



Fund

Fund Council

4th Meeting (FC4)—Montpellier, France

April 5-6, 2011

IEA Inception Report - Annexes

(Based on the feedback received, the IEA Design Team was requested to revise the Inception Report, and submit the revised document to the Fund Council for virtual approval.)

*Document presented for Agenda Item 17:
Inception Report of the Independent
Evaluation Arrangement*

Submitted by:
IEA Design Team

Annexes to the Inception Report

Establishment of a CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA)

For Consideration of the CGIAR Fund Council 5-6 April 2011

Contents

Annex 1: Glossary of Selected Evaluation Terms.....	2
Annex 2: Proposed Composition of the Reference Panel.....	4
Annex 3: Indicative Listing - Deliverables of the Consultancy	6
Annex 4: Persons Consulted and Providing Support During the Inception Phase.....	7
Annex 5: Voices for Change-Annex Chapter 4: An M&E Framework for the New CGIAR	10
Annex 6: Extract from Letter from Chair of Consortium to Chair of the Fund Council Expressing Concerns With the Proposed 2009 M&E Framework.....	18
Annex 7: The Current Evaluation Work Load of the Centers.....	19
Annex 8: Documents and Publications Consulted by the Consultants During the Inception Phase	19
Annex 9: Terms of Reference for the Consultancy	23

Annex 1: Glossary of Selected Evaluation Terms

Except where otherwise stated, these terms have been taken from the Glossary of the OECD-Development Assistance Committee Evaluation Network <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf> It is recognised that some terms may need to be modified for specific use by the CGIAR, and this will be done as part of the development of standards and guidance.

Appraisal: An overall assessment of the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of a development intervention prior to a decision of funding.

Attribution: The ascription of a causal link between observed (or expected to be observed) changes and a specific intervention.

Base-line study: An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made.

Beneficiaries: The individuals, groups, or organizations, whether targeted or not, that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention.

Best practice: Methods and techniques that have consistently shown results superior to those those achieved with other means and which are used as benchmarks to strive for. There is, however, no practice that is best for everyone or in every situation, and no best practice remains best for very long as people keep on finding better ways of doing things (Business dictionary.com). Best practice in evaluation refers to benchmarks for evaluation practices (often considered aspirational) and the overall practices of individual evaluation regimes certified as of good standard by their peers, generally through a peer review (jm).

Counterfactual: The situation or condition which hypothetically may prevail for individuals, organizations, or groups were there no development intervention.

Effectiveness: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

Evaluation: The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors.

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

Inputs: The financial, human, and material resources used for the development intervention.

Meta-evaluation: The term is used for evaluations designed to aggregate findings from a series of evaluation. It can also be used to denote the evaluation of an evaluation to judge its quality and/or assess the performance of the evaluators (but is not used in this latter way in this report).

Outcome: The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs.

Outputs: The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes (but not used in this latter way in this report. Also note that the term deliverables is sometimes considered synonymous with outputs).

Partners: The individuals and/or organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives.

Peer review is a generic term for a process of self-regulation by a profession or a process of evaluation involving qualified individuals within the relevant field. Peer review methods are employed to maintain standards, improve performance and provide credibility. In academia the term is often used to denote a prepublication review of academic papers. (Wikipedia)

Performance monitoring: A continuous process of collecting and analyzing data to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results.

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.

Results: The output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a development intervention.

Results chain: The causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts, and feedback. In some agencies, reach is part of the results chain.

Results framework: The program logic that explains how the development objective is to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions.

Results-Based Management (RBM): A management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts.

Results framework: The program logic that explains how the development objective is to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions.

Review: An assessment of the performance of an intervention, periodically or on an ad hoc basis. Frequently "evaluation" is used for a more comprehensive and/or more indepth assessment than "review". Reviews tend to emphasize operational aspects (in the case of the CGIAR including the science).

Stakeholders: Agencies, organisations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation.

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

Target group: The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit the development intervention is undertaken.

User (Client): Research produces an output which may be released into the results chain at varying degrees of adaptation to final application. The immediate user is generally a partner in the chain such as scientists in a national research system or government policy advisor. The end user is the final user of the product fit to the local situation (as in farmers, policy implementers, forest dependent people). This is not the equivalent of ultimate beneficiary that may be for example hungry or poor people (jm).

Value-for Money (VFM): Utility derived from every purchase or every sum of money spent. (VFM). The relationship between economy, efficiency and effectiveness, sometimes known as the 'value chain'. VFM is high when there is an optimum balance between all three – relatively low costs, high productivity and successful outcomes (UK Audit Commission).

Annex 2: Proposed Composition of the Reference Panel

Elizabeth McAllister recently chaired the Independent Review of the (CGIAR) and although this could be considered a conflict of interest she brings valuable insights from that work to the reference panel. She has held leadership positions in international development for over 25 years. She served in a number of senior positions at the World Bank including Director of the Operations Evaluation Department. Ms. McAllister led OED through a change process that linked its work plan to the Bank's policy agenda and scaled up its products to country, thematic/sector, and global reviews, from a previous focus on project evaluation. Prior to joining the World Bank, Ms. McAllister held executive positions in the Canadian International Development Agency in operations and policy including Director General, Performance Review (covering evaluation, internal audit and results based management). She has worked with a wide variety of international organizations on strategy, managing for results and evaluation including the UN FAO, the Caribbean Development Bank, the World Bank, CIDA, DIFD and the International Federation of the Red Cross-Red Crescent.

Bob Moore brings a long and comprehensive experience of the evaluation of agriculture and rural development to the panel. He is the Director of the FAO Office of Evaluation responsible for the evaluation of the totality of the Organization's work, including its public goods functions, governance and management. He has extensive knowledge of evaluation methodologies and practical experience in the management of large, complex evaluations as well as the development of evaluation policy. Bob has worked in the United Nations system throughout his 36 year career and in evaluation for 33 of those years, including in UNEP. He is familiar with the broad range of issues relating to international agricultural development, including institutional ones and has worked in all regions of the world, some 70 countries in total.

Zenda Ofir brings the evaluation perspective of the developing countries to the panel. She is a former president of the African Evaluation Association and former vice-president of the International Organisation for Cooperation in Evaluation. She has advised on evaluation policies and strategies for a large number of international agencies and has considerable experience of the development of monitoring and evaluation systems and the conduct of evaluations for government agencies, NGOs,

bilateral donors and international agencies. She is a previous member of SPIA. She annually teaches a course on aid effectiveness at the United Nations University and is a frequent guest lecturer in evaluation and learning. Zenda has a PhD in Chemistry and was national program manager in a South African science council (now the National Research Foundation) as well as Director of Research at the University of Pretoria.

Geoff Hawtin brings a management perspective and a historical and institutional overview of the CGIAR to the panel. He has served as: Interim Director General of the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT); Director General of Bioversity International; Deputy Director General for International Cooperation at ICARDA; Programme Leader, Food Legume Improvement at ICARDA; Director of the Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences Division of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC); and Founding CEO of the Global Crop Diversity Trust. He currently serves as: Senior Adviser at the Global Crop Diversity Trust; Chair of the Board of Directors of CATIE, Costa Rica; and is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew. Geoff has a Ph.D in plant sciences. Although Geoff is also currently a member of the CIAT Board of Trustees, it is not believed that this would compromise his role on the reference panel.

Rob D. van den Berg is currently Director of Evaluation at the Global Environment Facility in Washington, DC. He brings a large and varied experience of evaluation at senior levels to the panel. Rob has over 30 years of experience in international cooperation in a variety of positions at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the European Commission and the Global Environment Facility. In the early nineties he was the Dutch representative in the CGIAR. He was involved in the first efforts of IFPRI to develop impact evaluations and was a member of the impact evaluation task force of IFPRI until 2005. From 1999 to 2004 he was Director of Evaluation in the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He was Chairman of the OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation from 2002 to 2004 and involved in various joint international evaluations. He has co-edited several books and published numerous articles on various aspects of policy formulation, research, evaluation, history and development cooperation. He holds an M.A. in contemporary history.

Hans Gregersen is currently a Professor at the University of Minnesota. He brings a huge institutional memory of evaluation in the CGIAR to the panel, as well as considerable expertise (his direct association with the CGIAR ceased seven years ago and there is thus no continuing conflict of interest). His technical work, contained in over 190 publications, deals with impact assessment and evaluation of policy and economic issues associated with natural resources management. He has been a staff member and senior consultant with FAO, UNEP, the World Bank, IADB, ADB and OECD. Hans Gregersen joined the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the CGIAR in 1991 and continued on the Science Council until 2006. He served as chair of, first the independent Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group (IAEG), and later the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) and the Standing Committee on External Reviews for the international research centers and cross-cutting programs. In these capacities he participated actively in a review of the external evaluation process used in the CGIAR as well as in the design of its performance measurement and evaluation process. Hans Gregersen has been chair or a member of five External Program and Management Reviews of CGIAR Centers. He participated in a major evaluation of the progress and outputs of the USAID SANREM Cooperative Research Support Program (CRSP) and the Independent External Evaluation of FAO.

