<sup>2</sup> published in 2006 that attempt to assess major impacts attributed to your Center’s work and provide summary information describing the main results/indicator(s) of impact.

Study #	Full citation	Main result/indicators of impact reported by the study (i.e., adoption, estimates of income effect, other effects, poverty impacts, environmental impacts, IRR, etc.) – max of 100 words for each study
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
.		
.		

---

<sup>2</sup>An epIA study refers to a published journal article, conference paper, book chapter (but not entire edited book), report or any other publication that has entered the public domain, which is not a revised version of an earlier submission.

B. For each completed ex-post IA study listed in I.A above, please provide the relevant information under each component (check the appropriate item)

Components	Study # (corresponding to the list in I.A)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<b>1. Publication venue</b> (check one)							
Refereed journal							
Book chapter							
Conference paper (includes proceedings)							
In-house publication (reviewed externally)							
In-house publication (not reviewed externally)							
Unpublished report							
<b>2. (Co-) authorship</b> (check one or more)							
with other CG Center scientists							
with NARS scientists							
with ARI scientists							
Center only scientists							
<b>3. EpIA coverage</b> (check at least one)							
commodity improvement							
NRM related							
policy related							
biodiversity related							
training/capacity building related							
other							
specify:							

Components	Study # (corresponding to the list in I.A)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<b>4. Distance down the impact pathway covered by the study</b> (check one or more)							
uptake/adoption (field surveys)							
influence (bibliometric/citation analysis, key informant surveys, etc.)							
intermediate impacts (improved yield/quality, lower risk, higher income, conserve resources, increase market access/efficiency, develop human capacity)							
ultimate impact (poverty, food security, environment)							
<b>5. Geographical breadth of impacts assessed by the study</b> (check one)							
single location within single country assessment							
multi-locations (regions) within single country assessment							
multiple countries (~ 2-5) assessment							
Global assessment (i.e., spread over several continents)							
<b>6. Advances in new methods/models for epIA embodied in the study</b> (check one or more)							
addresses non-economic impacts							
addresses differential effects (different target groups)							
addresses positive and negative effects							
addresses multiplier effects (other sectors)							
employs novel methods (combines quantitative & qualitative, participatory approaches, etc.)							
other methodological advances							
specify:							

C. Please provide an estimate of the following:

1. Annual budget/expenditures devoted to epIA work in your Center in 2006: US \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- OR
2. Number of full time equivalent staff<sup>3</sup> devoted to epIA work in your Center in 2006: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>3</sup> Internationnally and nationally recruited scientists and consultants, but not RAs. Applies only to those conducting IAs, not communicators and trainers.

**II. Criterion 2: Building an IA culture at the Center** (Indicate “*Not applicable*” if there is nothing to report under a particular heading)<sup>4</sup> (20%)

- A. Please provide a list of internal workshops convened by the Center’s impact assessment unit/specialists within the past year to help assess the expected impacts of planned and ongoing research of the Center (for each, describe the theme and number of Center participants)
- B. Please provide 2 examples of systematic evaluation of user relevance of Center research outputs produced within the past year such as early adoption/influence studies (max of 100 words for describing data collection, analysis, and major finding for each example)
- C. Please provide specific examples of how empirical ex-post impact assessment findings have been applied as a basis for quantitative ex-ante impact projections that contribute to the Center’s priority-setting procedures, or have been used to validate earlier ex-ante work. (max. of 100 words)
- D. Please provide specific examples of establishment of baseline studies to provide counterfactuals for future *epIA* (max. of 100 words)

**III. Criterion 3: Communication/dissemination and capacity enhancement (10%)**

A. Please specify how the findings of epIAs have been disseminated in 2006 (Indicate “*Not applicable*” if there is nothing to report under a particular heading):

1. Number of epIA briefs published(not general M&E briefs):
2. Dissemination of epIA findings in popular media (number of stories published):
3. Dissemination of major IA findings through the Center website/IA webpage (indicate number of hits/visits/downloads of IA related reports/articles ):
4. Any other method of dissemination of epIA findings used in 2006:

B. Please specify your Center’s efforts in building capacity in IA in 2006 (Indicate “*Not applicable*” if there is nothing to report under a particular heading):

1. Number of IA related conferences/workshops conducted for external audiences in 2006 (e.g., NARS scientists):  
(Please attach list events)
2. Number of IA related training materials developed:  
(Please list)
3. Number of IA visiting specialists from a NARS hosted:
4. Any other IA related capacity building efforts in 2006 (max of 100 words):

---

<sup>4</sup> It is not expected that centers will have undertaken activity in all subcomponents listed under Criteria 2 and 3, but the list nevertheless needs to be comprehensive so all relevant information is reported.

