



SCIENCE COUNCIL REPORT TO EXCO MEMBERS

(18 May 2009)

At a time of transition in the CGIAR it is important to consider plans for the future but also to maintain impetus in current key tasks to ensure the quality and relevance of the CGIAR's science and overall programs. The Science Council (SC) is pleased to provide this written update of its activities in 2009 for the information of ExCo, CGIAR Members and the stakeholder community.

The SC held its most recent, eleventh, meeting at the *Centro Internacional de la Papa* (CIP) in Lima, Peru from the 27-30 March 2009¹. As well as the review of progress with the SC work plan this provided a valuable opportunity for a direct interaction with Board, management and staff of the Center on matters of scientific substance, particularly as the SC attended and discussed the presentations made to the Program Committee of the CIP Board. The SC considered an update on the recent developments in world food and agriculture related to the food price and financial crises as well as challenges to the emerging agri-business sector in Latin America and the formation of public-private partnerships. Building on the SC meeting, this report highlights activities in the four current areas of responsibility of the Science Council, namely monitoring and evaluation, impact assessment, strategic studies and mobilising science. However, the report starts by noting recent contributions of the SC to the Change Process.

The SC in the CGIAR Transition

At its Annual General Meeting (AGM08) held in Maputo, Mozambique, the CGIAR approved the establishment of an Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) as one of the key elements of the CGIAR system's new governance structure described in the change management document, *A Revitalized CGIAR—A New Way Forward: The Integrated Reform Proposal*. It is intended that the ISPC will replace the SC as an independent standing panel of high level experts that will provide advice to the new CGIAR Fund (Fund Council) on science and aspects of scientific partnerships. The SC/ISPC is expected to provide immediate input into the formulation of the Strategy and Results Framework and MegaProgram portfolio and the agreed broad areas of

¹ The End of Meeting Report is available at:
http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/user_upload/sciencecouncil/SC_11_Meeting/SC11_EOM_for_web.pdf

focus for the future ISPC include foresight studies, quality of science in CGIAR research, and impact assessment. However, routine monitoring and evaluation (M & E) meant for internal management will not be part of the responsibilities of this body. Apart from this broad outline, the roles and responsibilities of the ISPC have not yet (at the time of preparation of this report) been formally defined. The SC discussed requirements for independent scientific advice to the new CGIAR with observers at the Lima meeting and has taken the following steps:

- It has developed a “Lessons Learned” document² on the basis of its experience in conducting M&E for the system over the last several years (including better integration of the components of the M&E, improved planning, External Program and Management Reviews of Centers and Challenge Programs conducted by peers, system-wide and stripe reviews, Challenge Program proposal assessment and research results-related indicators in the Performance measurement system). The document has been provided for the benefit of the Transition Management Team (TMT) and the development of future M&E practices and responsibilities in the CGIAR.
- Assuming the implementation of the new CGIAR structure (Consortium, MegaPrograms, Fund and the ISPC) it has considered in a generic fashion the needs for M&E. This document³ is also to be provided as an input to the TMT in system design.
- It has considered how the roles nominated for the ISPC might be developed and implemented in the future (on the basis of past experience or required new expertise) and has provided a discussion document⁴ on the possible new ISPC for the benefit of the TMT, donors and other stakeholders.
- Derek Byerlee, SC Member and SPIA Chair, has been appointed as member of the team (chaired by IFPRI Director General, Joachim von Braun) which is charged with developing the first drafts of the Strategic Results Framework and outline MegaProgram portfolio.
- Rudy Rabbinge, the SC Chair remains a scientific advisor to the CGIAR Chair in the overall transition and, *inter alia*, provided SC input into the recent donor Meeting on the change process held in London, UK in late April 2009.

The SC seeks to collaborate in a proactive manner in the Change Process and to hasten the definition of ISPC roles and transitional responsibilities so that important CGIAR functions of the SC/ISPC are a) properly crafted with due regard to other new CGIAR elements, and, b) continuing responsibilities are not unduly interrupted before new CGIAR entities can be put in place. The SC/ISPC looks forward to continuing to provide its advice to the newly constituted Fund Council.