Winston J. Allen, originally from Sierra Leone, is currently a Senior Evaluation Specialist in the USAID Bureau for Policy, Planning and Research, where he provides technical support for the design and conduct of impact evaluations across the Feed-the-Future Presidential Initiative, Winston Allen brings an OECD-DAC perspective to the work of the panel. He has over 20 years experience in international development program monitoring and evaluation, socio-economic research, strategic and program planning, design and management. His skills and experience cut across several sectors including health, agriculture, education, and development economics. He has worked with NGOs, private foundations, the US Federal Government, and private corporations. He has extensive field experience working in countries in Africa, Asia, Middle East, and the Caribbean and prior to joining USAID focused his work on building the capacity for monitoring and evaluation, and use of data for decision-making and program management among regional organizations in Africa. Winston has a Ph.D in urban and regional planning and international development.

Annex 3: Indicative Listing - Deliverables of the Consultancy

(This listing is indicative and the Content, especially with respect to Guidance Notes, remains to be finalised and will be subject to availability of resources of time and money)

- 1) CGIAR evaluation policy is expected to cover:
 - a) the status of the policy;
 - b) purposes of evaluation and target audiences;
 - c) principles, fundamental standards and scope of evaluation, including independence and special features in evaluation of agricultural research for development;
 - d) institutional arrangements including, mandates, evaluation responsibilities and lines of reporting and consultation, including integration of individual donor evaluation needs;
 - e) the respective roles of evaluation, performance monitoring and management information systems, management reviews and impact assessment;
 - f) relationship of evaluation to other oversight functions, in particular audit;
 - g) principles of evaluation follow-up and learning;
 - h) determination of resources for evaluation, target level and sources of funding; and
 - i) an Annex providing the mandate of an Independent Evaluation Arrangement.

- 2) Evaluation Standards and Guidance (including criteria, metrics and methods):
 - a) Overall evaluation standards;
 - b) Initial guidance for the evaluation of CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs);
 - c) Initial guidance for the decentralized evaluation of CRP components and competency frameworks for evaluators and evaluation managers;
 - d) Initial framework and guidance for the evaluation of central scientific services, gene banks, etc.
 - e) Initial framework and guidance for the evaluation of the CGIAR partnership as a whole;
 - f) Guidance on the inclusion of partners in evaluation;
 - g) Principles of quality assurance;
 - h) Reference of resource materials; and
 - i) Notes on evaluation tools.

- 3) Elaborated proposals on institutional arrangements for the totality of the evaluation function in the CGIAR, including resources and staffing and for the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA):
 - a) Mandate, terms of reference and institutional arrangements for the IEA and its head;
 - b) Physical location and hosting of the IEA;
 - c) Staffing and principles for the use of consultants and contractors for the IEA, including selection and recruitment, basic job descriptions and tendering;
 - d) Arrangements for decentralized evaluation;
 - e) Establishing decentralized evaluation capacity and community of practice;
 - f) Scheduling of the full establishment of the IEA and initial work programme of the IEA;
 - g) Budget of the IEA; and
 - h) Budgeting for evaluation in the CRPs;

- 4) For Monitoring and Management Information on CRPs and other elements of CGIAR performance as required – notes covering:
 - a) Principles;
 - b) Interface between evaluation and monitoring and management information;
 - c) Performance indicators and metrics; and
 - d) Consolidation and unification of donor requirements for high level impact indicators (also for evaluation);.

This deliverable may take the form of a dialogue with the Consortium, rather than specific papers

- 5) In addition to the substantive documents the team will provide a summary report on the methods used in its work, the persons and documents consulted, analysis of any questionnaire responses, etc.

Annex 4: Persons Consulted and Providing Support During the Inception Phase

ADMINISTRATIVE AND LOGISTIC SUPPORT

Manuel Lantin	Science Adviser, Fund Council Office
Maria Iskandarani	Technical Specialist, Fund Council Office
Su Ching Tan	Administrator, WorldFish

CONSULTATIONS

FUND COUNCIL

Fund Council Members

David Radcliffe	Europe - European Commission
Carmen Thoennissen	Europe -Switzerland
Jonathan Wadsworth	Europe – DFID, UK
Hakan Mastorp	Europe – SDA, Sweden
Luciano Nass	LAC – EMBRAPA, Brazil
Catherine Coleman	North America – ACDI/CIDA, Canada

Rob Bertram	North America – USAID, USA
Nick Austin	Pacific – ACIAR, Australia
Raghunath Ghodake	Pacific - Papua New Guinea
Jean Lebel	Representing Foundations – IDRC, Canada
Prabhu Pingali	Representing Foundations – Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, USA
Juergen Voegelé	World Bank
Shantanu Mathur	IFAD

Fund Council Office

Fionna Douglas	Acting Executive Secretary
Iftikhar Mostafa	Adviser (Governance)
Manuel Lantin	Science Adviser
Maria Iskandarani	Technical Specialist

CONSORTIUM

Consortium Board Members (presentation and discussion)

Carlos Perez del Castillo Chair
Lynn Haight
Tom Arnold
Ganeshan Blachander
Agnes Mwang'ombe
Ian Goldin
Mohamed Ait Kadi
Matin Quaim

Consortium Office

Lloyd Le Page	Executive Director
Anne-Marie Izac	Chief Scientific Officer
Jennifer Cramer	Consultant
Martin Pineiro	Consultant, Lead on CGIAR Strategic Results Framework

CGIAR CENTERS Directors-General and Board Chairs (presentation and discussion)

BIOVERSITY	Emile Frison, Director General Paul Zuckerman, Board Chair
CIAT	Ruben Echeverria, Director General Juan Lucas Restrepo, Board Chair
CIFOR	Frances Seymour, Director General Hosny el-Lakany, Board Chair
CIMMYT	Thomas Lumpkin, Director General
CIP	Pamela Anderson, Director General (separate communication)
ICARDA	Mahmoud Solh, Director General Henri Carsalade, Board Chair
ICRISAT	William Dar, Director General Nigel Poole, Board Chair
IFPRI	Shenggen Fan, Director General Fawzi al-Sultan, Board Chair
IITA	Hartmann, Director-General (separate communication) Bryan Harvey, Board Chair
ILRI	Carlos Seré, Director General
IRRI	Robert Zeigler, Director General
IWMI	Colin Chartres, Director General

ICRAF	Dennis Garrity Director General
Eric Tollens	Board Chair
WorldFish	Stephen Hall, Director General
	Remo Gautschi, Board Chair

INDEPENDENT SCIENCE AND PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL (ISPC) - Board Members (presentation and discussion)

Kenneth Cassman, Chair
Vibha Dhawan
Rashid Hassan
Marcio de Miranda Santos
Jeffrey Sayer

STANDING PANEL ON IMPACT ASSESSMENT (SPIA)

Derek Byerlee	Chair
Mywish Maredia	Impact Assessment specialist (Associate professor, Michigan State University)

Secretariat ISPC and SPIA

Peter Gardiner	Executive Secretary
Tim Kelley	Senior Agricultural Research Officer
Sirkka Immonen	Senior Agricultural Research Officer (SPIA)
James Stevenson	Agricultural Research Officer (SPIA)

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING SPECIALISTS

Uma Lele	Consultant: Leader – 2003 global CIAR review
Elizabeth McAllister	Consultant: Leader – 2008 global CIAR review
Keith Bezanson	Consultant: senior member 2008 CGIAR review team
Rob Van Den Berg	Director, Evaluation office, Global Environment Facility
Aaron Azueta	Senior Evaluation Officer, Global Environment Facility
Cheryl Gray	Director, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank
Martha Ainsworth	Adviser to the Director, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank
Christopher Gerrard	Lead Evaluation Officer, Corporate and Global Methods, IEG, World Bank
Fred Carden	Head of Evaluation, Canadian International Development Research Center (IDRC)
Goberdhan Singh	Director General, Evaluation Directorate, ACDI/CIDA Canada
Bob Moore	Director, Office of Evaluation FAO
Javier Ekbois	Director – ILAC Cross-Center Institutional Learning and Change Initiative, CGIAR
Cristina Sette	Programme Specialist, ILAC
Debbie Templeton	Research Project Manager for Impact Assessment, ACIAR Australia
Yvonne Pinto	Director, ALIne (Agriculture Learning and Impacts Network)
David Bonbright	Chief Executive, Keystone Accountability
Andy Hall	Head of the Central Research team, Research into Use Programme

