

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

M&E Framework
for the
New CGIAR

14 October 2009

Table of Contents

18	
19	
20	
21	
22	1. Introduction
23	2. How should this new framework be different from the current?
24	3. A New M&E framework for the CGIAR
25	3.1 Principles of Monitoring and Evaluation in the CGIAR
26	3.2 The Performance Monitoring Framework
27	3.3 The Performance Evaluation Framework
28	3.4 “Mutual Accountability for Outputs” and “Shared Responsibility for Outcomes”
29	3.5. Corrective Action and Learning
30	4. Impact Assessment
31	5. Independent Evaluation Arrangement
32	
33	Table 1: Performance Monitoring Framework
34	Table 2: Performance Evaluation Framework
35	Figure1: Logical results monitoring framework incorporating the concepts of “mutual
36	accountability for outputs” and “shared responsibility for outcomes”
37	
38	
39	

M&E Framework in the New CGIAR

40

41 **1. Introduction**

42 The CGIAR accountability lies in four main areas:

- 43 • *Strategic impact*
- 44 • *Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance*
- 45 • *Managerial and Governance Performance*
- 46 • *Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization*

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

50

Definitions¹

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.

¹ OECD-DAC, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results, Paris, 2002.

51

52 The system of monitoring and evaluation in the CGIAR has been evolving since the CGIAR was
53 established in 1971. A range of review mechanisms have been introduced and refined over time.
54 This includes External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs) of Centers, Center Board
55 commissioned external reviews (CCERs), Inter-Center thematic stripe reviews and the annual
56 Performance Measurement (PM) System (a more complete list of the various review mechanisms
57 is included in annex 1). The EPMR and the PM System are the principal M&E mechanisms in
58 the CGIAR system. Both have been designed and continuously enhanced with help of the
59 Science Council. The latest improvements to the CGIAR M&E framework were introduced in

60 2005.¹ These improvements helped to consolidate the different types of reviews and to
61 strengthen the quality of EPMRs. The changes also embraced annual performance measurement
62 through self-assessment (with verification mechanism) as a new monitoring tool, and established
63 standardized requirements for the development of Center medium-term plans (constituting a
64 document against which Centers programmatic and financial performance is to be evaluated).
65 Over the past few years these improvements have enhanced the culture of M&E in the CGIAR
66 and will build a good foundation for M&E in the new CGIAR. In the future organizational set-up
67 of the CGIAR M&E needs to excel as a strong instrument for managing for results, learning, and
68 demonstrating accountability, and it will be critical to use the various M&E products more
69 effectively.

70 This document describes a M&E framework building on the new accountability relationships in
71 the context of a system-wide strategy and results framework (SRF) by integrating programmatic
72 and institutional M&E across the key entities and bodies of the new CGIAR. It streamlines M&E
73 requirements and strengthens M&E outputs, while meeting fiduciary requirements of the Fund
74 and the Consortium and avoiding duplication.

75

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

77 As the CGIAR is transforming itself into the Consortium and the Fund - jointly working with
78 partners towards achieving common strategic objectives and advised by an ISPC - the new M&E
79 framework will need to:

- 80 - **reflect the new accountability framework for the CGIAR,**
81 The roles and responsibilities for M&E within the new CGIAR system have to be re-
82 defined where the Consortium will be responsible for high-quality monitoring and
83 evaluation of the Centers and their contribution to the Mega-Programs. The Fund Council
84 appraises the performance of the Consortium in meeting its obligations set out in the
85 performance agreements.
- 86 - **define an evaluation arrangement that is acknowledged to be independent and**
87 **impartial to the policy-making process and the delivery and management of a**
88 **program**
89 Concern has been expressed about a potential conflict of interest of the SC in its current
90 dual role as adviser on quality and relevance of research (including the research planning
91 process), while also being responsible for commissioning external reviews and assessing
92 Centers research performance. Potential or perceived conflict of interest should be
93 therefore avoided in the new CGIAR, and as a result at AGM08 the CGIAR agreed that
94 “an independent evaluation arrangement will periodically take place at the Program and
95 System levels.”

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).

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

97 For the very first time the CGIAR will have a Strategy and Results Frame for the system
98 as a whole translating the CGIAR vision into tangible objectives and measurable results.
99 M&E should have a critical role in managing for results across the new CGIAR. The new
100 framework should move from predominantly Center focused M&E that “loosely”
101 operates under the umbrella of the “System Priorities” to a **results-based M&E system**
102 for the CGIAR as a whole that monitors and evaluates the program logic that was set out
103 in the SRF and agreed upon in the performance agreement between the Fund and the
104 Consortium.