**IV.** Please list/describe any other impact-related activity or outcome of 2006 that you believe warrants consideration in this exercise but is not covered in any previous criteria/questions (max of 100 words)..... (Modifier to overall score)

**Appendix II****CGIAR AGM 2006****Stakeholder Meeting Luncheon Session on****“The Impact of CGIAR and Partner Research in sub-Saharan Africa: Results of a SPIA/SC Commissioned Meta-Analysis”**

Tuesday, 5 December 2006 from 12.30 to 13.30 in the Georgetown West

Sponsor for the Meeting: DfID

**PROGRAMME**

Introduction	Jim Ryan, SPIA chair
Welcome Remarks	Jonathan Wadsworth, DfID
Meta-Analysis Summary & Key Results	Mywish Maredia, SPIA member
General Discussion	
Closing Remarks	Jonathan Wadsworth
Thanks	Jim Ryan

## **Appendix III**

### **Policy-oriented research impact assessment (PORIA) Case Studies: Methods and Planning Workshop 20-21 February 2007, IFPRI HQ, Washington DC**

#### **Participants:**

Mywish Maredia (SPIA Member), Bruce Gardner (University of Maryland), Robert Paarlberg (Wellesley College), Carol Weiss (Harvard Graduate School of Education), Elisabetta Gotor (Bioversity), David Raitzer (CIFOR), Jock Anderson (IFPRI), Jere Behrman (University of Pennsylvania/ IFPRI), Simeon Kaitibie (ILRI), Debbie Templeton (IRRI), Diemuth Pems (WorldFish), David Schimmelpfennig (ERS/USDA) and Tim Kelley (SPIA Secretary)

Regrets: K. Shideed (ICARDA)

#### **Objectives of the Workshop**

1. Enhance the scope and quality of data analysis in the PORIA case studies subject to constraints in data availability, budget and time;
2. Identify common issues and methodological constraints in the case studies;
3. Support case study teams in developing appropriate methods for the assessment and a reasonable workplan for finalizing the studies in the time frame laid out by SPIA.

#### **Programme Agenda & Timetable**

##### **Tuesday, 20 February**

#### **Overview:**

8:45 – 9:00	Welcome by IFPRI (Joachim von Braun) and SPIA (Mywish Maredia) Introductions
9:00 – 9:15	Overview of PORIA scoping study (Tim Kelley)
9:15 – 9:30	Main Phase Initiative – case studies (Mywish) Objectives and Structure of the Workshop (Bruce Gardner)
9:30 – 9:45	Discussion
9:45 – 10:15	Review of methods proposed for documenting IA in the case studies (Bruce)
10:15 – 10:45	Coffee Break
10:45 – 11:15	Commentary on methods proposed for assessing impact (Rob Paarlberg /Carol Weiss)
11:15 – 12:00	Discussion

#### **Case Study Presentations (Bruce Gardner chairs):**

12:00 – 12:20	IFPRI Case Study presentation <sup>5</sup> (Jock Anderson /Jere Behrman)
12:20 – 13:00	Commentary (Bruce, Rob, Carol) and Discussion
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 14:20	Bioversity Case Study presentation (Elisabetta Gotor)
14:20 – 15:00	Commentary and Discussion
15:00 – 15:20	WorldFish Case Study presentation (Diemuth Pemsil)
15:20 – 16:00	Commentary and Discussion
16:00 – 16:30	Coffee Break
16:30 – 16:50	ILRI Case Study presentation (Simeon Kaitibie)
16:50 – 17:30	Commentary and Discussion
17:30 – 17:45	Emerging issues from 4 case studies presented (Bruce)
17:45	Adjourn for light refreshments in IFPRI library