² Monitoring and Evaluation: Processes and Experiences (CGIAR Science Council, April 2009).

³ In process.

⁴ Defining the role of an Independent Science and Partnership Council: A discussion document contributing to the CGIAR Transition (CGIAR Science Council, April 2009).

Monitoring and evaluation

In the transition the SC has continued to convene and manage scheduled External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs) of Centers. In the period late 2008/early 2009 the SC, with the CGIAR Secretariat, has managed the *EPMRs of both ICRISAT and IRRI*. The Panel Reports were discussed at SC11 and these two Reports and SC and CGIAR Secretariat Commentaries will be considered by ExCo at ExCo16. The *EPMR of Bioversity International* is in progress and the Panel Report will be discussed by the SC in September 2009. Normally, the EPMRs of CIMMYT and IFPRI would follow. At the request of CIMMYT, the SC entered into discussions on how to combine *ex post* review with a strategic assessment. A draft was developed to give indications for future requirements although such a strategic assessment will not now go ahead with the mutual agreement of the parties until other aspects of the transition (such as programmatic responsibilities for commodities within programs) are addressed. However, attention to these reviews is warranted if the transitional state of the CGIAR continues into 2010 without alternative M&E arrangements being put in place.

The SC experience in all aspects of M&E entered into a Lessons Learned paper (as noted above). Many of the different components of the system's M&E are integrated one with another and are useful for planning. For instance, the system-level tool, CGMap, has been a recent development to facilitate planning at Center and system levels and monitoring of the achievements or planned output targets. This tool is extremely useful for the System and could accommodate new programmatic implementation of research.

The SC has commissioned a *Stripe Review of Social Science in the CGIAR*. Phase 1, conducted under the guidance of the Panel Chair, Professor Chris Barrett of Cornell University, resulted in a descriptive data report; a normative framework for social science in the CGIAR against which the review's analysis will be done; and the terms of reference for Phase 2.⁵ A three person panel was appointed in addition to the Chair and early in 2009, the Panel organised an e-consultation among the Center and CP focal persons nominated for this review and several other social scientists in the CGIAR. This helped create ownership, clarify the TOR and approaches and solicit views on important issues. The Panel's approach will include i) assessment of material provided by the Centers on key publications, impact from social science and exemplary partnerships; ii) review of a sample of current projects with significant social science content; iii) interviews of ARI and NARS social scientists and people who have worked in the CGIAR in the past; and iv) visits to Centers (IFPRI, Nairobi cluster, IWMI and ICRISAT). The Panel's report will be considered at SC12 in September 2009. The findings are expected to provide timely input into the structuring of social science in the CGIAR at a time of new program development.

⁵ Available at <http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/home/monitoring-evaluation/en/>

The Performance measurement system (PMS)

The SC's Standing Panel for Monitoring and Evaluation (SPME) coordinates the SC's assessment of one of the results-based indicators; the "Outcome" indicator. A total of 82 outcome cases were reviewed. For the second year running the cases were assessed on a 1-10 scale. The detailed assessment criteria put emphasis on i) the clarity of the linkage of the outcome to the output/output target identified by the Center, ii) the importance and relevance of the outcome, iii) the international public goods nature of the research that had led to the outcome, and, iv) the accuracy and direct relevance to the outcome case of the evidence given in support of that case. The SC's Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA see below) provides an assessment of another of the results-based indicators: impact culture. SPIA in consultation with the Centers, contributed to the modification and refinement of the impact culture indicator and has completed its evaluation of Center submissions on impact for the PMS. The PMS results have been made available to ExCo and are accompanied by the SC's observations for the outcome and impact culture indicator results. Properly used, these results-based indicators are useful for managers and funders to monitor the relevance of the system's and Centers' activities. To assist in their use, the SC has developed "Guidelines on Use of PMS Indicators" (attached to this document as Annex I). The SC has collaborated over time with the CGIAR Secretariat in the refinement of the CGIAR PMS and the two secretariats are planning a further "Lessons Learned" document on the PMS for the benefit of the new CGIAR.