105

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)

106

3. A New M&E framework for the CGIAR

107

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

110

111 As described in the definition of M&E above, Monitoring and Evaluation are two distinct
112 concepts closely complementing each other. For clarity, the two concepts are treated separately
113 in this document.

114

3.1. Principles of M&E in the CGIAR

- 115
1. 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.
116
117
118
119
120
 2. 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 basis for regular progress reports of the
121
122
123
124

125 Consortium to the Fund Council, and thus for annual performance reviews by the Fund
126 Council. A common system and set of metrics is used for reporting program performance
127 information to the Consortium and the Fund Council.

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

- 131 • The Consortium Board’s responsible for commissioning evaluations of components
132 of Mega-Programs, as well as any other thematic or Center-specific evaluations
133 deemed appropriate or as contractually agreed. It presents to the Fund Council both
134 the evaluation work plans and findings of each evaluation. It is expected that these
135 evaluations are carried out by external reviewers working to the terms of reference
136 issued by the Consortium.
- 137 • The Fund Council is responsible for commissioning periodic independent evaluations
138 of Mega-Programs (and cross-cutting themes) as deemed appropriate, to provide
139 independent validation of the findings of the self-evaluations commissioned by the
140 Consortium.
- 141 • An independent evaluation of the CGIAR Partnership as a whole is expected to occur
142 every 6-7 years. Consistent with the principle of mutual accountability, such an
143 evaluation would assess the contribution of all the parties, and would therefore be
144 commissioned by a reference group constituted for the purpose, and in which all the
145 parties are represented. Such an evaluation will assess (i) the efficacy of the
146 Consortium, the Fund, the ISPC (including their respective support units) and
147 GCARD in the context of the overall CGIAR partnership compact and the strategy
148 and results frame (ii) the effectiveness of its research in the light of the CGIAR vision
149 and strategic objectives. A reference group (or similar body) formed for the specific
150 purpose of commissioning and receiving the CGIAR Partnership Review will be
151 dissolved upon completion of the review.
- 152 • All evaluations are publicly disclosed after being reviewed by the Fund Council.
- 153 • All evaluations will be carried out in the context of this framework.²

154
155
156

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 (Source: OECD/DAC, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Paris 2002).

157 3.2 The Performance Monitoring

158 Key characteristics of the new monitoring system are:

- 159 - An accurate and harmonized performance monitoring system for Centers and Mega-
160 Programs will be established and managed by the Consortium.

161 *An Integrated Planning and Results Measurement System*³ will facilitate the monitoring
162 process by providing streamlined information on Mega Program plans, status of
163 implementation, results, finance and partnerships. It would operate as a web-based portal
164 providing access to project and program monitoring information at different aggregation
165 levels for monitoring purposes by Centers, Consortium and Fund.

- 166 - Performance in the four areas of accountability will be monitored: (i) Strategic Impact
167 (SI) (ii) Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance (PP) (iii) Managerial and
168 Governance Performance (M&G). (iv) Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization
169 (FP& RB).

- 170 - The Fund Council will regularly appraise the performance of the Consortium in meeting
171 its obligations as defined in the performance agreement (including its control
172 framework). In doing so it will rely on accurate, comprehensive, timely and harmonized
173 information provided by the Consortium.

- 174 - The Fund Council is the principal performance monitoring body of the Fund Office and
175 the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC).

- 176 - The Fund Council monitors the efficacy of its fund allocation mechanism.

177

178 Table 1 describes the new monitoring system.

179

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

180 Table 1: Performance Monitoring in the CGIAR

Monitoring body	Performance Dimension ¹	Area of Accountability ¹	Methodology/ Indicators	Frequency
Consortium	MP sub-programs <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 sub-program 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 	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/ 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 	

181 ¹ Strategic Impact (SI); Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance (PP); Managerial and Governance
182 Performance (M&G); Finance Performance and Resource Mobilization (FP& RB)

183 3.3 Performance Evaluation

184 Key characteristics of the new evaluation system:

- 185 • Performance evaluation in the new CGIAR will comprise (i) external evaluations of Centers
186 and sub-programs of Mega-Programs commissioned by the Consortium Board on a regular
187 schedule (ii) independent evaluations of Mega- Programs commissioned by the Fund Council
188 and (iii) independent evaluation of the CGIAR Partnership as a whole commissioned by a Joint
189 Fund Council/Consortium Reference Group. The latter two types of evaluation will be
190 conducted by an independent arrangement on a regular schedule. The various evaluation
191 products will be aligned in scope to avoid duplication and inefficiencies.⁴
- 192 • evaluations will assess performance in the four areas of accountability: (i) Strategic Impact (SI)
193 (ii) Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance (PP) (iii) Managerial and Governance
194 Performance (M&G). (iv) Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization (FP& RB);
- 195 • each institution and system body would be required to have 360 degree evaluations of their
196 performance as part of their own learning and improvement plans;
- 197 • adequate involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process is considered essential;
- 198 • all Fund Donors will rely on this evaluation framework and refrain from conducting additional,
199 duplicative evaluations of mega-programs or Centers (established as one of the guiding
200 principles in the CGIAR Fund Framework document).

