

Section 5

M&E Framework for the New CGIAR

Draft

October 26, 2009

This document defines a set of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) principles, and describes key characteristics of the new M&E system guided by global good practice in M&E of global programs.

It is a work in progress. It has benefited from advice provided by members of the editorial panel for the accountability framework and external evaluation experts. It was modified based on the feedback received during the recent e-

1. Introduction

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.

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.

The system of monitoring and evaluation in the CGIAR has been evolving since the CGIAR was established in 1971. A range of review mechanisms have been introduced and refined over time. This includes External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs) of Centers, Center Board–commissioned external reviews (CCERs), Inter-Center thematic stripe reviews, and the annual Performance Measurement (PM) System. The EPMR and the PM System are the principal M&E mechanisms in the CGIAR system. Both have been designed and continuously enhanced with help of the Science Council (SC). The latest improvements to the CGIAR M&E framework were introduced in 2005.¹ These improvements helped to consolidate the different types of reviews and to strengthen the quality of EPMRs. The changes also embraced annual performance measurement through self-assessment (with a verification mechanism) as a new monitoring tool, and established standardized requirements for the development

¹. Science Council Secretariat, Monitoring and Evaluation System for the CGIAR Centers, Rome 2005, http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/Reports/cgiar_me_final.pdf, (last visited July 6, 2009).

of Center medium-term plans (constituting a document against which Centers programmatic and financial performance is to be evaluated). Over the past few years these improvements have enhanced the culture of M&E in the CGIAR and will build a good foundation for M&E in the new CGIAR. In the future organizational set-up of the CGIAR, M&E needs to excel as a strong instrument for managing for results, learning, and demonstrating accountability, and it will be critical to use the various M&E products more effectively.

This document describes an M&E framework building on the new accountability relationships in the context of a Partnership-wide Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) by integrating programmatic and institutional M&E across the key entities and bodies of the new CGIAR. It streamlines M&E requirements and strengthens M&E outputs, while meeting fiduciary requirements of the Fund and the Consortium and avoiding duplication.

2. How should this new framework be different from the current?

As the CGIAR is transforming itself into the Consortium and the Fund—jointly working with partners toward achieving common strategic objectives and advised by an Independent Science and Partnerships Council (ISPC)—the new M&E framework will need to

- **reflect the new accountability framework for the CGIAR**

The roles and responsibilities for M&E within the new CGIAR Partnership have to be re-defined where the Consortium will be responsible for high-quality monitoring and evaluation of the Centers and their contribution to the Mega Programs. The Fund Council appraises the performance of the Consortium in meeting its obligations set out in the performance agreements.

- **define an evaluation arrangement that is acknowledged to be independent and impartial to the policy-making process and the delivery and management of a program**

Concern has been expressed about a potential conflict of interest of the SC in its current dual role as adviser on quality and relevance of research (including the research planning process), while also being responsible for commissioning external reviews and assessing Centers' research performance. Potential or perceived conflict of interest should, therefore, be avoided in the new CGIAR, and as a result at 2008 Annual General Meeting (AGM08) the CGIAR agreed that “an independent evaluation arrangement will periodically take place at the Program and System levels.”

- **support the execution of the Strategy and Results Framework (SRF)**

For the very first time the CGIAR will have a Strategy and Results Framework for the system as a whole, translating the CGIAR vision into

tangible objectives and measurable results. M&E should have a critical role in managing for results across the new CGIAR. The new framework should move from predominantly Center-focused M&E that “loosely” operates under the umbrella of the “System Priorities” to a **results-based M&E system** for the CGIAR as a whole that monitors and evaluates the program logic that was set out in the SRF and agreed upon in the performance agreement between the Fund and the Consortium.

What is Managing for Results?

A coherent framework for strategic planning, management, and communications based on continuous learning and accountability.

- Results-oriented strategy sets strategic directions and outcomes.
- Management decisions and resource allocations align with strategic outcomes.
- Program performance indicators target clients and their beneficiaries and differences to be made in beneficiaries' lives.
- Indicators are used as signals to motivate staff and to provide a base for understanding how service can be improved.