### Wednesday, 21 February

#### Case Study Presentations (cont.)

8:30 – 8:50	IRRI Case Study presentation (Debbie Templeton)
8:50 – 9:30	Commentary and Discussion
9:30 – 9:50	CIFOR Case Study presentation (David Raitzer)
9:50 – 10:30	Commentary and Discussion
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee Break
11:00 – 12:00	General discussion: -key issues/common methodology challenges -reasonable expectations of impact (influence) -decide on break out groups (3)
12:00 – 13:00	Refining methods and workplan: One-on-one consultations Group I: 2 case studies + Bruce Group II: 2 case studies + Rob Group III: 2 case studies + Carol
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 16:00	Refining methods and workplan: One-on-one consultations (cont.)
16:00 – 16:30	Coffee Break
16:30 – 17:00	Concluding comments from consultants
17:00 – 17:30	Next steps/timetable and deliverables/publication options
17:30	Adjourn

---

<sup>5</sup> Focused on the specific approach and methodology planned for documenting influence/impact, highlighting any major gaps or constraints (methods-wise) faced.

## Brief Synopsis of PORIA Planning Meeting Workshop

### *Overview Session:*

1. Joachim von Braun, Director General of IFPRI, welcomed the group and underscored a few key points related to PORIA:

- importance of effective communications of and advocacy in policy research;
- need for a solid understanding of impact pathways and, in particular, identifying the constraints within the policy-making process;
- need for IA studies that encompass a broader set of research activity, e.g., thematic;
- need to draw more lessons from IA work and synthesize;
- critical reflection: What's the optimal level of investment in IA? What is the impact of IA? What are the opportunity costs of doing IA?

2. Mywish Maredia welcomed the participants and consultants to the meeting on behalf of SPIA and thanked IFPRI for hosting the meeting. She emphasised that the next two days would provide an excellent opportunity for centre case study leaders to interact closely with expert consultants (Bruce Gardner, Robert Paarlberg, Carol Weiss) in developing appropriate methods and planning their studies. SPIA considers this an extremely important but challenging exercise and looks forward to documenting the impact of POR within these case studies and hopefully publishing these in a special issue of a professional journal. She outlined the timeframe for completing the study.

3. Tim Kelley provided background to the PORIA study, initiated largely in response to an expressed need for demonstrating accountability for the large and growing investments in POR (OED /World Bank study, 2003; AGM, 2003). A Scoping Study was initiated in August 2005 to clarify terminology, review methods and evaluate the available evidence of direct and indirect impacts from CGIAR POR. The study found the range and number of PORIAs conducted to date was inadequate (only 24 were identified of which only three measured impact in economic terms). Although this was partially attributed to the higher degree of difficulty and methodological challenges inherent in this type of work, the study concluded that a more credible set of studies documenting influence and impact further down the impact pathway is both desirable and feasible. Seven case studies were selected by SPIA for this second phase initiative after a call for proposals went out in late 2006. These case studies give priority to 'impact' versus 'influence', although contributions that offer new insights into policy-making processes and that advance best practices in documenting 'influence' are also deemed important. It also gives priority to 'demand-led' approaches over 'supply-led' ones.

4. Bruce Gardner outlined the objectives for the meeting (see program agenda), which focuses on enhancing the quality of the impact assessment in term of: a) facts and information, and b) approaches and methods of analyses. There are five key components of the impact pathway and in the context of the 7 case study proposals they have received relatively consistent treatment:

- 1) inputs (light treatment)
- 2) outputs (strong)
- 3) uptake (mixed)
- 4) influence (weak)
- 5) impact (somewhat weak)

The goal was to produce and present ‘convincing evidence’ of influence or impact. Bruce went through each of these five components. In the discussion that followed, some key points were raised.

5. Carol Weiss highlighted the role of other, non-research related factors that influences policy and the challenge of assigning attribution to research in this context. In particular, she identified the four *i*'s that influence policy making: (i) other interests, that both promote and inhibit policy change, e.g., what are the rival influences, the competing stakeholders?; (ii) ideology; (iii) other information; and (iv) institutional arrangements in the decision making. Rob Paarlberg supplemented this list of factors with some others that can be characterized as dynamic factors that can cause policies to change from the ones generated by the four *i*'s (the *c* list): cooperation; coercion, crisis, political change. Some key points emerging from this discussion included:

- constructing a set of hypotheses about the policy making process within each of the case studies, i.e., positing which factors are most operative;
- the value of laying out in fairly detailed fashion the impact pathway as the backbone to guide the investigation (using a schema/diagram of what happened, with linkages);
- identifying the factors that were working in opposition to the change
- well developed (and argued) counterfactuals provide the most credible basis for impact/influence assessments
- researchers themselves are often the transmission belt, especially as they find their way into government positions, although this is more observed in developed countries
- consider opportunity for SPIA to generalize across the case studies.

