Assessment of CGIAR Research Programmes

David Radcliffe

October 2015

This report has been produced for Evidence on Demand with the assistance of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) contracted through the Climate, Environment, Infrastructure and Livelihoods Professional Evidence and Applied Knowledge Services (CEIL PEAKS) programme, jointly managed by DAI (which incorporates HTSPE Limited) and IMC Worldwide Limited.

The views expressed in the report are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily represent DFID's own views or policies, or those of Evidence on Demand. Comments and discussion on items related to content and opinion should be addressed to the author, via enquiries@evidenceondemand.org

Your feedback helps us ensure the quality and usefulness of all knowledge products. Please email enquiries@evidenceondemand.org and let us know whether or not you have found this material useful; in what ways it has helped build your knowledge base and informed your work; or how it could be improved.

DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.12774/eod_cr.october2015.radcliffed

First published October 2015

	A4NH	AAS	CCAFS	DC	DS	FTA	GL	GRISP
Strategic relevance and theory of change	21/25. Essential to 1 SLO and well aligned with IDOs. ISPC satisfied with ToCs and impact pathways for each (of 4) FP but concerned about lack of coherent ToC across programme.	15/25. Aquatic systems important for all SLOs; ToCs mapped out by (geographically based) FP but weak evidence on plausibility. Focus areas are logical, NEPAD links appreciated, but not clear how regional/national priorities determined choices.	21/25. Links between climate change agriculture food security crucial to SLO/ IDO progress. IPs OK but change mechanism linking outputs, IDOs, SLOs could be clearer. Plausibility of some projected impacts questionable. Good on regional, national partnerships implying joint priority setting.	19/25. Important crops for significant populations, particularly given climate change; not always clear how dynamics of demand relate to major staples. ToCs and impact pathways clear, some targets very ambitious. Good geographical prioritisation.	12/25. Very weak on ToC. More of a bundling of ongoing research structured by regional FPs. Responds to some national/ regional priorities but no global strategic overview.	18/25. Main focus SLO3 but NRs relate to all SLOs. Well developed impact pathways but ToC still being developed (challenging for complex programme) and IDOs not well aligned with system-wide ones. Well focused regional priorities.	18/25. Legumes important in poverty, nutritional SLOs, particularly for poor. Market led approach, could do more on producer-consumer relations and trade. ToCs still under development. Some targets over-ambitious?	24/25. Rice is key staple. Linkages to system IDOs and SLOs well presented. ToCs with clear assumptions and good metrics. Good links with regional/national systems.
Contribution and relevance to the SRF and CGIAR overall objectives (the SLOs and IDOs).	5	4	5	3	4	4	4	5
Analysis of impact pathways and description of beneficiaries. Who will benefit from this research and	4	3	4	4	2	4	3	4

	A4NH	AAS	CCAFS	DC	DS	FTA	GL	GRISP
how will this happen								
Plausibility of the Theory of Change and its alignment with the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework and IDOs	4	2	3	3	1	2	3	5
Degree of alignment of question or problem to be addressed and expected outputs with national and regional priorities and initiatives	4	3	5	5	3	4	4	5
Scientific quality	21/25. Mix of further developing and expanding tried and tested approaches (biofortification) and novel approaches to new challenges (e.g. nutrition in value chains, food safety). Publications in high impact journals (e.g. Lancet), including	11/25. Approach (research in development) is novel but justification (why better than other approaches) is weak. Unclear how biophysical research adds value to participatory research or how AAS build on existing and pipeline technologies to achieve outcomes	21/25. Science to create evidence for action at all levels. Specific outcomes linked to CSA and climate smart villages could be more clear. Lesson learning induced programme shift, dropping some legacy projects and moving towards more	19/25. Solid scientific approach playing to track record of ICRISAT and collaborators. Specific research questions could be better articulated in some cases. Prioritisations based on lessons learned	9/25. Lack of detail on science. Some interest in experimenting with demand driven approaches but not well articulated.	20/25. Innovative approaches (RiD, sentinel landscapes etc) and researchable constraints identified. Strong emphasis on evidence creation/impact assessment. Good track record on policy influencing. Internal lesson	18/25. Solid scientific approach. Overlaying FPs/ product lines confusing in defining clear research questions. Good publications track record. Lessons being learned (note	23/25. Sound science (including advanced science), 'traditional' approach (as opposed to RiD). Clear methods and excellent track record (publications, media, varieties released etc). Programme still evolving based on lessons.