Source: Elizabeth Mc Allister, et.al., “Bringing together the best of science and the best of development,” Independent Review of the CGIAR System, Washington , DC 2008, Technical Report, http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/agm08/agm08_CGIAR-technical-report.pdf (last visited July 13, 2009).

3. A New M&E framework for the CGIAR

The following M&E framework defines a set of M&E principles, and describes key characteristics of the new M&E system guided by global good practice.

As described in the definition of M&E above, monitoring and evaluation are two distinct concepts closely complementing each other. For clarity, the two concepts are treated separately in this document.

3.1. Principles of M&E in the CGIAR

- (1) Evaluation of performance to achieve the SRF and governance of the CGIAR will follow best practice and will include evaluations that are independent and impartial to the policy-making process and delivery and management of programs.
- (2) The Consortium and CGIAR Fund donors are mutually accountable for Mega Program outputs. The Consortium and Centers are accountable for high-quality science and technology products and services as specified in the performance agreements, and donors are accountable for an aligned provision of funds to support the development of research outputs as agreed in the performance agreements.
- (3) The monitoring system regarding research under the SRF is the overall responsibility of the Consortium designed to provide real-time information about program outputs and outcomes to research managers in Centers and

the Consortium, to inform their decision making. 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 is 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 programs are likely to or have achieved their stated objectives, as articulated in the SRF and the CGIAR Joint Declaration.
- The Consortium Board is responsible for commissioning evaluations of Mega Programs or their components, as well as any other thematic or Center-specific evaluations deemed appropriate or as contractually agreed. It presents to the Fund Council both the evaluation work plans and findings of each evaluation. It is expected that these evaluations are carried out by external reviewers working to the terms of reference issued by the Consortium.
 - The Fund Council is responsible for commissioning periodic independent evaluations of Mega Programs (and cross-cutting themes) as deemed appropriate, to provide independent validation of the findings of external evaluations commissioned by the Consortium.²
 - An independent evaluation of the CGIAR Partnership as a whole is expected to occur every six to seven years. Consistent with the principle of mutual accountability, such an evaluation would assess the contribution of all the parties, and would therefore be commissioned by a reference group constituted for the purpose, and in which both the Consortium and the Fund Council are represented. Such an evaluation will assess (i) the efficacy of the Consortium, the Fund, the ISPC (including their respective support units), and GCARD in the context of the overall CGIAR partnership compact and the strategy and results frame; and (ii) the effectiveness of its research in light of the CGIAR vision and strategic objectives. A reference group (or similar body) formed for the specific purpose of commissioning and receiving the CGIAR Partnership Review will be dissolved upon completion of the review.
 - All evaluations are publicly disclosed after being reviewed by the Fund Council.
 - All evaluations will be carried out in the context of this framework, i.e., all Fund Donors will rely on this evaluation framework and refrain from conducting additional, duplicative evaluations of Mega Programs or Centers.

². 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).

3.2 Performance Monitoring

Key characteristics of the new monitoring system follow:

- An accurate and harmonized performance monitoring system for Centers and Mega Programs will be established and managed by the Consortium.
An Integrated Planning and Results Measurement System³ will facilitate the monitoring process by providing streamlined information on Mega Program plans, status of implementation, results, finance, and partnerships. It would operate as a Web-based portal providing 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 agreement (including its control framework). In doing so, it will rely on accurate, comprehensive, timely, and harmonized information provided by the Consortium.
- The Fund Council is the principal performance monitoring body of the Fund Office and the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC).
- The Fund Council monitors the efficacy of its fund allocation mechanism.

Table 1 describes the new monitoring system.

³. Possibly developed based on the current EasyMTP/CGMap, Performance Measurement System, and the Financial Information System (FIS).

Table 1: Performance Monitoring in the CGIAR

Monitoring body	Performance dimension ¹	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 subprogram outputs and intermediate outcomes 	Semi-annual
	<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 	
	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 	
	<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 	Annual
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
	Fund Office and 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 	

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

3.3 Performance Evaluation

Key characteristics of the new evaluation system:

- Performance evaluation in the new CGIAR will comprise (i) external evaluations of Mega Programs (or their 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 validating 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 inefficiencies while ensuring rigor and credibility.⁴

- 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 have 360 degree evaluations of their performance as part of their own learning and improvement plans.
- Adequate involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process is considered essential.
- All Fund Donors will rely 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.