Impact assessment

SPIA's major current study focuses on *environmental impacts*. The goal is to expand epIAs within the Centers and at the System-level that specifically target environmental impacts of research, either by enhancing the productive resource base or by mitigating adverse externalities. A review of the state of the art for determining environmental and social impacts of agricultural research has been completed and SPIA has recently commissioned case studies from the Centers and one NARS that look at a range of environmental impacts, measure and use 'externalities', and integrate environmental and economic impacts. A planning and methods workshop is scheduled for June 2009 at FAO in Rome.

The SPIA/SC has *completed the policy-oriented research impact assessment study* which involved seven Center case studies (Bioversity, CIFOR, ICARDA, IFPRI, ILRI, IRRI, and Worldfish) and the final synthesis report with summaries of the cases studies were presented at a special session at AGM08. The study addresses methodological challenges inherent in documenting influence and impact of policy research and provides good evidence of the value of selected CGIAR policy research activities in influencing national policy and management practices leading to impacts on the ground. A scoping study on enhancing the value and use of *ex-post* IA related information looked at the manner and extent to which the evaluation results, particularly epIA, can be utilized for learning, and how the *approach* taken to such

evaluations enhances the learning. A synthesis was presented at the SPIA-IA Focal Point meeting in Brasilia.

Recurring activities for SPIA include methodological evaluation - randomized control trials (RCT) are being assessed to see if the method can be used to enhance the rigour of epIAs. RCTs are being used increasingly for their strong counterfactual and high internal validity. The method appeals to donors and academicians in development economics but RCTs are controversial and criticized by many in the evaluation field. SPIA continues to disseminate its key outputs through green cover reports, impact briefs and training materials. Particularly important is the continuing practice of the publication of SPIA's assessments in peer reviewed journal articles, which provides professional confirmation of the quality of the assessment process. In addition, there are joint SPIA-IA Focal Point meetings to foster communication on IA methods and contribute to building a community of practice, linkages to professional evaluation and impact assessment associations (e.g., NONIE, 3ie, AfrEA, etc.), and involvement in other professional meetings (e.g., SPIA is organizing a special IA session at the International Association of Agricultural Economics meeting in Beijing in August, 2009).

Several potential areas for the assessment of impact have been discussed with donors for the future. The first relates to a *study to enhance and update impact assessment of CGIAR crop germplasm improvement*. To embark on such a large scale system-level assessment as this will require special external donor funding but which must be provided to the CGIAR in such a way as to preserve the independence of the SPIA. The consultancy report on environmental and social impacts (see above) explored a number of topics related to social impacts and has set the stage for a full case study analysis. There are four components of social impacts SPIA believes deserve priority attention: *poverty* (first priority area); *gender*; *food security*; and *nutrition/health*. Donors are supportive of SPIA moving further down the pathway towards these highly relevant indicators of impact.

Two other high priority, under-assessed areas of research which merit SPIA's attention in terms of future system-level impact assessment are: *biodiversity* (including germplasm collection, conservation, characterization and evaluation) and *training / capacity development*. These are areas which to-date have constituted a significant share of the CGIAR budget and yet have hardly any studies to document their impact.

Mobilising science

The SC, including through meetings with ADE in Maputo and consultations with stakeholders in other fora, continues to refine its strategy for the mobilization of science. CGIAR scientists are well connected to their traditional research partners, but recent changes in the research landscape have seen a move away from basic agricultural research and into other natural sciences in the developed countries, as well as an emergence of new major players and donors. The SC notes that it has no desire to micro-manage the Centers' mode and degree of partnerships, but instead it hopes to tap opportunities particularly in the non-agricultural sciences and amongst non-

traditional partners. This is taking practical expression in 2009 through the organization by the SC, in partnership with key stakeholders, of a science forum. These are expected to be biennial events which will provide a forum to broker new partnerships, highlight opportunities where linkages can be forged to capture innovative science, particularly in disciplines beyond conventional agricultural research, with the potential to deliver an impact on development goals.