SENIOR STAFF AND EVALUATION AND IMPACT SPECIALISTS IN CGIAR Centers who have been interviewed and/or provided information (in addition to DGs Listed Above)

Maya Rajasekharan	Program Officer, Office of the Director General, CIAT
Andrew Taber	Deputy Director General (Research) CIFOR
Marianne Bänzinger	Deputy Director General (Research and Partnership), CIMMYT
Bekele Shiferaw	Director, Socioeconomics Program, CIMMYT

Maria Luz C. George	Head, Project Management Unit, CIMMYT
Graham Thiele	Leader of Social and Health Sciences Division, CIP
Guy Hareau	Head of Impact Assessment, CIP
Aden Aw Hassan	Director of Social, Economic and Policy Research Program, ICARDA
Dave Hoisington	Deputy Director General – Research, ICRISAT
Cynthia Bantilan	Global Theme Leader Markets, Policy and Impact, ICRISAT
Stacy Roberts	Head of Donor Relations, IFPRI
Peter Hazell	Head of Independent Impact Assessment, IFPRI
Victor Manyong	Director, Research for Development Directorate, IITA
John McDermott	Deputy Director General – Research, ILRI
Nancy Johnson	Agricultural Economist – Impact assessment, ILRI
David Raitzer	Impact Assessment and Strategic Planning, IRRRI
Mark Giordiano	Head, Institutions and Policies, IWMI
Tony Simons	Deputy Director General, ICRAF
Frank Place	Head of Impact Assessment, ICRAF
Charles Crissman	Director of Policy Economics and Social Science, WorldFish
Elisabetta Gotor	Impact Assessment Specialist, WorldFish

DONOR AGENCY STAFF (in addition to Fund Council Members and Evaluation Specialists)

ACDI/CIDA – Canada	Iain Macgillivray, DG, Multilateral Development Institutions
DFID – UK	Rachel Lambert, Senior Agriculture Research Adviser, DFID Research
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation:	David Bergvinson, Senior Program Officer, Agricultural Dev
USAID – USA	Meredith Soule, Agricultural and Natural Resources Economist?
Emily Hogue, Jane Gore, Eric Whittey:	Evaluation, monitoring and learning Specialists, rural development research and development
World Bank	Jock Anderson, Consultant, Agriculture and Rural Development Dept
Eija Pehu	Agriculture and Rural Development Department

CGIAR TRUSTEE – World Bank

Ulrich Hess	CGIAR Fund Trustee (Multilateral Trusteeship and Innovative Financing)
Neil Ashar	Counsel, Legal Vice Presidency

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL HOSTING ARRANGEMENTS

Manoj Juneja	FAO Assistant DG- Administration and Finance
--------------	--

GLOBAL FORUM ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Mark Holderness	Executive Secretary
-----------------	---------------------

Annex 5: Voices for Change-Annex Chapter 4: An M&E Framework for the New CGIAR

1. INTRODUCTION

The funders and implementers of the CGIAR's international agricultural research for development share a mutual accountability to all users of that research, and together with partners, have a shared responsibility for getting CGIAR research into use to achieve development outcomes.

The CGIAR accountability lies in four main areas:

- *Strategic Impact*
- *Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance*
- *Managerial and Governance Performance*
- *Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization*

A key element of good accountability practice is Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), as both learning and control mechanisms at the levels of the Centers, the Consortium, the Mega Programs, the Fund, and the Partnership as a whole.

Monitoring and evaluation in the CGIAR has been evolving since the CGIAR was established in 1971. The Review mechanisms currently include External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs) of Centers, Center Board-commissioned external reviews (CCERs), Inter-Center thematic stripe reviews, donor commissioned center and/or program reviews, and the annual Performance Measurement (PM) System.

While these mechanisms have been strengthened in recent years and the culture of monitoring and evaluation is strong, a primary objective of the reform process was to streamline review processes, clarify core responsibilities and reduce duplication. The new M&E Framework is designed to achieve these objectives while also strengthening M&E outputs and meeting fiduciary requirements of the Fund and the Consortium.

2. A NEW M&E FRAMEWORK FOR THE CGIAR

The new Monitoring and Evaluation Framework will support the successful execution of the SRF and help translate the CGIAR vision into tangible results. It will reflect a new accountability framework in which the Consortium is responsible for high quality monitoring and evaluation of Centers and their contribution to the Mega Programs, and the Fund Council regularly appraises the performance of the Consortium. In addition, an independent evaluation arrangement will be established to avoid conflicts of interest.

2.1. PRINCIPLES OF M&E IN THE CGIAR

- (1) Evaluation of performance to achieve the Strategy and Results Framework and governance of the CGIAR will follow

DEFINITIONS

Monitoring — A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing (development) intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

Evaluation — The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program. An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, on-going, or completed (development) intervention.

Source: OECD-DAC, "Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results," Paris, 2002.

international best practice and will include evaluations that are independent and impartial to the policy-making process and delivery and management of program.

- (2) The Consortium, Centers and CGIAR Fund donors are mutually accountable for Mega Program outputs financed by the Fund. As agreed in the performance agreements, (i) the Consortium and Centers are accountable for high-quality science and technology products and services, and (ii) fund donors are accountable for an aligned provision of funds to support the development of research outputs.
- (3) The monitoring system for research under the SRF is the overall responsibility of the Consortium and is designed to provide real-time information about program outputs and outcomes to research managers in Centers and the Consortium. This information also serves as a basis for regular progress reports of the Consortium to the Fund Council, and thus for annual performance reviews by the Fund Council. A common system and set of metrics will be used for reporting program performance information to the Consortium and the Fund Council.
- (4) The evaluation system provides periodic objective assessments of the extent to which Mega Programs and other aspects of the CGIAR are likely to or have achieved their stated objectives, as articulated in the SRF and the CGIAR Joint Declaration.
 - The Consortium Board commissions periodic *External Evaluations of Mega Programs components* and/or cross-cutting issues. These evaluations feed into the independent evaluations of Mega Programs.
 - The Consortium Board also commissions *External Evaluations of Centers* every five years to evaluate Centers' governance, management and financial health. The broad objective of a Center evaluation is to provide the Consortium Board with an external and rigorous assessment of the institutional health of Centers. The evaluation of Centers programmatic performance is

incorporated in the evaluation of Mega-Programs.

- The Fund Council commissions *Independent Evaluations of Mega Programs* every four years focusing on the extent to which its outputs and outcomes are likely to achieve, or have achieved, stated objectives. The evaluations are implemented through an independent evaluation arrangement and may include validation of findings from external evaluations commissioned by the Consortium.
- An *Independent Evaluation of the Partnership* is carried out every six to seven years. It is commissioned by a Reference Group constituted for the purpose, in which all relevant parties will be represented. The evaluation will assess (i) the efficacy of the Consortium, the Fund, the ISPC (including their support units), and the relationship with GCARD; and (ii) the effectiveness of the research conducted by the Partnership in light of the CGIAR Vision and Strategic Objectives.
- All evaluations will be carried out in the context of this framework, i.e., all CGIAR Fund Donors and Centers will to the extent possible and unless otherwise approved by the Consortium Board, rely on this evaluation framework and refrain from conducting additional, duplicative evaluations of Mega Programs or Centers. All evaluations are publicly disclosed.

2.2 PERFORMANCE MONITORING

Key characteristics of the new monitoring system follow:

- A reliable and harmonized performance monitoring system for Centers and Mega Program will be established and managed by the Consortium.
- This *Integrated Planning and Results Measurement System*¹ will provide streamlined information on Mega Program plans, status of implementation,

¹ . Possibly developed based on the current EasyMTP/CGMap, Performance Measurement System, and the Financial Information System (FIS).

international best practice and will include evaluations that are independent and impartial to the policy-making process and delivery and management of program.

- (2) The Consortium, Centers and CGIAR Fund donors are mutually accountable for Mega Program outputs financed by the Fund. As agreed in the performance agreements, (i) the Consortium and Centers are accountable for high-quality science and technology products and services, and (ii) fund donors are accountable for an aligned provision of funds to support the development of research outputs.
- (3) The monitoring system for research under the SRF is the overall responsibility of the Consortium and is designed to provide real-time information about program outputs and outcomes to research managers in Centers and the Consortium. This information also serves as a basis for regular progress reports of the Consortium to the Fund Council, and thus for annual performance reviews by the Fund Council. A common system and set of metrics will be used for reporting program performance information to the Consortium and the Fund Council.
- (4) The evaluation system provides periodic objective assessments of the extent to which Mega Programs and other aspects of the CGIAR are likely to or have achieved their stated objectives, as articulated in the SRF and the CGIAR Joint Declaration.
 - The Consortium Board commissions periodic *External Evaluations of Mega Programs components* and/or cross-cutting issues. These evaluations feed into the independent evaluations of Mega Programs.
 - The Consortium Board also commissions *External Evaluations of Centers* every five years to evaluate Centers' governance, management and financial health. The broad objective of a Center evaluation is to provide the Consortium Board with an external and rigorous assessment of the institutional health of Centers. The evaluation of Centers programmatic performance is

incorporated in the evaluation of Mega-Programs.