6. Rob Paarlberg emphasized the value and credibility inherent in using a demand-side approach, i.e., starting with the policy change and working back to the influences, using an external consultant to document the case. He also mentioned the value and importance of partnerships and giving credit to the partners. David Schimmelpfennig introduced the Bayesian approach and [how it might be used in documenting influence and attribution]

7. Although there was some discussion about identifying the conditions that advance research effectiveness in the policy making process, i.e., how to make research more influential, this aspect will not be the focus of this study.

8. A number of questions were raised by the case study leaders seeking advice when using qualitative methods, e.g.:

- interview methods, techniques, protocols and strategies;
- ensuring quality responses, how to handle known and unknown biases;
- need for developing/establishing the timeline of events;
- interviewer and the analyst (should be the same if possible)
- interviewer - external consultant (for successful demand-led approach), or from the centre?
- using written questionnaire – when to send;
- interview style, establishing good rapport;
- reconciling different accounts;
- confidentiality issue.

There was considerable discussion on each of these issues, including pros and cons of different strategies and approaches.

9. The art of asking questions to policy makers/informants was discussed. The main suggestions given were:

- A formal introduction of the study (ideally only one page) on official letterhead should precede the interview.
- The policy change, and hence the assessment of this policy change, should be put in a positive light, if possible.
- Interview as many people as possible including the senior most technocrat from each institutions even if they aren't the policy-makers per se.
- The need to ask more generally about the issues that affected the policy change, not just focus on the original research paper.
- The need to carefully draft the questions to determine influence – although there is no hard and fast rule.
- The need to be mindful of the fact that different informants may give us different answers to the same questions.
- The need to consider the role the key informants played in the policy decision-making process.
- Where possible, see if you can have a follow-up session – may be just on the phone – in case you have further queries.

#### ***Case Study Presentations Session:***

Case study leaders gave presentations (Powerpoints available from Tim Kelley) which were followed by discussions in the plenary. Major points from these discussions and those following in the one-on-one sessions with the consultants were captured by the case study leaders and are summarized below.

#### ***IFPRI: Transfers out of poverty (Jere Behrman & Jock Anderson)***

Notes during the meeting and one-on-one consultations were directly incorporated into the new workplan.

#### ***Bioversity: Impact of the In-Trust Agreements between FAO and the CGIAR centres***

Rober Paarlberg provided feedback on what to prioritize in the study, and specifically in emphasising the following:

- The research role of Bioversity International in the Policy making process
- Make a clear distinction between Influence and Impact
- Distinguish between research before and after the policy took place
- Bioversity operated together with other players and often covered a moderator role in the policy making arena. Include this in the impact pathway.
- Use questionnaires and interviews in order to define the counterfactual and the main variables that will subsequently help in modelling the actual value of CG genebanks
- The impact of a multilateral system of germplasm conservation could go beyond accession and distribution of material. Need to capture other indicators generated by the policy in place that could have an impact on germplasm availability and value.

Bruce Gardner helped in defining the methodological approach for measuring the impact. David Schimmelpennig provided guidance in defining the proposed Bayesian hierarchical correlated count data model. Specifically, they advised on:

- Exploring other viable quantitative methodologies. The Bayesian approach is not necessary to pursue my objective even though it would be interesting to address an impact study with Bayesian statistics
- Gather more data through interviews or questionnaires in order to add more information into the equations.
- Look carefully at the trend of data already collected and explain the reason of it.
- Try to capture through an in-depth analysis what is the real value of the agreement in place besides acquisition and distribution of germplasm.