201

202 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 (Source: OEC/DAC, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Paris 2002)

203 **Table 2: Performance Evaluation System**

Commissioning Body	Evaluation product^{1,2,3}	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 sub-components and cross-cutting issues • External evaluation of Consortium Office, incl. 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 ⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent Partnership Review 	6-7 years

204 ¹In addition each entity will conduct 360° Assessments and/or Stakeholder Perception surveys on a regular basis
 205 (i.e. 2-3 years),

206 ² The independent evaluation of Mega-Programs and the independent Partnership Review will be conducted by an
 207 independent evaluation arrangement;

208 ³ Brief definitions of the various evaluation products can be found in the glossary

209 ⁴Purpose built management structure in which both the Consortium and the Fund share control and cost. It is formed for
 210 the specific purpose of commissioning and receiving the CGIAR Partnership Review and will be dissolved upon completion
 211 of the review.

212

213 3.4 “Mutual Accountability for Outputs” and “Shared Responsibility for Outcomes”

214 In the new CGIAR two concepts are being introduced which are being addressed by the M&E
215 framework:

- 216 • **“mutual accountability for outputs”**, which is the relationship between entities within
217 the new CGIAR, where the Consortium and Centers can be expected to be held **fully**
218 **accountable for high-quality science and technology products and services** within an
219 agreed time, and **mutually the Donors would be held accountable for an aligned**
220 **provision of funds** to support the development of research outputs as agreed in the
221 performance agreements.
- 222 • **“shared responsibility for outcomes”**, where both Consortium and Donors together
223 **with their partners have a shared responsibility for managing towards outcomes**, i.e.
224 demonstrating sustainable influence and uptake of outputs by clients and longer-term
225 improvements of livelihoods in developing countries.
- 226 • Within this shared responsibility for outcomes the Consortium together with the Centers
227 are expected to be accountable for engaging with partners, aligning the research agenda
228 with developing countries priorities, advocating research needs and achievements,
229 monitoring outcomes based on agreed indicators and monitoring global trends.
- 230
- 231 • The Donors in turn are responsible for harmonizing and aligning their policies and for
232 making an effort to effectively leverage complementarities between CGIAR research and
233 their national programs (developing country donors) or their bilateral technical assistance
234 programs (multilateral organizations and developed country donors).
- 235

236 Figure 1 illustrates a logical results monitoring framework in the context of the SRF (including
237 indicators) incorporating the concepts of “mutual accountability for outputs” and “shared
238 responsibility for outcomes” **(MAY BE ADJUSTED BASED ON COMPLETION OF SRF)**.

239

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

Shared Responsibility	<p>CGIAR Vision <u>Shared</u></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Accountability of Consortium / Centers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring global trends Reporting on results indicators <p>Accountability Fund Donors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action
	<p>Strategic Objective <u>Shared</u></p>	<p>Example: “Food for People” Results criteria: Hunger reduced. Indicator: % undernourished, % children underweight, Income < \$1 day</p>	<p>Accountability of Consortium / Centers:</p> <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 <p>Accountability of Fund Donors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonize and align policies Demonstrate efforts to effectively leverage complementarities of CGIAR research and national programs / bilateral technical assistance programs Independent evaluation of MPs Ex-post impact assessment of the development effectiveness of CGIAR investments
	<p>Mega Program/Strategic Intermediate Objective <u>Shared</u></p>	<p>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</p>	
	<p>Intermediate Outcome <u>Shared</u></p>	<p>Example: NARS in country X incorporate new drought tolerant variety into their extension program. Intermediate Outcome 1 Indicator 1 : NARS countries x,y,z release new high drought-resistant maize variety to farmers by 20XX</p>	
Mutual Accountability	<p>Output <u>Full</u></p>	<p>Example : New high drought-resistant maize variety available. Annual target/ indicator:</p> <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 	<p>Accountability of Consortium/Centers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieving outputs Monitoring and reporting on outputs Ensure Center systems in place to monitor and report on results Ensure institutional and financial health <p>Accountability of Fund Donors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned and adequate funding