	A4NH	AAS	CCAFS	DC	DS	FTA	GL	GRISP
	ground breaking biofortification work.	(addressed in revised proposal). Novel learning system in place but not clear how this has been successfully used to date.	strategic focus. Global leadership and good publication record.	is still work in progress.		learning mechanism.	programme fairly new)	
Novelty and soundness of the research being proposed	5	3	4	4	2	4	4	4
The strength and clarity of the research objectives and the hypotheses which are being tested by the CRP	4	2	3	4	1	4	3	5
The clarity of the description of research methodology	4	2	4	4	2	3	4	5
Track record of the team, assessed on the basis of what was achieved in the previous round of funding (publications and demonstration of commitment to quality, peer review mechanisms, etc.)	4	2	5	4	2	5	4	5
Lessons learned; evidence of	4	2	5	3	2	4	3	4

	A4NH	AAS	CCAFS	DC	DS	FTA	GL	GRISP
building on previous work								
Comparative advantage	20/25. With many actors in health research comparative advantage of CGIAR is not obvious, but leadership in cross-disciplinary research and convening power is a CGIAR strength. A4NH a ccesses top class global expertise in subject area. Partnerships essential to outcomes and well structured. Engagement with FTA and system CRPs to improve nutritional outcomes is a strength	15/25. AAS is a gap which CGIAR has advantage to fill. NGOs are key partners in approach – perhaps they should lead unless value added by CGIAR more clearly articulated?	23/25. Strategic engagement of key partners (inc. Future Earth) and CGIAR convening power and cross-disciplinary approach provide unique comparative advantage. Future Earth strengthens science, NGO partners link with development and links to UN/ World Bank/IFAD strengthen policy outcomes.	22/25. ICRISAT and ICARDA have international mandate and good track record for crops included and are well connected with national and regional partners. Incubation hub gives advantage with private sector engagement. NGO partnerships might be better developed.	18/25. Dryland systems work is a gap and CGIAR is well placed to address. Some national partners and links with other CRPs should add value but there are notable omissions.	25/25. Interface between forests, trees and people important and CG is well placed to lead (through CIFOR, ICRAF, Biodiversity etc). Good array of key partners from global, national agencies, NGOs and private sector.	22/25. ICRISAT and ICARDA have international mandate and good track record for crops included and are well connected with national and regional partners. Incubation hub gives advantage with private sector engagement. NGO partnerships might be better developed.	23/25. Very clear comparative advantage backed by track record. Good ARI, private sector, regional body partnerships. Note STRASA as model with high impact. (clearer partnership strategy?)
The research proposal fills relevant research gaps, and is based on the CGIAR and host centre	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	5

	A4NH	AAS	CCAFS	DC	DS	FTA	GL	GRISP
comparative advantage in one or more specified research area								
The capacity of the CGIAR and their partners to deliver the research. Is this something that the CGIAR should be prioritising or could others do this better?	3	3	4	5	4	5	5	5
Strategic fit and relevance of named partners; do the partners included add value in terms of scientific contribution and enhance the probability of impact?	5	3	5	3	3	5	3	4
Cross cutting issues	18/25.Good gender strategy and analysis, incorporation of gender in programme, with metrics for measuring progress. Less emphasis on broader social and political	22/25. People centred approach (potentially) addresses socio-political constraints. Gender issues highly relevant and analysis is strong. C. 20% budget for gender related work.	22/25. Good gender strategy/ analysis, but not always clear how gender mainstreaming feeds into research prioritisation or outcomes. Engagement with policy processes	12/25. DC is catching up on gender but is taking positive steps to developing a sound approach. More could be made of the poverty status of people dependent on	8/25. Socio-political conditions particularly relevant in region but not addressed in proposal. Also gender issue require deeper analysis in regional context. Climate change	23/25. FTA includes socio-political context, including human rights work. Strong gender analysis. Enabling policies are a FP in programme.	15/25. Clear efforts to integrate gender issues in programme but still work in progress. More could be made of the poverty status of people dependent on	20/25. Technologically driven but cognizant of enabling environment. Good progress on gender.

	A4NH	AAS	CCAFS	DC	DS	FTA	GL	GRISP
	issues. FP 'IPP' focussed on evaluation, including enabling environment for adoption/ research uptake.		at global, regional and national level shows importance of enabling environment.	these crops and political economy of places where they dominate.	could be more emphasised.		these crops and political economy of places where they dominate. Regional marketing opportunities recognised (scope for further development).	
Evidence that broader gender, social and political issues have been considered within the research	3	5	4	2	2	5	3	4
Strength of gender analyses and the clarity and plausibility of gender impacts	4	5	4	2	2	4	3	4
Recognition of importance of enabling environment	4	3	5	3	1	5	3	4
Total scores	**80**	**63**	**87**	**72**	**47**	**86**	**73**	**90**
General comments	Some interesting areas of research addressing areas of high political priority. Does not	A novel participatory approach, strong on gender, but science does not	Well established and well performing CRP addressing area	Relatively recently approved CRP. Seems to be developing well.	Weak proposal FC12 only approved with 50% budget cut. Task force	A well balanced CRP – between science and policy with some innovative	Relatively new programme. Extension proposal has	Well established and well performing CRP. 1st to be approved. Some

	A4NH	AAS	CCAFS	DC	DS	FTA	GL	GRISP
	fit together well as an integrated programme.	clearly come through in extension proposal.	of high political priority.		established to examine how research in drylands should go forward.	approaches and good track record. Extension proposal rewritten based on ISPC/CO comments and IEA evaluation.	point by point response to ISPC/CO comments. Rather conventional approach but good on value chains.	highlights featured in DFID reports.