⁴. An “external” evaluation is an evaluation conducted by entities and/or individuals outside the donor and implementing organizations. An “independent” evaluation is a n 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 (OEC-DAC, “Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management,” Paris 2002).

Table 2: Performance Evaluation in the CGIAR

Commissioning body	Evaluation product ^{a,b,c}	Frequency
Consortium Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External Center evaluations 	5 years
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External evaluation of MPs and/or subcomponents and cross-cutting issues External evaluation of Consortium Office, including shared services 	4 years
Fund Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent evaluation of Mega Programs 	4 years
Joint Consortium/Fund Council Reference Group ^d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Partnership Review 	67 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. The scope of Center evaluation will be streamlined to complement Mega Program evaluations. d. Purpose-built management structure in which both the Consortium and the Fund share control and 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.

3.4 “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 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 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.
- 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 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).

Figure 1 illustrates a 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.” *(MAY BE ADJUSTED BASED ON COMPLETION OF SRF).*

Figure 1: Logical results monitoring framework incorporating the concepts of “mutual accountability for outputs” and “shared responsibility for outcomes”

Shared Responsibility	CGIAR Vision <u>Shared</u>	To reduce poverty and hunger, improve human health and nutrition, and enhance ecosystem resilience through high-quality international agricultural research, partnership, and leadership Results criteria: Food security increase (reduction in malnutrition); Area-weighted productivity increase. Indicator: Calorie deficiency; Yields per hectare	Accountability of Consortium and Centers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring global trends Reporting on results indicators Accountability of Fund Donors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action
	Strategic Objective <u>Shared</u>	Example: “Food for People” Results criteria: Hunger reduced. Indicator: % undernourished, % children underweight, Income < \$1 day	Accountability of Consortium and Centers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement with partners and stakeholders Alignment of research agenda with developing countries’ priorities Monitoring outcome indicators Reporting on shared outcomes Gap analysis Accountability of Fund Donors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonize and align policies Demonstrate efforts to effectively leverage complementarities of CGIAR research and national programs and bilateral technical assistance programs
	Mega Program/Strategic Intermediate Objective <u>Shared</u>	Example: Increase Productivity of Crop and Livestock Systems Outcome 1 / Core Result 1: The use of drought-tolerant maize has significantly improved livelihoods of poor farm households in Africa Outcome Indicator 1: % of land under maize cultivation in Africa use drought-tolerant variety by 20XX. Target: x% of land under maize cultivation in Africa use drought-tolerant variety by 20xx	
	Intermediate Outcome <u>Shared</u>	Example: National Agricultural Research System in country X incorporates new drought-tolerant variety into their its program Intermediate Outcome 1 Indicator 1: NARS countries x, y, z release new high drought-resistant maize variety to farmers by 20XX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent evaluation of Mega Programs Ex post impact assessment of the development effectiveness of CGIAR investments
Mutual Accountability	Output <u>Full</u>	Example : New high drought-resistant maize variety available Annual target and indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community-based varietal testing completed in x, y, z communities New phenotyping protocols for crop water status defined for maize 	Accountability of Consortium and Centers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieving outputs Monitoring and reporting on outputs Ensuring Center systems in place to monitor and report on results Ensuring institutional and financial health Accountability of Fund Donors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned and adequate funding

3.5. Corrective Action and Learning

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, the independent evaluation arrangement must not only evaluate the effectiveness of research conducted by the Consortium through its Member Centers, but also help enhance 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. In the past this has been a weakness because the system-wide monitoring system was fragmented and only partially aligned, and the enforcement mechanisms were rather informal. The Constitution of the Consortium and the CGIAR Fund Framework address the responsibilities for enforcement measures of corrective action resulting from M&E findings.

4. Impact Assessment

In the new CGIAR, the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) will provide independent advice and expertise to the funders of the CGIAR. Part of the ISPC's terms of reference is "to improve the information base for making 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."

5. Independent Evaluation Arrangement⁵

It has become international best practice to have the evaluation function in an organization impartial and independent from the policy-making process and the delivery and management of a program. However, in the CGIAR the separation of evaluation responsibilities from the policy-making process has been blurred. Potential or perceived conflict of interest should be, therefore, avoided in the new CGIAR, and as a result at AGM08 the CGIAR agreed that "an independent evaluation arrangement will periodically take place at the Program and System levels." The expectation is that this arrangement clearly demonstrates a separation of the evaluation function from the policy-making process and the delivery and management process of a program. Oversight responsibility for this arrangement would lie with the Fund Council.

⁵. This section is a work in progress and is meant to facilitate the discussion of ExCo around the different options and features for an "independent evaluation arrangement."

“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/EXTGLOREGPARPRO/Resources/sourcebook.pdf>.

Purpose of the independent evaluation arrangement is to

- evaluate the effectiveness of research conducted by the Consortium through its Member Centers,
- promote mutual accountability between the Consortium and the CGIAR Fund, and
- promote learning and an effective feed-back loop from the evaluation to policy makers, researchers, and research managers as well as partners.

Scope of work

The independent evaluation arrangement would be responsible for evaluation activities commissioned by the Fund Council and the Joint Fund Council/ Consortium Reference Group (in case of the CGIAR Partnership Review), particularly,

- **CGIAR Partnership Review (every six to seven years)**

Review undertaken periodically to evaluate the overall performance of the CGIAR Partnership. The review shall evaluate (i) the efficacy of the Consortium, the Fund, and the ISPC (including their respective support units) in the context of the overall CGIAR partnership compact and the strategic results framework, and (ii) the effectiveness of its research in light of the CGIAR vision and strategic objectives.

- **Independent Evaluation of Mega Programs and cross-cutting themes (every four years)**

A results-based evaluation every four years of Consortium research conducted in a particular Mega Program, i.e., whether a Mega Program's outputs and outcome are likely to or have achieved its stated objectives. It should provide an independent validation of the findings of the external program evaluations commissioned by the Consortium.

The independent evaluation arrangement will seek views from the science community (including the ISPC) on the scientific content of its work as appropriate.

Discussion of options

The CGIAR Transition Management Team (TMT) explored a number of options for operationalizing the independent evaluation arrangement in the new CGIAR. These options ranged from appointing a small independent panel to organize and commission separate, independent review panels for periodic Mega Program evaluation and periodic system-wide reviews to the option of fully outsourcing the evaluation function to an outside entity.

After further analysis it has become clear that the **CGIAR needs its own independent evaluation unit** to provide adequate accountability for achievement of CGIAR objectives, to ensure adequate capacity in research evaluation, to retain institutional memory, and to promote institutional learning from evaluation.

Instead of having a “free-standing” CGIAR Independent Evaluation Office, the TMT is exploring the possibility of **anchoring a CGIAR independent evaluation unit within an existing independent evaluation department with a strong independent evaluation culture** (preferably in one of the multilateral development organizations).

CGIAR Independent Evaluation Unit hosted by a multilateral organization

Possible set-up

Under this set-up, the multilateral organization would host a CGIAR Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), where the IEU would be headed by a Chief Evaluator reporting on substantial matters to the CGIAR Fund Council. Administratively, the unit would be part of the hosting organization, that is, it would follow the host's administrative rules and procedures (e.g., similar to the CGIAR Secretariat in the World Bank or SC Secretariat in FAO) and report on administrative matters to the head of the hosting evaluation department.

The unit will be staffed by a small team of professionals that have demonstrated expertise in both evaluation and science. The team would manage the independent evaluations and draw on external (scientific) experts in the research and management areas to be evaluated.

A long-term agreement between the CGIAR Fund Council and the multilateral organization would frame the arrangement for hosting the IEU.

For example, it could entail commitment of both partners to

- knowledge exchange in the area of evaluation of agricultural research and development,
- sharing of lessons from evaluations and contributing to their dissemination,
- exploring the conduct of joint evaluations of agricultural analytical work and investment projects,
- providing mutual access to both partners' networks of evaluation experts, and
- peer-reviewing evaluation products for quality enhancement.

Key considerations in exploring this set-up

- no added bureaucracy; general costs are expected to be lower because of economies of scale in administrative overhead;
- 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 mutual 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.