*Science Forum 2009*⁶ (16-17 June, Wageningen) is organized by the SC in partnership with the CGIAR Secretariat, the Alliance of the CGIAR Centers, GFAR and Wageningen University and Research Centre. The 2009 forum will focus on innovative science in six domains (below) and the research and partnership needs that can help mobilize that science more effectively for development. This forum brings together researchers from every CGIAR Center and Challenge Program with researchers from ARIs, NARS and other crucial stakeholders. The Science Forum themes are:

- Resilient natural resource systems.
- The future of food: developing more nutritious diets and safer food.
- ICTs transforming agricultural science, research and technology generation.
- Beyond the yield curve: exerting the power of genetics, genomics and synthetic biology.
- Eco-efficiencies in agro-ecosystems.
- Agriculture beyond food science for a bio-based economy.

SF09 will provide inputs to the new Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD) on new science and potential upstream linkages whereas GCARD may consider overall CGIAR partnership approaches to fulfilling the CGIAR strategy including national and regional development linkages.

Strategic studies

The SC has continued to seek to fill gaps in system-level knowledge of *stewardship and liability for intellectual property (IP)* so as to inform the development of a system-wide policy on IP. A strategic study has been conducted, combining the views and recommendations of two experts in the respective fields into a draft discussion document. The SC plans to seek and incorporate feedback from a wider audience, and to plan a meeting (probably in August 2009) as part of the ADE (Alliance Deputy Director's Executive) meeting with the private sector. Following the workshop, the SC will establish a document with jointly agreed recommendations which would be useful for guiding policy development.

The SC has also considered how the ISPC may improve uptake of future advice through client evaluation surveys and the potential restructuring of formats and publications for ISPC advice. The SC has developed a large body of information and advice which will be important to provide inputs for the Consortium at its

⁶ The official Website of the SF09 is <http://www.scienceforum2009.nl>

establishment so that lessons relevant for CGIAR policy and project implementation would not be lost or need to be reinvented. The new ISPC has been charged with a foresight role. A common understanding between the SC and the Centers/Programs would be necessary from the outset for such studies - as would a detailed communication plan targeting the appropriate decision-makers and likely implementers.

Science Council members and other business

Derek Byerlee formally took up the role of the new Chair of SPIA at the Lima meeting and a new member of SPIA, Ross Conner (University of California, Irvine), was officially welcomed. ExCo Members will receive recommendations on a new SC member to replace Mariza Barbosa who stepped down in 2008. Ruben Echeverria resigned as Executive Director of the SC after nearly five years of service to take up the Director General position at CIAT. SC12 will be held in CIFOR Indonesia from the 3rd to the 5th of September 2009. A list of recent SC documents and publications is appended as Annex II).

Annex I
SC Guidelines for the Use of the Research-based PMS Indicators
May, 2009

General comments

One of the components of the current CGIAR's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system is a Performance Measurement System (PMS) for the Centers, composed of a set of performance indicators. Though this is an important instrument to assess the CGIAR Centers' performance (and that of the System as a whole), there are other tools which complement the PMS (such as EPMRs) in the overall M&E of the System.

To the extent that indicators used in the PMS are able to reflect actual performance, this information can have value for decision making, in particular for Centers' managers and for donors. Measuring within Center performance, over time, and benchmarking against what can be expected from high-performing organisations is an essential of good practice in the management of a Research Center. The principle of rewarding good performance with increased allocations of resources, as practiced in some measure by several key donors in the CGIAR is essentially a sound one as it is a powerful and effective incentive for encouraging good performance across Centers. However, as with any instrument, there are always risks of unintended and undesirable effects from donors' inappropriate use of performance indicators. Thus, the indicators will need to be revised from time to time on the basis of experience to provide for clearer incentives for good performance. Furthermore, as the CGIAR System changes the PMS will need to evolve and be adjusted to the new CGIAR system structure as a component of an integrated internal M&E system.