240 3.5. Corrective Action and Learning

241 In order to make the M&E system most effective, clear follow-up principles, processes and
242 responsibilities will be defined for the various M&E products described in this framework, to
243 ensure best possible learning and improvements in performance by the different entities. For
244 instance the independent evaluation arrangement must not only evaluate the effectiveness of
245 research conducted by the Consortium through its Member Centers, but also help enhance
246 institutional learning through an effective feed-back loop from the evaluation to policy-makers,
247 researchers and research managers as well as partners. Moreover, the Fund needs to put in place
248 a process for reviewing the M&E information on the Mega-programs and to take corrective
249 action where necessary. In the past this has been a weakness as the system-wide monitoring
250 system was fragmented and only partially aligned, and the enforcement mechanisms were rather
251 informal. The Constitution of the Consortium and the CGIAR Fund Framework address the
252 responsibilities for enforcement measures of corrective action resulting from M&E findings.

253

254 **4. Impact Assessment**

255 In the new CGIAR the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) will provide
256 independent advice and expertise to the funders of the CGIAR. Part of the ISPC's terms of
257 reference is "to improve the information base for making strategic investment decisions and help
258 increase the rigor and the reach of impact assessment studies within the CGIAR by
259 commissioning, in partnership with the Consortium, ex-post impact assessment of the
260 development effectiveness of CGIAR investments."

261

262

263 **5. Independent Evaluation Arrangement⁵**

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

“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, identify 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>.

273

274

275 **Purpose of the independent evaluation arrangement is to:**

- 276
- evaluate the effectiveness of research conducted by the Consortium through its Member
277 Centers;
 - promote mutual accountability between the Consortium and the CGIAR Fund;
 - promote learning and an effective feed-back loop from the evaluation to policy-makers,
280 researchers and research managers as well as partners.

281

282

⁵ The following chapter is a work in progress and is meant to facilitate the discussion within TMT around the different options and features for an “independent evaluation arrangement”.

283 **Scope of work**

284 The independent evaluation arrangement would be responsible for evaluation activities
285 commissioned by the Fund Council, particularly

286 • **CGIAR Partnership Review (every 6-7years)**

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

292
293 • **Independent Evaluation of Mega-Programs (every 4 years)**

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

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

300 **Options – STILL UNDER DISCUSSION**

301 **Discussion of Options**

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

307 After further analysis it has become clear that the **CGIAR needs its own independent**
308 **evaluation unit** to provide adequate accountability for achievement of CGIAR objectives, to
309 ensure adequate capacity in research evaluation, to retain institutional memory and promote
310 institutional learning from evaluation. **The question is where to best place this unit?**

311 Instead of having a “free-standing” CGIAR Independent Evaluation Office, the CGIAR
312 Transition Management Team (TMT) wishes to explore the possibility of **anchoring a CGIAR**
313 **independent evaluation unit within an existing independent evaluation department with a**
314 **strong independent evaluation culture** (preferably in one of the multilateral development
315 organizations such as IEG/World Bank or IFAD).

316

317 **CGIAR Independent Evaluation Unit hosted by a multilateral organization**

318 Possible set-up

319 Under this set-up the multilateral organization would host a CGIAR Independent Evaluation Unit
320 (IEU), where the IEU would be headed by a Chief Evaluator reporting on substantial matters to
321 the CGIAR Fund Council. Administratively the unit would be part of the hosting organization,

322 i.e. it would follow the host's administrative rules and procedures (e.g. similar to the CGIAR
323 Secretariat in the World Bank or SC Secretariat in FAO) and report on administrative matters to
324 the Head of the hosting evaluation department. A long-term agreement between the CGIAR
325 Fund Council and the multilateral organization would frame the arrangement for hosting the
326 IEU.

327

328 For example, it could entail commitment of both partners to

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

335

336 Key considerations in exploring this set-up are:

- 337 • no added bureaucracy; general costs are expected to be lower because of economies of
338 scale in administrative overhead;
- 339 • to leverage already established good practices and capacity in evaluation through
340 tapping new networks of evaluation experts in agricultural research and development;
- 341 • to enhance evaluation professionalism in the CGIAR;
- 342 • to retain institutional memory and promote mutual institutional learning;
- 343 • to stimulate methodological advancement in the evaluation of the “Research-
344 Development Continuum”;
- 345 • to leverage potential synergies in agricultural research outcome evaluation, i.e.
346 interventions leading to uptake of technologies and other research outputs by partners
347 and stakeholders that are in common;
- 348 • to support harmonization efforts in the light of the Paris Declaration on Aid
349 Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action.

350

351