- The Fund Council commissions *Independent Evaluations of Mega Programs* every four years focusing on the extent to which its outputs and outcomes are likely to achieve, or have achieved, stated objectives. The evaluations are implemented through an independent evaluation arrangement and may include validation of findings from external evaluations commissioned by the Consortium.
- *An Independent Evaluation of the Partnership* is carried out every six to seven years. It is commissioned by a Reference Group constituted for the purpose, in which all relevant parties will be represented. The evaluation will assess (i) the efficacy of the Consortium, the Fund, the ISPC (including their support units), and the relationship with GCARD; and (ii) the effectiveness of the research conducted by the Partnership in light of the CGIAR Vision and Strategic Objectives.
- All evaluations will be carried out in the context of this framework, i.e., all CGIAR Fund Donors and Centers will to the extent possible and unless otherwise approved by the Consortium Board, rely on this evaluation framework and refrain from conducting additional, duplicative evaluations of Mega Programs or Centers. All evaluations are publicly disclosed.

2.2 PERFORMANCE MONITORING

Key characteristics of the new monitoring system follow:

- A reliable and harmonized performance monitoring system for Centers and Mega Program will be established and managed by the Consortium.
- This *Integrated Planning and Results Measurement System*¹ will provide streamlined information on Mega Program plans, status of implementation,

¹ . Possibly developed based on the current EasyMTP/CGMap, Performance Measurement System, and the Financial Information System (FIS).

results, finance, and partnerships. It will provide access to project and program monitoring information at different aggregation levels for monitoring purposes by Centers, Consortium, and Fund.

- Performance in the four areas of accountability will be monitored: (i) Strategic Impact (SI), (ii) Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance (PP), (iii) Managerial and Governance Performance (M&G), and (iv) Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization (FP& RB).
- The Fund Council will regularly appraise the performance of the Consortium in meeting its obligations as defined in the performance agreements.
- The Fund Council is the principal performance monitoring body of the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC).
- The Fund Council may review the performance of the Fund Office and Trustee.²
- The Fund Council monitors the efficacy of its fund allocation mechanism.

Table 1 describes the new monitoring system.

2.3 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Key characteristics of the new evaluation system:

- Performance evaluation in the new CGIAR will comprise (i) external evaluations of Mega Program components commissioned by the Consortium Board on a regular schedule, (ii) independent evaluations of Mega Programs and/or cross-cutting themes commissioned by the Fund Council and which may inter alia validate findings of Consortium-commissioned evaluations, and (iii) independent evaluation of the CGIAR Partnership as a whole commissioned by a Joint Fund Council/Consortium Reference Group.
- The latter two types of evaluation will be conducted by an independent arrangement on a regular schedule. The various evaluation products will be aligned in scope to avoid duplication and

2. Management and oversight of the Fund Office and Trustee of the Fund rests with the World Bank. Any performance reviews by the Fund Council of the Fund Office or Trustee would be conducted in coordination with the Bank and could advise the Bank in its management and oversight capacities.

inefficiencies while ensuring rigor and credibility.³

- Evaluations will assess performance in the four areas of accountability: (i) Strategic Impact (SI), (ii) Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance (PP), (iii) Managerial and Governance Performance (M&G), and (iv) Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization (FP& RB).
- Each institution and Partnership body would be required to obtain 360 degree feedback of their performance as part of its own learning and improvement plans.
- Adequate involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process is considered essential.
- All CGIAR Fund Donors and Centers will rely, to the extent possible and unless otherwise approved by the Consortium Board, on this evaluation framework and refrain from conducting additional, duplicative evaluations of Mega Programs or Centers.

Table 2 describes the evaluation system for the new CGIAR.

2.4 MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR OUTPUTS” AND “SHARED RESPONSIBILITY FOR OUTCOMES”

In the new CGIAR, two concepts are being introduced that are being addressed by the M&E framework:

- “mutual accountability for outputs,” which is the relationship between entities within the new CGIAR, where the Consortium and Centers can be expected to be held fully accountable for high-quality science and technology products and services within an agreed time, and mutually, the Fund Donors would be held accountable for an aligned provision of funds to support the development of research outputs as agreed in the performance agreements.
- “shared responsibility for outcomes,” where both Consortium and CGIAR donors together with their partners have a shared responsibility for managing toward outcomes, i.e., demonstrating sustainable influence and uptake of outputs by clients and longer-term improvements of livelihoods in developing countries.

3. An “external” evaluation is an evaluation conducted by entities and/or individuals outside the donor and implementing organizations. An “independent” evaluation is an evaluation carried out by entities and persons free of the control of those responsible for the design and implementation of the program. Independence implies freedom from political influence and organizational pressure (OECD-DAC, “Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management,” Paris 2002).

TABLE 1: PERFORMANCE MONITORING IN THE CGIAR

MONITORING BODY	PERFORMANCE DIMENSION ^a	AREA OF ACCOUNTABILITY ^a	METHODOLOGY AND INDICATORS	FREQUENCY
CONSORTIUM	MP subprograms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ outputs ■ Intermediate outcomes 	PP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Performance Measurement of Programs, i.e., comprehensive monitoring of achievement of MP subcomponent outputs and intermediate outcomes 	Ongoing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Institutional and financial health of Centers 	FP&RB M&G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Performance Measurement of institutional and financial health indicators 	Annual
	MP Performance Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Results 	SI and PP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Measurement of core output and outcome indicators as defined in the SRF 	Annual
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Progress and Corporate Risks 	FP&RB M&G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Implementation ratings, disbursement rates ■ measures of (i) partnership quality and relevance, (ii) stakeholder perceptions, (iii) cost of consortium administration relative to cost of research, (iv) compliance to fiduciary good practices 	
FUND COUNCIL	Performance Agreements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rights and obligations defined in performance agreements ■ Resource mobilization and efficacy of fund allocation 	SI PP M&G FP&RB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Based on Consortium report, performance/compliance reviews of performance agreements ■ Adequate funding flows ■ Leveraging complementarities with national programs and bilateral technical assistance programs 	Annual
	ISPC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Results ■ Client orientation 	PP M&G FP&RB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Achievement of work plan ■ Satisfaction survey 	
	Fund Office	Bank Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Achievement of work plan ■ Satisfaction survey 	

a. Strategic Impact (SI); Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance (PP); Managerial and Governance Performance (M&G); Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization (FP&RB)

TABLE 2: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN THE CGIAR

COMMISSIONING BODY	EVALUATION PRODUCT ^{A,B,C}	FREQUENCY
CONSORTIUM BOARD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External evaluation of each Center governance, management and financial health 	5 years
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External evaluation of MP components and cross-cutting Issues 	4 years
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External evaluation of Consortium Office, including shared services 	
FUND COUNCIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent evaluation of Mega Programs and cross cutting Issues 	4 years
JOINT CONSORTIUM/FUND COUNCIL REFERENCE GROUP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Partnership Review 	6 to 7 years

a. In addition each entity will conduct 360° assessments and/or stakeholder perception surveys on a regular basis (i.e., 2–3 years). b. The Independent evaluation of Mega Programs and the Independent Partnership Review will be conducted by an independent evaluation arrangement. c. Brief definitions of the various evaluation products can be found in the glossary. d. Purpose-built management structure in which both the Consortium and the Fund share control and all CGIAR donors share cost. It is formed for the specific purpose of commissioning and receiving the CGIAR Partnership Review and will be dissolved upon completion of the review.

- Within this shared responsibility for outcomes, the Consortium together with the Centers are expected to be accountable for engaging with partners, aligning the research agenda with developing countries’ priorities, advocating research needs and achievements, monitoring outcomes based on agreed indicators, and monitoring global trends.
- The CGIAR donors, in turn, are responsible for harmonizing and aligning their policies and for making an effort to effectively leverage

complementarities between CGIAR research and their national programs (developing-country donors) or their bilateral technical assistance programs (multilateral organizations and developed-country donors).

Annex 1 illustrates an example of a possible logical results-monitoring framework in the context of the SRF (including indicators) incorporating the concepts of “mutual accountability for outputs” and “shared responsibility for outcomes.

2.5. LEARNING AND PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT

In order to make the M&E system most effective, clear follow-up principles, processes, and responsibilities will be defined for the various M&E products described in this framework, to ensure best possible learning and improvements in performance by the different entities. For instance, an evaluation both evaluates the effectiveness of research conducted by the Consortium through its Member Centers, and also enhances institutional learning through an effective feed-back loop from the evaluation to policy makers, researchers, and research managers as well as partners. Moreover, the Fund needs to put in place a process for reviewing the M&E information on the Mega Programs and to take corrective action where necessary.

3. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

In the new CGIAR, the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) will provide independent advice and expertise to the Fund Council. In addition part of the ISPC's terms of reference is to "improve strategic investment decisions and help increase the rigor and the reach of impact assessment studies within the CGIAR by commissioning, in partnership with the Consortium, *ex-post* impact assessment of the development effectiveness of CGIAR investments." To this end the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) will maintain its current form as an independent panel with the Chair of the Panel functioning as an *ex officio* member of the ISPC.

4. INDEPENDENT EVALUATION ARRANGEMENT

The new independent evaluation arrangement will be finalized in its design in 2010 and become operational in 2010/11 or as required. Its design and governance should be in accordance with international best practice and follow standards of "independence" as defined by the OECD/DAC Network of Development Evaluation, based on guidance provided by the Fund Council in consultation with the Consortium Board.

"INDEPENDENCE AND IMPARTIALITY IS A PREREQUISITE FOR THE CREDIBILITY OF EVALUATIONS"

The Sourcebook for Evaluating Regional and Global Partnership Programs, Indicative Principles and Standards, published by the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank and the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, identifies the organizational independence of the evaluation function as a key good practice in evaluation governance.

The sourcebook states that "the members of an evaluation unit or team should not have been directly responsible for setting the policy, design, or overall management of the program, nor expect to be in the near future. Members of an evaluation unit or team evaluating a Global and Regional Partnership Program should report to a unit separate from program management. This would normally be the commissioner of the evaluation, usually the governing body. Members of the unit or team should be insulated from political pressures from either donors or beneficiary groups and should not participate in political activities that could affect independence."

Source: Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank and the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, *Sourcebook for Evaluating Regional and Global Partnership Programs, Indicative Principles and Standards*, Washington, DC 2007, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXT/GLOREGPARPRO/Resources/sourcebook.pdf>

Additional key considerations in exploring an independent evaluation arrangement are

- To limit added bureaucracy;
- to leverage already established good practices and capacity in evaluation through tapping new networks of evaluation experts in agricultural research and development;
- to enhance evaluation professionalism in the CGIAR;
- to retain institutional memory and promote institutional learning;
- to stimulate methodological advancement in the evaluation of the "Research-Development Continuum";
- to leverage potential synergies in agricultural research outcome evaluation, i.e., interventions leading to uptake of technologies and other research outputs by partners and stakeholders that are in common;
- to support harmonization efforts in light of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action.

Annex 6: Extract from Letter from Chair of Consortium to Chair of the Fund Council Expressing Concerns With the Proposed 2009 M&E Framework

I would like to express today my concern with regard to the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the new CGIAR that was approved at the CGIAR Business Meeting in December 2009. Chapter 4 of "Voices for Change – M&E Framework for the new CGIAR" begins by stating: "a primary objective of the reform process was to streamline and reduce duplication. The new M&E Framework is designed to achieve these objectives".

However, it is questionable if the outline of the new M&E Framework fully fulfills this promise. The decisions taken reflect a new accountability framework in which the Consortium Board is responsible for external evaluation of each Centre, CRPs and crosscutting issues including Consortium Office and shared services, while the Fund Council is responsible for evaluating CRPs and cross-cutting issues through the establishment of a new Independent Evaluation Arrangement. The evaluations by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement may include validation of findings from external evaluations of CRPs commissioned by the Consortium, but reports and accountability would be only to the Fund Council. There is also provision for an independent evaluation of the Partnership (Consortium, Fund Council, ISPC) and the relationship with GCARD every six to seven years. The Independent Science and Partnership Council commissions in partnership with the Consortium, *ex-post* impact assessment of the development effectiveness of CGIAR investments. Further the Centers continue to have a responsibility for evaluation of work outside the CRPs and it may also be noted that the 2008 Independent Review of the CGIAR System found that Centers were overburdened with individual donor evaluations of small grants.

At the first meeting of the Fund Council held in Brussels in February 2010, there was a lively debate with regards to the establishment, functions and role of the CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement and how it could operate effectively within the new M&E Framework as approved. A number of concerns were expressed, including by me, regarding the potential duplication of evaluations and evaluation functions and responsibilities among the various actors in the system as well as to its cost-effectiveness.

As a result, the Fund Council agreed to commission a consultancy to address these issues. The scope of the work for two evaluation experts as defined in the TORs for the consultancy is largely limited to developing the Independent Evaluation Arrangement as originally envisaged, without taking an overall look at the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed evaluation framework. I would like to place on record that the Consortium Board was not consulted in the preparation of the TORs. The consultant team however is supposed to engage initially, in a number of consultations with stakeholders, including the Fund Council and Consortium Board members and CEO in order to determine their needs and expectations, before submitting its inception report and this does provide an opportunity to address wider concerns.

We feel strongly that this consultancy offers an excellent opportunity for the consultants to provide guidance on the most effective and cost-effective way in which the roles of monitoring and evaluation by the different governance structures of the CGIAR system, including the newly created Independent Evaluation Arrangement should be organized for the benefit of the CGIAR System as a whole. A central feature in this undertaking should be to come up with a lean and simple system as possible, reducing to a minimum the potential overlaps, avoiding excessive transaction costs and fostering coherence and learning from evaluation by all parties as well as accountability.

Annex 7: The Current Evaluation Work Load of the Centers

Numbers of Externally Commissioned Reviews and Evaluations						
Center	Period for which reported	Average Number Reviews & Evaluations per year	External Reviews Commissioned By:			
			ISPC/CGIAR	Challenge Fund	Center Board (CCERs)	Individual donor
CIMMYT	mid 2008-2010	10	1	1	1	12
CIP	2007-11	3			4	8
CIAT	2006-11	1.8	2	1		6
ICARDA	2006-10	3	2		6	8
ILRI	2008-9	5	n/s		4	5
Bioversity	2007-10	2.3	1		3	5
CIFOR	2007-9	2.0	1		1	4+
Average 7 Centers		3.8				
Percentage by number of evaluations			9%	3%	25%	63%
Average number of external reviewers per evaluation/review was 2.6 with a median range of 1-3						
Average duration of missions was 12 days with the great majority being 1-2 weeks but the EPMR reported being one month						
Source: Center responses to consultant team						

Annex 8: Documents and Publications Consulted by the Consultants During the Inception Phase

We are grateful to staff and partners of CGIAR institutions for sharing many of these documents with us. We encourage people to point out any important documents we have missed. As well as those listed, we have also looked at the draft CRPs and a number of individual reviews CCERs and EPMRs that have been sent in by Centers as examples of useful evaluations and reviews.

Arivananthan, Meena, Peter Ballantyne, and Enrica M. Porcari. 2010. Benchmarking CGIAR research outputs for availability and accessibility [Article and Abstract]. *Agricultural Information Worldwide* 3, no. 1 (January 30): 17-22.

Bantilan, Cynthia, P. Mehta, S. Chandra, and J. Keatinge. 2008. Dealing with diversity in scientific outputs: implications for international research evaluation. *Research Evaluation* 13, no. 2: 87.

Byerlee, Derek, James Stevenson, Tim Kelley, Mywish Maredia, and Ross Connor. 2010. *Assessing the impacts of research-led agricultural technologies on poverty and hunger: Plans for a major new initiative by the CGIAR Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)*. SPIA Briefing Note, 3rd May 2010.

<http://impact.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/images/Povertybriefing.pdf>.