Given experiences in other settings, a particular risk that needs to be acknowledged in the context of the CGIAR is the establishment and use of a link between indicator-based performance and resource allocation. It must be emphasized that this should not be made in a mechanical way. There are three reasons why care should be exercised in making a direct and simplistic link between reported performance and resource allocation:

- a) Without adequate validation procedures in place to ensure accurate reporting, there will be a tendency to over-state performance/impact in order to get more resources;
- b) Some Centers having performance problems may actually require temporary support to bring them to a higher level of performance. Penalizing them by reducing financial support could in fact exacerbate the underlying performance problems. Hence, provision should be made under some cases for allowing poor performing Centers to submit an explanation of and an action plan for dealing with its performance deficiencies prior to decisions taken about resource allocation. Furthermore, the PM does not allow differentiating between well performing and poorly performing units where targeted measures or support would be needed to rectify the situation;
- c) Aiming for high values in the indicators included may reduce attention to achieving high levels of performance in areas that do not easily lend themselves to being measured through annual indicators, such as relevance and long term actual impact.

In order to enhance the quality and credibility of the CGIAR PMS and to minimize the risks mentioned above, the following 'quality assurance elements' are useful:

- i) *audits of data quality* conducted by the CGIAR Internal audit unit;
- ii) develop *guidelines for the use of performance indicators* which emphasize that decisions should be “performance informed” rather than “performance based” - for the reasons indicated above under a), b) and c).⁷. The guidelines should be used in dialogue with donors to clarify what the PMS indicators actually measure, i.e., their value as a partial reflection of performance, their utility for strictly management purposes for internal decision making and the implications of mechanistically using them in resource allocation decisions⁸;
- iii) create *incentives* for improving performance by rewarding Centers (via prizes or recognition) for exemplary performance in some area. For example, SPIA identified the six best 3B indicator impact stories in 2006 (out of 30 submitted) and worked with the Centers in producing high quality impact briefs of these and posting them on the CGIAR Impact website, as ‘best practice’ *ex post* impact assessments.

Annual performance indicators should therefore inform, but not constitute the sole basis for, funding decisions by donors; they do not provide a comprehensive assessment of all performance. Other instruments also provide information on Center/programme performance over time (EPMRs, MTPs, impact assessments etc), particularly on relevance, quality and quantity of results and their potential for impact. These should also factor into the overall assessment, especially given the heterogeneity of research domains and challenges faced by the fifteen Centers. Furthermore, considerations like temporary needs, current research proposals, emerging challenges (climate change, increased food prices, etc) should also be considered in funding decisions.

The following provides the SC’s guidance to the use of the research related indicators of the CGIAR PMS.

Guidelines for using research-related PMS indicators

The Structure of the PMS has been revised and the new structure is shown below:

Structure of PMS	
Component I. Research Related Indicators	
Element 1: Outputs	Publications Capacity building (under development) Data (under development)
Element 2: Outcome	SC assessment of outcome cases submitted by Center
Element 3: Impact Culture	SC/SPIA rating of commitment to documenting impacts from past research in a credible way and building an impact assessment culture

⁷ In this respect it would be useful to fully understand how donors allocate resources and the relative weight given to “performance” vis-à-vis other criteria, such as donor strategy for development aid, recognizing there may be considerable variability across donors.

⁸ An example will illustrate. Even if a Center were able to successfully measure and document actual impacts from previous research, given the long lag time between research activities and ultimate impacts, donors should be very careful in considering whether impacts from previous research (conducted some 10-20 years ago) are a good prediction of current and future research success. Alternatively, if donors are keen to reward those Centers who invest core resources in documenting impacts (a public good to the CGIAR system), then it is reasonable to use the “impact culture indicator” as a basis for influencing allocation decisions.