Carol Weiss provided additional advice on the following:

- Be as precise as possible in drawing impact pathways and identifying the underlying role of Bioersity
- Working with external consultants at the issue from an outsider's point of view.
- Record interviews asking previous permission to the interviewed

### ***WorldFish: Community-based fisheries mgmt in Bangladesh***

The consultants agreed that this is a very interesting case because not only is there influence/impact on the policy level, but in addition the micro-level impact of policy change can be quantified from the pilot sites. However, there were a number of questions and suggestions how to improve the conceptual framework and implementation of the study

- Detailed description of timeline of CBFM in Bangladesh
- Check wider history of community based management (globally)
- Description of the laws and regulations that were in place before the research (and then a clear objective statement of the research)
- Clear distinction between research and extension (proof of concept)
- Account of the current situation (which policies have changed or are expected to change in the near future? How likely is such a change?). Does and if so how does change depend on the outcome of the election? On what level are relevant decision made → determine key persons for expert interviews on this level.
- What is the status of law enforcement (of related policies)?
- Distinguish between ex ante (upcoming national policy changes) and ex post (impact of CBFM in the project/pilot sites).
- Specify the influence of the CBFM project on policy makers
- Impact pathway diagram would be useful
- Also account for negative impact (e.g. reduction in government revenues)
- Take equity impact into account (pro-poor impact?) by comparing different income groups with regard to project impact.
- Check whether CBOs receive(d) any payments/subsidies and assess how sustainable these will be after the project has ended.
- Do CBOs make use of existing institutions/management groups?
- Establish IPG character of research output → spill-over to and lessons learnt for other countries?
- Check how much of the increase in household income is due to tax/lease reduction (or other direct project support)?
- Not only present average impact but give variability of benefits/impact across sites and make "worst case" and failures transparent.
- Careful description of the counterfactual: decreasing fish stocks & production in all sites?
- Check if water quality is an issue?

Additional comments from the one-on-one sessions on day two:

- Give clear specification what the research output really is
- For estimation of IRR extrapolate but don't overstretch
- Enough data for a double delta approach?
- Give some evidence on biodiversity changes (not necessarily with number on it)
- Assessment whether the policy (change) is advisable (e.g. after figuring in changes in government revenues and all costs)
- How much of the CBFM is attributable to WorldFish rather than others?
- Sustainability of the approach
- Outline what needs to be done and what can be done ...
- Do expert / key stakeholder interviews myself (to maximize information), prepare a timeline and bring this along, send a list of questions to the respondents before the interview. Tape record the interview if possible.
- Prepare set of hypotheses of how influence spread and "who talked to whom"

***ILRI: Dairy marketing in Kenya & East Africa***

ILRI proposed a mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches to analyze the impact of the new Kenyan Dairy Policy, which is yet unwritten, but has led to changes in the way small scale milk vending activities are regulated in Kenya. The new policy emphasizes training in milk handling as a means to licensing, which, in turn, leads to a reduction in transactions costs for small scale milk vendors (SSMVs). The qualitative assessment will describe and chronicle the activities of ILRI researchers, NGO partners, policy makers, enforcers, and SSMVs which led to the new policy, while the quantitative approach will use a multi-market framework to estimate economic benefits of the policy change on producers, consumers, and milk traders.

Issues arising from the meeting with respect to the ILRI proposal include the following:

- Initial discussions focused on making the multi-market model more tractable, e.g, there were suggestions that the number of food commodities be reduced to milk alone.
- May need to extrapolate 1-year ex-post results to estimate ex-ante benefits.
- While the multi-market model may be appropriate, especially with its emphasis on distributional impacts of the new Kenyan Dairy Policy on poor and rich urban and rural households, limitations on huge data requirements, time and other resources required to build and analyze a credible model, make it necessary for ILRI to consider using a simpler, possibly econometric, approach.
- A simple econometric approach can be used to estimate welfare gains for consumers and producers, but also to determine how the gain from reduced transactions costs is reflected in the new consumer and producer price changes.
- The cost of the Smallholder Dairy Project needs to be taken into consideration, vis-à-vis the benefits derived from project activities. Some of the benefit stream may not necessarily be tangible.
- Can the analysis separate small producers from large producers?
- What proportion of the informal market and formal market were exposed to informal payments?
- How much of Kenya's milk is in the low priced markets?
- ILRI will need to put a handle on time frame in which the policy came into effect, given that the policy is not a written policy. This should also include an outline of the processes involved in effecting the policy change, and a clear specification of what research outputs were extended to agents who previously enforced the old policy. For

example who talked to whom, who gave instructions that the old policy must no longer be enforced, what was the specific instruction, when was the instruction issued. This should be accomplished by the lead researcher interviewing the people involved in the policy change work, i.e., government authorities, street-level bureaucrats, etc.

- A look at the effect of the new policy by investigating price and quantity movements over time, including the periods before and after the policy came into effect is in order.
- Need to document both influences and economic impacts.

***CIFOR: CIFOR's influence on policy and practice in the pulp and paper sector***

***IRRI: Pesticide use & Philippine farmer health (Debbie Templeton)***

Key points emerging from the discussion after the presentation:

- The PORIA for pesticide use and health of Philippines farmers looks promising.
- The framework for measuring impact looks sound. Regardless there is still a need to get a clear picture on the correct counterfactual when re-estimating the HC function and economic surplus model.
  - The research appears to be one that 'sped up' the policy process – but by how much?
  - Examine the change in pesticide subsidies in the Philippines and in other countries over time. Is there a strong relationship between pesticide use and subsidies?
- The framework for determining influence needs more work including:
  - A well-developed timeline & documentation of all relevant changes that took place.
  - Role of NGOs. Did they have any influence?
  - Role of the release of pest-resistant varieties in the policy makers decision-making process.
  - More documented evidence of media releases.
  - Interviews with journalists if possible.
  - Increased understanding of the other policy changes that were underway prior to the health work. For example, during 1981 to 1983, the FPA banned 17 pesticides for use in the Philippines. These included Paris Green, the OCs DDT (in mosquito coils), DBCP and endrin, the OPs parathion ethyl, and, and some sodium compounds. IPM pronounced national crop protection policy
  - Time frame of the existence of, and changes, in pesticide subsidies in the Philippines.
  - The role of donors. Were donors' decisions to fund IPM also influenced by the pesticide use-health cost study?
- The art of asking questions to policy makers/informants was discussed. The main suggestions given were:
  - A formal introduction of the study (ideally only one page) on official letterhead should precede the interview.
  - The policy change, and hence the assessment of this policy change, should be put in a positive light, if possible.
  - Interview as many people as possible including the senior most technocrat from each institutions even if they aren't the policy-makers per se.
  - The need to ask more generally about the issues that affected the policy change, not just focus on the original research paper.
  - The need to carefully draft the questions to determine influence – although there is no hard and fast rule.
  - The need to be mindful of the fact that different informants may give us different answers to the same questions.

- The need to consider the role the key informants played in the policy decision-making process.
- Where possible, see if you can have a follow-up session – may be just on the phone – in case you have further queries.

***ICARDA Fertilizer use on barley in Syria (Kamel Shideed)***

Due to unavoidable circumstances, the case study leader was unable to attend the meeting.

***Wrap up Session:***

A proposed timeframe for completing the study was presented and discussed:

Detailed case study workplans with full methodology details submitted: 15 March  
 Consolidated project leader's / consultants' comments back to case study leaders: 10 April  
 Progress report submitted to SPIA: 30 May  
 First draft report submitted to SPIA: 15 August  
 SPIA comments sent back to centers: 15 September  
 Revised draft reports submitted to SPIA: 30 October  
 Final Workshop (results presented): 15 November  
 Selected case studies presentation at AGM: December  
 Publication in special issue (e.g., Food Policy): 2008

There was discussion on what the purpose of the final workshop was and whether an earlier workshop to discuss preliminary results and draft reports might not be more useful – as was done for the SPIA NRMR impact assessment study. It was agreed that SPIA would assess the need and timeframe for a second workshop in early September after reviewing the first draft reports. If a workshop is deemed useful, other venues will be considered, e.g., at IFAD or Bioversity in Rome, or at CIFOR in Indonesia (three case study leaders located in SE Asia)

No decision was taken on whether to publish the case studies in a professional journal or in a book as a group but the various outlets for publishing were described:

- 4) SPIA 'green cover' report (where case studies are summarized) and 7 case study Briefs (2-4 pages) and 1 synthesis Brief [following the NRMR IA study model] – this is a requirement.
- 5) Centre publications (full length study) – this is strongly advised.

Journal – special issue where intro, methods, individual case studies and synthesis articles would be published, e.g., in Food Policy, or New Directions in Evaluation, or possible in a book – either of these would be feasible and highly desirable from SPIA's perspective.