CGIAR. 2009. *Voices for Change, the New CGIAR*, December 8 2009

- CGIAR Consortium. 2011. *A Strategy and Results Framework for the CGIAR: For submission to the CGIAR Funders Forum, February 20, 2011.*
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/srf_feb20_2011.pdf.
- CGIAR Fund Council. 2010. *Summary of inaugural meeting, February 23, 2010, Brussels.*
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/FC01_sop_march31_2010.pdf.
- CGIAR Fund Office. n.d. *Principles and Options for an Independent Evaluation Arrangement for the CGIAR Fund. Summary.* Document for First Fund Council meeting in Brussels, 23 Feb 2010.
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc1 CGIAR_ia_options.pdf.
- . 2010. *Exploring Options for an Independent Evaluation Arrangement for the CGIAR: Report on a Workshop held on January 20, 2010 in Washington DC.*
- CGIAR Independent Review Panel. 2008. *Bringing together the best of science and the best of development: Independent Review of the CGIAR System Synthesis Report.* Independent Review of the CGIAR System. Report to the Executive Council. Also full technical report, at
http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CBYQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.cgiar.org%2Fpdf%2Fagm08%2Fagm08 CGIAR-technical-report.pdf&rct=j&q=bringing%20together%20the%20best%20of%20science%20and%20the%20best%20of%20development%20cgiar&ei=5Y2GTfSQB42LhQevyf3LBA&usg=AFQjCNGAIh2bFmx3tusBBxCUA_9kDpUHrA&cad=rja
http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/agm08/agm08_independent_review_synthesis_report.pdf.
- Cooksy, Leslie. 2008. *Enhancing the Use of Ex post Evaluation of Outcomes and Impacts in the CGIAR: Summary of Key Issues.* Science Council, CGIAR.
http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Impact_Assessment/eplA_Learning_Summary_Report_FINAL.pdf.
- Douthwaite, Boru, Robert Delve, Javier Ekboir, and Steve Twomlow. 2003. Contending with Complexity: The Role of Evaluation in Implementing Sustainable Natural Resource Management. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 1, no. 1: 51-66.
- Ekboir, Javier. 2003. Why impact analysis should not be used for research evaluation and what the alternatives are. *Agricultural Systems* 78, no. 2. *Agricultural Systems*: 166-184.
- . 2004. *Can Impact Analysis be Used for Research Evaluation?* CMMYT.
<http://infoagro.net/shared/docs/a2/ekboir.pdf>.
- GLOBAL DONOR PLATFORM FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT (GDPRD), FAO, and World Bank. 2008. *Tracking results in agriculture and rural development in less-than-ideal conditions: A sourcebook of indicators for monitoring and evaluation.*
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0380e/i0380e00.htm>.
- Görgens, Marelize, and Jody Zall Kusek. 2009. *Making Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Work: A Capacity Development Toolkit.* World Bank.
http://intresources.worldbank.org/INTINFRES/Resources/2780429-1173474961747/Making_Monitoring_and_Evaluation_Systems_Work_2009.pdf.
- Gormley, Wilma. 2001. *Selecting Partners: Practical Considerations for Forming Partnerships.* Tips and Tools Series #2. Organizational Change Program for the CGIAR-Supported International Agricultural Research Centers. http://www.trg-inc.com/resources/electronic_partnerships.pdf.
- Haddad, Lawrence, Lindstrom Johanna, Pinto Yvonne (2010): *The Sorry State of M&E in Agriculture: Can People-Centred Approaches Help?*
- Hall, Andrew, V. Rasheed Sulaiman, Norman Clark, and B. Yoganand. 2003. From measuring impact to learning institutional lessons: an innovation systems perspective on improving the management of international agricultural research. *Agricultural Systems* 78, no. 2

- (November): 213-241. doi:10.1016/S0308-521X(03)00127-6.
- Hall, Andrew, and V. Rasheed Sulaiman. 2005. 11 - Innovation Systems Perspective: From Measuring Impact to Learning Institutional Lessons. http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-85054-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.
- Horton, Douglas, Gordon Prain, and Gordon Prain. 2010. *Perspectives on Partnership: Highlights of a Literature Review*. CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative. http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/briefs/ILAC_Brief25_Partnership.pdf.
- IDL/TANGO. 2010. *Evaluation of Innovation Systems and Agricultural Research Programmes: Literature Review*. DFID, Research Into Use Programme. <http://www.researchintouse.com/resources/riu10innovsys-litreviewdrft.pdf>.
- IDS Various authors. 2010. IDS Bulletin - Volume 41, Issue 6 - *People-centred M&E: Aligning Incentives So Agriculture Does More to Reduce Hunger* - Wiley Online Library. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezproxy.webfeat.lib.ed.ac.uk/doi/10.1111/idsb.2010.41.issue-6/issuetoc>.
- Jobin, Denis. 2008. A Transaction Cost-Based Approach to Partnership Performance Evaluation. *Evaluation* 14, no. 4 (October 1): 437 -465. doi:10.1177/1356389008095487.
- Kelley, Timothy, Jim Ryan, and Hans Gregersen. 2008. Enhancing ex post impact assessment of agricultural research: the CGIAR experience. *Research Evaluation* 17, no. 3: 201-212.
- Lahey, Robert. 2010. *The Canadian M&E System: Lessons Learned from 30 Years of Development*. World Bank Independent Evaluation Group. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEVACAPDEV/Resources/ecd_wp_23.pdf.
- Lele, Uma, and Javier Ekboir. 2004. Technology Generation, Adaptation, Adoption and Impact: Towards a Framework for Understanding and Increasing Research Impact. In *A paper prepared for a reader on Food Security, edited by Dr. Manfred Shulz of Freie Universität Berlin*. World Bank. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2005/04/08/000090341_20050408113908/Rendered/PDF/319640TGAAL.pdf.
- Lele, Uma, and Arthur A. Goldsmith. 1989. The Development of National Agricultural Research Capacity: India's Experience with the Rockefeller Foundation and Its Significance for Africa. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 37, no. 2 (January 1): 305-343.
- Lele, Uma, Jules Pretty, Eugene Terry, and Eduardo Trigo. 2010. *Transforming Agricultural Research for Development*. The Global Forum for Agricultural Research (GFAR) Report for the Global Conference on Agricultural Research (GCARD) 2010. http://www.fao.org/docs/eims/upload//282426/GAT_Report_GCARD_2010_complete.pdf.
- Lindstrom, Johanna. 2009. *What is the state of M&E in Agriculture? Findings of the ALINe online consultation survey*. ALINe. <http://www.aline.org.uk/pool/what-is-the-state-of-mande-in-agriculture.pdf>.
- Louis Lengrand & Associés, PREST University of Manchester, ANRT (Association nationale de la recherche technique), and Reidev Ltd. 2006. *Smart innovation: A Practical Guide to Evaluating Innovation Programmes*. Brussels-Luxembourg: European Commission: DG Enterprise and Industry. ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/innovation-policy/studies/sar1_smartinnovation_master2.pdf.
- Mackay, Ronald, and Douglas Horton. 2003. Expanding the use of impact assessment and evaluation in agricultural research and development. *Agricultural Systems* 78, no. 2 (November): 143-165. doi:10.1016/S0308-521X(03)00124-0.
- Maredia, Mywish, Derek Byerlee, and Jock Anderson. Ex Post Evaluation of Economic Impacts of Agricultural Research Programs: A Tour of Good Practice. In . nd. http://xsei.centrogeo.org.mx/vedet/biblioteca/val_eco_deg/ExpostEconImpacAgri.pdf.
- Maredia, Mywish K. 2009. *Improving the Proof: Evolution of and Emerging Trends in Impact Assessment Methods and Approaches in Agricultural Development*. IFPRI Discussion Paper 00929. Washington DC: IFPRI.

- <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/ifpridp00929.pdf>.
- Mayne, John. 2008. *Building an Evaluative Culture for Effective Evaluation and Results Management*. CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative.
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/52535/2/ILAC_WorkingPaper_No8_EvaluativeCulture_Mayne.pdf.
- Melamed, Claire. 2011. *Does development give poor people what they want?* Background Note. London: Overseas Development Institute, February.
<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/5360.pdf>.
- OECD. 1997. *The Evaluation of Scientific Research: Selected Experiences*. Paris: ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT.
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/9/26/2754549.pdf>.
- . 2006. *Government R&D Funding and Company Behaviour: Measuring Behavioural Additionality*. OECD Publishing.
- Okubo, Yoshiko. 1997. *Bibliometric Indicators and Analysis of Research Systems: Methods and Examples*. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers. OECD Publishing.
<http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/fulltext/5lgsjhvj7ng0.pdf?expires=1297356346&id=0000&ccname=guest&checksum=1CAD780919BF25E4B515D610B40B710F>.
- Perrin, Burt. 2000. How to — and How Not to — Evaluate Innovation. Paper presented at the UK Evaluation Society Conference <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/perrin.htm>.
- Raitzer, David A., and Timothy G. Kelley. 2008. Assessing the contribution of impact assessment to donor decisions for international agricultural research. *Research Evaluation* 17, no. 3: 187-199.
- Renkow, Mitch, and Derek Byerlee. 2010. The impacts of CGIAR research: A review of recent evidence. *Food Policy* 35, no. 5 (October): 391-402. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.04.006.
- Rovere, Roberto La, and John Dixon. 2007. *CIMMYT. Operational guidelines for assessing the impact of agricultural research on livelihoods. Good practices from CIMMYT*. CIMMYT.
<http://apps.cimmyt.org/english/docs/manual/ia/contents.htm>.
- Sagasti, Francisco, and Vanessa Timmer. 2008. *An Approach to the CGIAR as a Provider of International Public Goods*. Background report to the 2008 System-Wide Review of the CGIAR System. http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/ir_sagasti_timmer.pdf.
- Smith, Gordon C S, and Jill P Pell. 2003. Parachute use to prevent death and major trauma related to gravitational challenge: systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 327, no. 7429 (December 20): 1459-1461. doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7429.1459.
- Spencer, Dunstan, Stein W Bie, Ursula Blackshaw, and Anne Thomson. 2005. *Evaluation of DFID's Renewable Natural Resources Research Strategy (RNRRS)*. Evaluation Report EVD659. UK Department for International Development.
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/performance/files/ev659.asp>.
- Surr, Martin, Andrew Barnett, Alex Duncan, Melanie Speight, David Bradley, Alan Rew, and John Toye. 2002. *Research For Poverty Reduction: DFID Research Policy Paper*. London: UK Department for International Development.
<http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/0708/DOC10654.pdf>.
- The Boston Consulting Group. 2009. *Design and Establishment of the Consortium of CGIAR Centers: Final report*. Report submitted to the CGIAR Alliance. October.
[http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/cgiar/Documents/final_report_design_of CGIAR_centers_6oct09.pdf](http://www.ciat.cgiar.org/cgiar/Documents/final_report_design_of_consortium_of CGIAR_centers_6oct09.pdf).
- UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group) (2005) *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*
- UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group) (2005) *Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*
- UN OIOS. 2008. *Review of results-based management (RBM) at the United Nations Secretariat* United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services. <http://daccess-dds->

- ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N08/458/06/PDF/N0845806.pdf?OpenElement.
- Various authors. 2000. Special issue on data and strategies in evaluating public R&D. *Research Evaluation* 9, no. 2.
<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/beechn/rev/2000/00000009/00000002;jsessionid=tr4zhh1b9uqh.alexandra>.
- Walker, T., M. Maredia, T. Kelley, R. La Rovere, D. Templeton, G. Thiele, and B. Douthwaite. 2008. *Strategic Guidance for Ex Post Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research*. Prepared for the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment, CGIAR Science Council. Science Council Secretariat: Rome, Italy.
http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Impact_Assessment/SC_epIA_low-res_for_web.pdf.
- Watts, Jamie, Douglas Horton, Boru Douthwaite, Roberto La Rovere, Graham Thiele, Shambu Prasad, And Charles Staver. 2008. Transforming Impact Assessment: Beginning the Quiet Revolution of Institutional Learning and Change. *Experimental Agriculture* 44, no. 01: 21-35.
doi:10.1017/S0014479707005960.
- Whitty, Brendan. 2010. *An accountability framework for technological innovation*. ILAC Briefing 24. CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative. http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/briefs/ILAC_Brief24_Accountability.pdf.
- World Bank ARDD. 2006. *Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: How to Go Beyond the Strengthening of Research Systems*. Washington DC: World Bank Agriculture and Rural Development Department.
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/Enhancing_Ag_Innovation.pdf.
- World Bank OED. 2004. *The CGIAR at 31: An Independent Meta-Evaluation of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research*. World Bank Operations Evaluation Department.
http://www.wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2004/03/16/000090341_20040316114317/Rendered/PDF/281310PAPEROCGIAR0at0310see0also025926.pdf

Annex 9: Terms of Reference for the Consultancy

I. Background

At the 2009 CGIAR Business Meeting a new Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the new CGIAR was approved¹. It will support the successful implementation of the Strategy and Results Framework and help translate the CGIAR vision into tangible results. It reflects a new accountability framework in which the Consortium Board is responsible for external evaluation of each Center, Mega Program components and cross cutting issues, and Consortium Office including shared services, while the Fund Council is responsible for evaluating Mega Programs and cross cutting issues through an **independent evaluation arrangement**.

Excerpt from CGIAR M&E Framework

The evaluation system provides periodic objective assessments of the extent to which Mega Programs and other aspects of the CGIAR are likely to or have achieved their stated objectives, as articulated in the SRF and the CGIAR Joint Declaration.

¹ http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/Business%20Meeting%202009/voices_for_change_final_jan2010.pdf

- The Consortium Board commissions periodic *External Evaluations of Mega Program components* and/or cross-cutting issues. These evaluations feed into the independent evaluations of Mega Programs.
- The Consortium Board also commissions *External Evaluations of Centers* every five years to evaluate Centers' governance, management and financial health. The broad objective of a Center evaluation is to provide the Consortium Board with an external and rigorous assessment of the institutional health of Centers. The evaluation of Centers programmatic performance is incorporated in the evaluation of Mega-Programs.
- The Fund Council commissions *Independent Evaluations of Mega Programs* every four years focusing on the extent to which its outputs and outcomes are likely to achieve, or have achieved, stated objectives. The evaluations are implemented through an independent evaluation arrangement and may include validation of findings from external evaluations commissioned by the Consortium.
- An *Independent Evaluation of the Partnership* is carried out every six to seven years. It is commissioned by a Reference Group constituted for the purpose, in which all relevant parties will be represented. The evaluation will assess (i) the efficacy of the Consortium, the Fund, the ISPC (including their support units), and the relationship with GCARD; and (ii) the effectiveness of the research conducted by the Partnership in light of the CGIAR Vision and Strategic Objectives.

Source: Voices for Change, The New CGIAR, Washington DC, 2009

The overall M&E framework incorporates a number of decisions on the specific aspects of monitoring and evaluation. As approved by the CGIAR Business Meeting, an independent evaluation arrangement will be established; its design will be finalized in 2010 and it will become operational in 2010/11 or as required. Its design and governance should be in accordance with international best practice and follow standards of “independence” as defined by the OECD/DAC Network of Development Evaluation, based on guidance provided by the Fund Council in consultation with the Consortium Board.

At its first meeting on February 23, 2010, the Fund Council (FC) agreed to “*appoint a part-time (about 25%) evaluator for the next 18 months to help design the whole independent evaluation arrangement. The individual would:*

- *be hired by and work for the FC;*
- *be hired to move forward the establishment of the independent evaluation arrangement;*
- *be regarded not as a consultant but as an evaluator, to move forward the establishment of the independent evaluation arrangement;*
- *have independence from other entities in the System;*
- *would bring to the FC a high level of evaluation credibility;*
- *receive a ToR that the arrangement should include elements of independence, learning, cost-effectiveness, non-duplication of function, etc;*
- *work out the ToRs for the kinds of MP evaluation that the system expects to have and develop mock-ups of what such evaluation would look like;*
- *be given a deadline to submit his/her recommended design well before the scheduled conduct of the first evaluation; and*
- *not be involved in actual evaluation of the MPs and the system.*

A committee composed of FC members would be appointed to draft the ToR for the abovementioned individual and serve on the search and selection committee. Professional evaluators (e.g. the heads of IFAD’s evaluation unit and World Bank’s evaluation unit) would be invited to join the committee.”

At the Search and Selection Committee's suggestion, the Fund Council agreed during its second meeting on July 14 and 16 *“to shorten the timeline for design of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) from 18 months to 12 months. It also agreed that a second person should be hired to help design the IEA.”*

II. Objective of Assignment

Develop and establish an “Independent Evaluation Arrangement” for the CGIAR that will operate effectively within the new M&E Framework as approved by the CGIAR at its Business meeting in December 2009. The work should be guided by international best practice in evaluation, and involve adequate consultation with the key stakeholders.

III. Scope of work

During a 12-month period a team of two evaluation experts should design a new Independent Evaluation Arrangement for the CGIAR that would operate effectively within the new M&E framework (approved by the CGIAR in December 2009).

The framework states that “Performance evaluation in the new CGIAR will comprise (i) external evaluations of Mega Program components commissioned by the Consortium Board on a regular schedule, (ii) independent evaluations of Mega Programs and/or cross-cutting themes commissioned by the Fund Council and which may inter alia validate findings of Consortium-commissioned evaluations, and (iii) independent evaluation of the CGIAR Partnership as a whole commissioned by a Joint Fund Council/Consortium Reference Group.” The latter two types of evaluation will be led by a new CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement.

The CGIAR is a unique science for development partnership. Thus, lessons learned and best practices from science evaluation as well as development evaluation should be considered and incorporated into the CGIAR evaluation system.

The Team would have the following responsibilities:

1. Develop a CGIAR Policy on Research for Development Evaluation

These guidelines would encompass:

a. A set of core principles and norms to serve as guiding criteria for forming and operationalizing the evaluation function;

The basis for designing a new evaluation function is to establish a set of core principles and norms to serve as guiding criteria for forming and operationalizing the new evaluation function. Those principles and norms should embrace

- Independence
- Consultation with stakeholders, including end-users of research
- Competence and quality assurance
- Learning and knowledge building
- Non-duplication and cost-effectiveness.²

² Adapted from the United Nation Evaluation Group, Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, April 2005.

b. Evaluation Policies and Standards.

Building on international best practice, experiences from within the CGIAR and the CGIAR M&E framework document a **system-wide CGIAR Evaluation Policy and Standards** should be developed. It should encompass both Consortium and Fund Council commissioned external evaluations to ensure similar quality and methodology.

The **evaluation policy** should include

- Clear explanation of the concept and role of evaluation within the organization;
- Clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation professionals, the governing bodies, programme management at the Consortium/Centers;
- An emphasis on the need for adherence to the organization's evaluation guidelines;
- Explanation of how evaluations are prioritized, planned and linked;
- Description of how evaluations are organized, managed, budgeted and implemented; including an explanation of how key stakeholders (e.g. farmers organizations and civil society organizations) should be involved in the evaluation process;
- An emphasis on the requirements for the follow-up of evaluations;
- Clear statement on disclosure and dissemination of findings.²

Clear **system-wide standards** should be established as a reference guide for the evaluations that are to be conducted at the various programmatic and institutional levels of the CGIAR Partnership. These would address

- Competencies and ethics of evaluators
- Conduct of evaluations (i.e. design, process, selection of team, implementation, reporting, and follow-up (including learning and knowledge building)
- Evaluation report

The guidelines should be developed in close collaboration with the Consortium Board (or their representatives) to ensure agreement on and commitment to high quality standards across all evaluation products and effective alignment across the different levels of evaluation responsibilities.

The proposed CGIAR Policy on Evaluation jointly developed with the Consortium Board should be submitted to the Fund Council for approval.

2. Help define the Mandate of the Head of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA), and develop Terms of Reference for the new IEA and its Head

In the context of the CGIAR M&E Framework and informed by comprehensive consultations with stakeholder the evaluation experts should help to (i) clearly define the mandate of the head of the IEA and (ii) develop clear ToR for the unit as a whole and the unit head in particular. Special attention should be given to ensuring non-duplication of evaluation functions and impact assessment functions and responsibilities across the system.

The documents describing the mandate and the TORs should be submitted to the Fund Council for their approval.

3. Develop Guidelines for drafting Terms of Reference for the independent evaluation of CGIAR funded Mega-Programs

The new CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework will be implemented through a set of Mega Programs led by the Consortium and its Centers. For each MP a performance agreement will be signed with the CGIAR Fund. The future IEA will be leading the independent evaluation of the Mega Programs on behalf of the Fund Council.

The Evaluation Team should develop guidelines for terms of reference for the evaluation of Mega Programs that build on and validate Consortium Board commissioned periodic external evaluations of Mega Program components and/or cross-cutting issues. This will be critical to avoid duplication and increase cost-effectiveness of the evaluation system as a whole. The guidelines should set the broad rules for the formulation of ToR for individual Mega Programs.

The Guidelines should be fully aligned with the overall CGIAR Policy on Evaluation, and shall be submitted to the Fund Council for approval.

4. Develop guidelines for the independent evaluation of the CGIAR Partnership as a whole (“System-Review”)

The M&E Framework document states that an Independent Evaluation of the Partnership shall be carried out every six to seven years. It is commissioned by a Reference Group constituted for the purpose, in which all relevant parties will be represented and managed by IEA. The evaluation should assess (i) the efficacy of the Consortium, the Fund, the ISPC (including their support units), and the relationship with GCARD; and (ii) the effectiveness of the research conducted by the Partnership in light of the CGIAR Vision and Strategic Objectives.

The Team should develop guidelines for preparing, managing and following-up on a partnership review, including

- Procedures for the selection of the reference group and its ToR;
- Procedures for search and selection of the evaluation panel(s);
- Description of the core evaluation building blocks, including core performance indicators that need to be tracked to ensure the “evaluability” of the partnership with regards to its effectiveness and impact;
- General approach to evaluating the independence of IEA, its evaluation processes, and the credibility and utility of its evaluations.

The guidelines should be fully aligned with the overall CGIAR Policy on Evaluation, and shall be submitted to the Fund Council for approval.

5. Advise the Fund Council on the design of performance agreements with the Consortium, including the development of performance indicators

A core pillar of the reform is that in the new CGIAR the Fund and the Consortium will sign performance agreements for MP to operationalize the SRF. The monitoring system for research under the SRF is the overall responsibility of the Consortium and will be designed to provide real-time information about program outputs and outcomes to research managers in Centers and the Consortium. This information also serves as a basis for regular progress reports of the Consortium to the Fund Council, and thus for annual performance reviews by the Fund Council. A common system and set of metrics will be used for reporting program performance information to the Consortium and the Fund Council³

³ http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/Business%20Meeting%202009/voices_for_change_final_jan2010.pdf

The Evaluation Team will advise the Fund Council on the design of the performance agreements, particularly with regards to the set of metrics for tracking and reporting program performance that will be subject to the annual performance reviews by the Fund⁴. A common information system tracking reliable and valid performance indicators of MPs will be critical for ensuring the long-term “evaluability” of the MPs by the IEA.

6. Assess options and administrative arrangements for housing the IEA at FAO

The proposed location for the Independent Evaluation Arrangement/Unit is FAO in Rome. The Unit would be hosted by FAO and would have a separate administrative agreement with the host organization ensuring that its independence is not compromised. The Fund Council showed strong agreement and FAO signaled their interest in serving as the host organization and offered to further explore this possibility.

The Team is expected to further explore in more detail the administrative opportunities and requirements for housing this unit at FAO, while ensuring that its **independence** is not compromised. This includes an assessment of :

- the reporting arrangements vis-a-vis FAO and the Fund Council that should result from a host agreement
- the administrative cost charged by the host organization
- staff hiring procedures
- any other relevant areas

If, after a thorough assessment, an arrangement with FAO does not appear to be suitable, then alternative housing arrangement through other international organizations should be also explored, as needed. The assessment, including recommendations, should be submitted to the Fund Council for decision.

7. Assess budget and staffing needs of the IEA

Based on the proposed ToR of the IEA and its Head, the Team should assess the budget and staffing needs for IEA. This assessment should take into account feasible administrative scenarios for housing the Arrangement at FAO.

As MPs will be phased-in over the coming years, it should also take into account short to long-terms staffing scenarios.

The budget proposal should be submitted to the Fund Council for decision.

IV. Duration of Assignment and Location

The assignment foresees 120 working days over a period of 12 months. A work plan to be prepared by the Team at the onset of the assignment should propose a more detailed timeline and allocation (in a balanced and staggered way) of the working days over the given time period of 12 months (see section V).

⁴ While performance agreements for an early set of fast track MPs are expected to be signed within 2010, it will be still relevant to seek the evaluators advise on the design of the performance agreements that are expected to be signed 2011 and beyond.

The Team will be hired through the CGIAR Fund Office in Washington, DC. It may choose to operate virtually as far as the work allows. Administrative and professional support will be provided to the Team by the Fund Office staff.

The Fund Council (or designated representatives) will provide oversight for this assignment.

V. Deliverables

The Team is expected to prepare the following documents for consideration by the Fund Council

1. Reports

Inception Report The Team should prepare an inception report that includes a work plan specifying methodological and organizational aspects of its work, including any provisions for needed meetings, interviews, travel, formal events of consultations etc., as well as the necessary working days foreseen for key components of the work plan.

The inception report should be ready within one month after the start date of the assignment, and will need to be approved by the CGIAR Fund Council before proceeding with the assignment.

Progress Reports

The Team should submit progress reports to the Fund Council for its Fall Meeting 2011 (and thereafter at the request of the Fund Council) reporting on the status of the work in relation to the work plan set out as part of the inception report. The Fund Council will assess the progress made to date, and advise on any adjustments that are required for the second half of the assignment.

(Draft) Final Report

A draft final report is due at the end of the assignment summarizing the work completed (see next paragraph) and making recommendations for next steps.

The final report should accommodate comments/suggestions received from the Fund Council.

2. Guidelines, ToRs, and Proposals

The Team is expected to take the lead in (i) consulting with the key stakeholder groups on the preparation of the various documents and (ii) submitting the documents to the Fund Council for their consideration and approval (closely working with the Fund Office). The following documents should be prepared:

- CGIAR Policy on Evaluation of Research for Development
- Mandate of the Head of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement, and Terms of Reference for the new Independent Evaluation Arrangement and its Head
- Guidelines for drafting Terms of Reference for the independent evaluation of Mega-Programs
- Guidelines for the Independent Evaluation of the CGIAR Partnership as a whole
- Budget and staffing proposal of an Independent Evaluation Arrangement of the CGIAR, including an assessment of options and a proposal on the administrative arrangement for housing of staff working as part of IEA

A detailed timeline for preparing deliverables listed under paragraph 2 (Guidelines, ToRs and proposals) should be included in the inception report, and progress made on the preparation of the individual documents reported as part of the progress report(s).

VI. Consultations

In developing the deliverables the Team is expected to conduct comprehensive consultations with key stakeholders, including - but not limited to - the Consortium Board, Center leadership, Fund Council, ISPC, and selected beneficiaries/end-users. This could involve formal consultation workshops on some of the key policy and guideline documents.