Component II. Institutional indicators

Element 4: Institutional Health

Element 6: Financial Health

Component III. Stakeholder Perceptions (survey every three years)

The research-related component has three elements that aim at measuring results-based performance in the generation and application of knowledge, in capacity strengthening and through these, in delivering outcomes and impact. Performance in each element is measured through one or more Indicators. Some of the indicators related to Element Outputs are being developed. The characteristics of the research-related performance indicators, their limitations and guidance regarding intended use are summarised in Table 1. These guidelines attempt to clarify the following:

1. The rationale for including the indicator in the PMS
2. What the indicators are actually measuring
3. The caveats and qualifiers on the consequences of establishing direct mechanical links between performance and resource allocation (as discussed above)
4. Appropriate and inappropriate use of each of the indicators for each major component of the PMS
5. Performance targets

Table 1 – Characteristics of research-related performance indicators and guidelines for their use

INDICATOR	Rationale	What the indicator measures?	Intended use	Good use of the indicator	Inappropriate use of the indicator	Expected good performance (benchmarks)
OUTPUT						
Publications	Publications are vehicles to transmit output information. Peer review is a universally accepted means of quality control. Centers can reach wide-spread impact through citation of their publication and recognition by external stakeholders as a preferred partner of excellence	It measures productivity of research and is an approximate measure of the quality of science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Centers to monitor productivity and to maintain high quality database for multiple purposes -Partners, stakeholders and research peers are informed about the excellence -Some donors for assessing competence for future funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -as a composite indicator of research productivity and quality -as a measure of the standing of the CGIAR system among peer scientists -as a benchmark to observe trends over time and compare institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for relevance (which is not measured by this indicator) - as sufficient single indicator of quality (need to be complemented by other indicators and direct assessment of publication quality) - as corresponding to an even productivity within Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -2 publications in Thomson journals per year per scientists -1 publication other than in Thomson journals per year per scientist -success in getting a proportion of articles into high impact journals
Capacity building	under construction except one sub-component: Co-authorship with NARS partners					
	Co-publishing is a specific measure of the relevance of the Center's research to NARS partners, and a measure of the quality and relevance of the partnerships	The extent to which NARS scientists are partners as indicated by joint documentation of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Centers and partners to plan and monitor joint research to the stage of publishing results -NARS stakeholders are informed of results of particular potential relevance to them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -as one component of a indicator for overall capacity building -for monitoring productivity and capacity building elements of collaborative research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -for indicating the overall value of Center's partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -to be determined as an appropriate range -100% should not be the target
Databases	under construction					

INDICATOR	Rationale	What the indicator measures?	Intended use	Good use of the indicator	Inappropriate use of the indicator	Expected good performance (benchmarks)
OUTCOME	Outcome is a measure of relevance as evidenced by wide-spread use of Center outputs by the intended users. It is an important step in the impact pathway that the Center can influence through partnerships and capacity building	Achievement of expected outcomes from research outputs across Center's research agenda (over time)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Donors for accountability; donors and partners for getting information about success stories. -Centers to learn about and monitor their own progress along the impact pathway. -Centers to plan their monitoring activities for credibly documenting outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -as milestones in the impact pathways -to establish links with MTPs - to observe Center performance and differences among Centers in terms of types of outcome, ability to document outcome and accumulation of success cases of adoption and use of outputs 	- as indicators corresponding to the center's total portfolio and drawing inference of similar success in all projects (the indicator corresponds to a small self-selected sample of well documented cases)	number of well documented outcomes as a function of Center budget (ranging from 4 per US\$ 10m to 7 per US\$ 50m)
IMPACT CULTURE	The indicator measures Centers' commitment to documenting impact and establishing an impact assessment culture, which is likely to be correlated with actual impact in the long run	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Center's effort to credibly document impact to fulfil their accountability imperative to CGIAR; -Center's commitment to establishing an impact culture among own researchers and partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donors: to continuously validate efficacy of agricultural research as an effective instrument for achieving CG goals; Centers: for improving performance management to cover systematically the <i>ex post</i> (from outcomes to long term impacts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - as an indication of the Center's commitment to documenting impact <i>ex post</i> - as the Center's institutionalization of impact evaluation - indicator of quality and rigor of <i>ex post</i> impact assessments conducted 	- as a proxy for size or extent of impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -one large scale high quality epIA per \$20 m of investment; - investing 1.25% of budget for epIA; - epIAs further down the impact pathway; quantify economic, social & environ. impacts; etc. -follows 'best practices' as defined in Walker et al. (2008)

Annex II

List of recent SC documents

2009

Defining and Refining Good Practice in *Ex-post* Impact Assessment – Synthesis Report

SC Commentary to IRRI EPMR

SC Commentary to ICRISAT EPMR

Discussion draft of the Stewardship and Liability Study

Defining the role of an Independent Science and Partnership Council: A discussion document contributing to the CGIAR Transition

Monitoring and Evaluation: Processes and Experiences

Report of the External Program and Management Review of the Seventh IRRI EPMR

Report of the External Program and Management Review of the Sixth ICRISAT EPMR

2008

Policy-Oriented Agricultural Research Impacts: Evidence and Insights from 7 Case Studies

Policy-Oriented Agricultural Research Impacts: Evidence and Insights from 7 Case Studies (Brief N.23)

The Impact of the In-Trust Agreements on CGIAR Germplasm Exchange and the Role of Bioversity International in establishing the Agreements (Brief N. 24)

Policy and Practice in Indonesian Pulp & Paper Sector: assessing influence of CIFOR's research (Brief N. 25)

Barley fertilization policy change in Syria: the role of ICARDA's policy-oriented research (Brief N. 26)

Assessing IFPRI's impact: the case of the Mexican PROGRESA/Oportunidades program (Brief N. 27)

Changing Dairy Marketing Policy in Kenya: assessing the impact of the smallholder dairy project (Brief N.28)

Pesticide use in the Philippines: assessing contribution of IRRI's research to reduced health costs (Brief N.29)

Community-Based Fisheries Management in Bangladesh – assessing the policy influence of the WorldFish Center (Brief N. 30)

Ethical Challenges for the CGIAR: Report of Three Studies

Ethical Challenges for the CGIAR (Brief N. 31)

Generation CP External Review

SC Commentary on IWMI's new Strategic Plan

The global food crisis and the need for a comprehensive international research strategy: a perspective from the Science Council

Biotechnology, Biosafety and the CGIAR

SC Report to ExCo-15

SC Commentary to Co-Hort Challenge Program proposal for Phase II

SC Commentary on CIFOR's new Strategic Plan

SC Commentary on ICRAF's new Strategic Plan

SC-10 End of Meeting Report

Bio-fuels Research in the CGIAR: a Perspective from the Science Council

Impact of Agricultural Research in South Asia since the Green Revolution (Brief N. 21)

An Assessment of the Impact of Agricultural Research in South Asia since the Green Revolution

Raitzer & Kelley, Assessing the Contribution of Impact Assessment to Donor Decisions for International Agricultural Research, *Research Evaluation Journal (SPIA)*

Kelley, Ryan & Gregersen, Enhancing *ex post* Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research; the CGIAR Experience, *Research Evaluation Journal (SPIA)*

Strategic Guidance for *Ex Post* Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research

Strategic Guidance for *ex post* Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research (Brief N. 22)

SC Commentary on CGIAR Climate Change Challenge Program proposal

SC Commentary on CGIAR Oasis Challenge Program proposal

SC Commentary on Generation Challenge Program External Review

SC Commentary to Water & Food Challenge Program proposal for Phase II

SC Report to ExCo-14

Land Decline in Land-Rich Africa, a creeping disaster in the making – a joint publication with the Center for Development Research (ZEF) of the University of Bonn, Germany

Biofuels Research in the CGIAR

SC9, Nairobi, 28 March – 1 April 2008, End-of Meeting Report

Report of the 6th External Program and Management Report of International Institute of Tropical Agriculture

Report of the 3rd External Program and Management Report of International Water Management Institute

Report of the Second External Program and Management Report of International Livestock Research Institute

Report of the First External Evaluation of the Water and Food Challenge Program

Report of the First External Evaluation of HarvestPlus Challenge Program

Report of the 3rd External Program and Management Report of Africa Rice Center

Report of the 6th External Program and Management Report of International Potato Center

Report of the 6th External Program and Management Report of the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical