



Terms of Reference for Review of EC-IFAD funded CGIAR Projects

1. Introduction

These are the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the review of projects implemented by CGIAR (formerly the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research), and which are solely or partially funded by the European Commission (EC), complemented with funding from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

In particular, the review will focus on all projects supported by the EC Programme “Putting Research into Use for Sustainable Agriculture and Resilience” (PRUNSAR) under Contribution Agreement (CA) **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968**, which was signed on **26 November 2015 (budget EURO 20M)**. Ten projects were approved in 2015 and completed by 2021. In 2018, the EU provided an extra EURO 10M to support three new projects (increased budget EURO 30M) and funds were received by centres in early 2019. Further, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the implementation of the entire Programme was adversely affected: as a result, EC/IFAD extended the Programme implementation period by 18 months (from 26 November 2021 to 26 May 2023). In parallel, IFAD, through its own grant programme, allocated USD 9.5 million to support nine projects funded by EC under PRUNSAR.

The PRUNSAR Programme comprises 13 projects; 12 being implemented by nine of the CGIAR Centres and one by INBAR. The projects implemented by CGIAR Centres were all components of the CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) Phase II, which ended in late 2021. The selected projects all had a particular emphasis on supporting smallholder farmers and rural livelihoods and promoting pro-poor agricultural and rural innovation through the delivery and uptake of global and regional public goods derived from agricultural research.

1.1 Background: CGIAR Centres and CRPs

CGIAR is a global research partnership on agricultural science and innovation dedicated to reducing poverty, enhancing food and nutrition security, and improving natural resources and ecosystem services. Its research is carried out by 14 CGIAR Centres and Alliances in close collaboration with partners such as national and regional research institutes, civil society organisations, academia, development organisations and the private sector.

The Centres operate within a Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) which provide strategic direction to ensure that the Centres and CRPs produce measurable results. The CRPs were focused, thematic research programmes aimed at producing common strategic System Level Outcomes (SLOs). The SLOs were a critical component of the CGIAR’s SRF. There were three SLOs: 1) reduce poverty, 2) improve food and nutrition security for health, and 3) improve natural resources and ecosystem services.

The funding of the EC to the CGIAR has been managed by IFAD since 2008. Since that time, AGRINATURA has been a partner in monitoring, evaluating, and assessing impact of the funded projects and generating lessons and evidence to support strategic decision making.

The projects under DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968 - PRUNSAR were allocated to one of the CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs, Phase II) which are now closed. Table 1 below shows the CRPs in Phase II. The projects funded by EC-IFAD, are listed in Table 2 and (in more detail) in Annex 3.

Table 1. Overview of CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs) Phase II

A. Innovation in agri-food systems (AFS) CRPs	
1.	Grain Legumes and Dryland Cereals Agri-food Systems (GLDC)
2.	Fish Agri-Food Systems
3.	Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA)
4.	Livestock-Agri-food Systems
5.	Maize Agri-Food Systems
6.	Rice Agri-Food Systems
7.	Roots, tubers, and bananas (RTB) Agri-Food Systems
8.	Wheat Agri-Food Systems
B. Global Integrating CRPs	
9.	Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) CRP
10.	Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH) CRP
11.	Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE) CRP
12.	Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM) CRP
C. Platforms	
13.	Platform for Big Data in Agriculture
14.	Excellence in Breeding Platform
15.	Genebank Platform

1.2 Outline of the TORs

The review of the projects funded under **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968** will be conducted by AGRINATURA EEIG¹, a European group of research institutes working on agriculture for development, in close collaboration with IFAD and the EC. The review will be carried out from September 2022 to April 2023.

These TORs are structured as follows:

- Section 2 sets out the objectives of the review.
- Section 3 details the proposed methodology and approach, which consists of a desk-study of all 13 projects funded under **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968**, followed by a more in-depth field research-informed analysis of a sub-set of projects (to be agreed).
- Section 4 proposes the expected outputs (reporting and knowledge products) for the review.
- Section 5 outlines the expected profiles of the AGRINATURA researchers that will contribute to the study.
- Section 6 proposes the timeline and completion date for the review.

¹ As per para 12 of annex I of the Contribution Agreement, a budgetary allocation was retained for IFAD to commission AGRINATURA EEIG to monitor selected EU-supported programmes. AGRINATURA EEIG is a not-for-profit pan-European network of 35 European agricultural research organisations and universities which brings together expertise in monitoring and evaluation of agricultural research for development and provides an independent opinion. It uses consistent standards and methods which results in easy comparisons to be made with reference to performance of projects between different projects funded by the EU.

2. Objectives of the review

The **overall objective** of the review is to assess progress in achieving output and outcome targets, and to analyse and seek to identify the impacts of EC funded CGIAR projects on policy, practice and on smallholder farmers and other key stakeholders. Outputs from the review will also include lessons from experience and insights on best practices that can inform and assist decision-making processes for the CGIAR in Agricultural Research for Development (AR4D) design and implementation, and guide future AR4D support from the EC and IFAD. The term ‘review’ is thus and in this context used and understood as to evaluate outcomes and identify impact. The review will derive additional and more in-depth lessons through further scrutiny and analysis of impact pathways, the project theory of change, the rate of adoption of research outcomes (putting research into use), and the quality and effectiveness of partnerships.

Where possible, the review will seek to attribute the outputs delivered under PRUNSAR to the EC-IFAD funding but will also take into consideration that not all outputs from a particular CRP component were directly underpinned by EC-IFAD funding because of the intertwined nature of CGIAR research programmes.

3. Review approach

The review will be conducted in two stages, which are described below.

Stage 1: Desk review of all funded activities

The first stage: AGRINATURA will undertake a desk review of the entire PRUNSAR programme, ('Putting Research Into Use for Sustainable Agriculture and Resilience' - Contribution Agreement **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968**). This comprises an appraisal of all the activities funded by the programme, in all targeted countries. The desk review will consider all documents relevant to the 13 projects, presented in Table 2. The full 'description of the Action' of **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968** is attached in Annex 2.

Table 2 PRUNSAR Projects

Fund Recipient	Project Title	Budget of EU in EUR (direct costs)
Project under the original Contribution Agreement		
ICRAF	Restoration of Degraded Lands for Food Security and Poverty Reduction in East Africa and the Sahel: taking successes in land restoration to scale.	3 730 000
	Food and Fodder Trees for Diversifying Diets and Livelihoods in Eastern and Southern Africa	970 000
ILRI	Improved productivity through crop-livestock interventions in Eastern DR Congo and Burundi	3 200 000
WorldFish	Managing aquatic agricultural systems to improve nutrition and livelihoods.	1 860 000
	Improving the technical foundations of sustainable aquaculture	930 727
CIP	Food Resilience Through Root and Tuber Crops in Upland and Coastal Communities of the Asia-Pacific	1 740 000
Biodiversity International	CCAFS Linking Agro-biodiversity value chains and climate adaptation empowering the poor to manage risk	1 450 000
IWMI	Africa to Asia: testing adaptation in Flood-Based Resource Management	1 450 000
IRRI	Improved crop management and strengthened seed system for drought-prone areas of South Asia.	1 450 000
INBAR	South-South knowledge transfer strategies for scaling up pro-poor bamboo livelihoods, income generation and employment creation, and environmental management in Africa	970 000
Projects approved under the amendment to the Contribution Agreement (top-up)		
CIAT	Building livelihoods and resilience to climate change in East & West Africa: AR4D for large-scale implementation of Climate-Smart Agriculture	2 900 000
ILRI	Control of Peste des petits ruminants (PPR) in Eastern and Western Africa	3 000 000
AfricaRice	Sustainable and diversified rice-based farming systems	3 000 000

For each project, the documents to review may include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Approved Grant Agreement;
- Approved full Project Design Proposal including Project Logframe;
- Annual Project Progress Reports and Project Completion Reports when applicable;
- The most recent or final cumulative Project Statement of Expenditure;
- A brief summary of the current situation of the Project, including start date, funds provided, and any agreed extensions;
- Project and Programme Strategic Results Framework documents;
- Approved relevant proposals for funded CRP components;
- CGIAR Centres' reports (technical, financial, audit reports, etc) relating to the funded activities;
- CGIAR Advisory Services (CAS)' CRP evaluation reports² relevant to the EC-IFAD funded activities (to be provided by CGIAR).

Proposed evaluation criteria

Five evaluation criteria are the basis of the 'Results Oriented Monitoring'³ (ROM) independent review system that is used by the EC for the review of performance of its projects and programmes set out by OECD-DAC⁴. These are: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. Among these five criteria, four (by order of importance here below) will be applied during the review:

- 1) **Impact:** The positive and negative changes produced by the supported activities as defined by project/programme logframes, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. It considers the likely potential of longer-term effect of the activities on beneficiaries and the heterogeneity in impact across different beneficiary groups (e.g. women and marginalised social groups) and comprises the analysis of economic, social and environmental impact, as well as understanding the impact pathways. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors.
- 2) **Sustainability:** Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity or a project are likely to continue after donor funding ends. The review should consider the sustainability and scalability of new knowledge, new practices, innovation, and other technical improvements.
- 3) **Effectiveness:** A measure of the extent to which the activities funded by **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968** attained their objectives and delivered the intended outputs and

² The CGIAR Advisory Services (CAS) completed the evaluation of all CRPs in 2020 ([Link](#)). The CAS reviews serve as the CGIAR's final set of evaluative information on the research and organisational performance of CRPs. It is foreseen that the results of the 2020 CAS reviews, where available and applicable, will be taken into consideration and referred to for the EC/IFAD review carried out by Agrinatura EEIG.

³ https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/external-independent-review-system_en

⁴ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

outcomes. The key question is what difference the project made in practice, as measured by the extent to which the intended beneficiaries really benefited from the knowledge, technologies, innovations or other services that were made available.

- 4) **Efficiency:** Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the supported activities use the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted. Where robust evidence is available, the review should seek to make careful comparisons of the cost-effectiveness of other projects with similar objectives implemented in similar contexts.

Analytical framework

A common framework for analysis will be developed by Agrinatura with a set of guide questions relating to each of these criteria. For example, under 'impact', the review will assess the changes produced by the supported activities, and whether the research has contributed to effects on beneficiaries such as enhanced income, improved food security, nutrition, and other social and environmental impact. In addition, the review will make an evaluation of the potential of the program to make research available for sustainable agriculture and resilience to climate change in the long-term. Under 'effectiveness', the review will establish the extent to which the projects have achieved their stated objectives, delivered their outputs, and transformed these into research and development outcomes which made a measurable difference to intended beneficiaries and users. Under 'sustainability', the review will evaluate the viability of proposed innovation in the medium and long term and the potential to up-scale. Under 'efficiency', the review will assess value for money and efficient use of financial and technical resources. In the early stages, Agrinatura will schedule regular meetings with IFAD to provide updates on the status of the development of the analytical framework and to solicit guidance and feedback. The desk review framework developed for the most recent review is attached as Annex 4 and can, based on the above modifications and the initial discussions, be suitably adjusted for the present review.

The review will also examine the level of achievement of the outputs in the Logical Framework (in the Description of the Action **2015/360-968**, Appendix 1). Agrinatura is expected to conceive suitable analytical tools to explore the programme results concerning: (i) delivery of pro-poor innovations and knowledge for smallholders including women, (ii) capacity for pro-poor agricultural research, (iii) evidence to support policies, (iv) the extent of synergies and complementarities with other programmes and innovation partnerships in each project under review. In addition, the framework will consider the role of stakeholders, with special attention to farmer organisations (FOs), if applicable, in different stages of the projects, including project design and needs identification, implementation, research uptake, and monitoring and evaluation.

The desk review will be carried out based on the documents that are available. If deemed necessary, phone/Zoom and email exchanges will be used for clarifications and to collect relevant additional information.

Performance ratings

During the desk study, the projects reviewed will be given an overall performance rating for each of the four review criteria proposed above, using the following scale:

- **(6) Highly satisfactory.** The grant objective(s) was met or surpassed. Implementation of all components exceeds all physical targets. Over 100% of all outputs were achieved and have led to the realization of all desired outcomes. All results were achieved on time, or earlier than anticipated.
- **(5) Satisfactory.** The grant objective(s) was mostly met and most important output targets were achieved (over 90% of physical targets met). Most outputs have led to the desired outcomes and most results were achieved on time.
- **(4) Moderately satisfactory.** The grant objective(s) was somewhat met, but some components are lagging behind. Only 70% the main physical targets were met. Some important outcomes were not achieved and there were some delays in implementation.
- **(3) Moderately unsatisfactory.** The grant objective(s) was not met – or is not likely to be met – and implementation of many components is below target (less than 60% of the main physical outputs targets were met). Few outcomes are likely to be realized and there were lots of delays in implementation.
- **(2) Unsatisfactory.** The grant objective(s) was not met and less than 50% of physical targets were met. Implementation of all components has been significantly delayed throughout project implementation.
- **Highly unsatisfactory.** The grant has failed to reach its objective(s) and has achieved less than 40% of outputs/physical targets.

Each rating should be part of the conclusion for each of the four criteria.

Outputs of stage 1

The outputs of the first phase are two-fold:

- 1) A written report based on the Desk Study analysis of all the projects funded by **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968**, structured around the four review criteria (efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) and evidence from the analysis indicated above, with more detailed project specific information provided in annexes.

- 2) A field visit proposal for the Case Study stage of the review (see below). The second stage will offer the opportunity for more in-depth analysis of a small sample of interventions funded by EC-IFAD (see Table 2 above) that provide particularly important lessons and learning opportunities as indicated in the following selection criteria.

Stage 2: Selection of projects for Case Studies: field visits for in-depth analysis of a sub-set of the funded projects

The second phase of the review will be focussed on a sub-set of the projects funded by **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968** (see Table 2 for the list from which a selection will be made). This will involve field-visits to a small number of countries with the aim of conducting an in-depth analysis of interventions.

It is tentatively proposed that four case studies will be implemented, each by a team of two experts.

At an early stage of the desk review, a proposal will be developed for the selection of projects that will be analysed in-depth during Stage 2 (field research). The proposal will be submitted for validation by IFAD and the EC. Although the selection will be informed by desk review findings, selection criteria that may be considered are the following:

1. Projects that have contributed/are on track to contribute significantly to the reduction of food insecurity and poverty through pro-poor agricultural development. These could include projects where policy findings have contributed (or are expected to contribute) to the overall goals of poverty alleviation and improved livelihoods.
2. Projects that have delivered particularly well/not well on the following expected outputs:
 - a. Pro-poor scientific, technological and institutional innovations and knowledge, with emphasis on meeting the needs of low-income smallholder farmers including women;
 - b. Particularly interesting lessons and high potential for scalability, also through South-South Triangular Cooperation (SSTC).
 - c. Evidence of high effectiveness of innovative approach to meeting future agricultural and rural development needs, with strong policy impact potential;
 - d. Capacity for pro-poor agricultural research and high potential to be taken up, replicated and enhanced among researchers, non-research stakeholders and institutions including National Agricultural Research and Extension Systems (NARES);
 - e. Partnerships established between CGIAR centres CRPs and non-CGIAR research institutions, and research and non-research development institutions for more effective uptake of research outputs;

- f. Improved complementarities and synergies with research, extension, development and innovation programmes and activities supported by the EC, IFAD, Government programmes, and other donors.
3. Projects in which Farmer Organisations (FOs)⁵ are particularly important stakeholders involved in the project and/or have strong ownership of the project. This includes projects where FOs have (had) an integral role in various project stages, i.e. from needs identification and project design, to implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of outcomes.
 4. The design of these Projects was premised on the need to demonstrate their potential to tackle EC's concept of 'last mile' hurdles or bottlenecks which may take a variety of forms and be more binding for some groups (e.g. women or youth). Are there examples of such outcome or impact achievements that it is particularly important to study in more depth?
 5. Projects where upfront, significant challenges (related e.g. to fragility and conflict) have been effectively addressed or, alternatively, are substantially off track to achieve their objectives, especially if it is apparent that useful lessons can be drawn from such failures to deliver.
 6. Geographical focus, thereby maximising efficiency by proposing locations in which a multitude (high density) of projects are implemented to allow missions to visit the maximum number of project sites.
 7. Projects reflecting a variety in typology of agri-food systems, agroecological and geographical areas
 8. Projects with a particular focus on resilience and **nutrition**.

Thematic research questions for analysis

While the development of the analytical framework for the desk review will be informed by the approach taken in the last review (see Annex 4) and there will be overlaps between the coverage in the desk and field studies, the field phase will focus on the following five questions and themes:

- 1) **Putting research into use, Innovation uptake and Scaling-up.** This question is focussed on understanding what the research findings from the funded activity are, and who is/should be/will be using these research outputs (i.e. the beneficiaries). It will consider the rate of adoption (or potential for adoption) of research outputs, including understanding the complex processes related to transformation and adaptation of research outputs into research and development outcomes. Through examining these outcomes, the extent to which the research is, or will be, delivering its full transformative potential will be assessed. This question also considers the role end-users/beneficiaries have played (if any) in the design and implementation of the project.

⁵ In addition to farmer organisations, projects that involve other users associations, e.g. community organisations relevant to land, trees, water management etc., or other associations in value chains and systems beyond the farm.

2) **Impact pathways from an environmental, social, and economic perspective at farmer, community and landscape level.** A systematic approach will be taken to understand the evolution of changes and improvements generated as a result of the project/interventions⁶. The aim is to provide a high-quality analysis of the impact pathway, built on a theory of change, to understand the contribution of the project/intervention towards economic, environmental and social outcomes. In addition, there will be analysis of capacity strengthening and learning situations all along the impact pathways in order to provide greater insights into key mechanisms that generate uptake of research outputs. In some of the selected cases, it may be possible to plausibly attribute impact to the project/intervention (or series of projects, i.e. innovation trajectories), whereas in others an understanding of the impact pathways could provide insights into how, and under what conditions, impact and change could be expected to occur in the future. The following aspects will be analysed:

- a. **Economic aspects:** In particular, production costs, yields, post-harvest loss reduction, value addition, profitability and market access.
- b. **Environmental and Climate aspects:** In particular, adaptation to climate change, fertility, biodiversity, and water access and management.
- c. **Social aspects:** In particular, food and nutrition security, gender equity, social inclusion (including youth engagement/empowerment) and impacts on vulnerable groups, resource access and rights, incomes and livelihoods.
- d. **Other aspects:** In particular, where participatory identification of outcome and impact indicators with key stakeholders highlight significant aspects beyond those mentioned above.

3) **Impact pathways related to public policy.** This will outline plausible pathways of how the research findings (will/could) contribute to informing evidence-based public policies. Outcomes refer to changes in policies and policy makers' knowledge, attitudes, skills, and practices to enable the creation of a policy environment to ensure that impact can reach end-users, in particular smallholder farmers. Where research is specifically directed towards informing agricultural or food policy, the pathways planned and implemented for policy engagement will be reviewed and the contribution assessed. In innovation trajectories over the long term, where different projects have contributed and multiple actors have participated, attribution is challenging and the analysis of the role of public policy in the impact pathway will need to be accompanied by caveats (see also footnote 6).

⁶ Where possible, the analysis will go beyond the project to evaluate the innovation trajectories, as pathways that generate impact are generally built over a longer period through clusters of projects (not just individual interventions).

4) Partnerships. This question focuses on the establishment, roles and significance of partnerships and collaborations related to the selected activities. It will consider, in particular:

- a. The role of stakeholders, including the private sector, farmers and especially FOs⁷ where applicable and in which project stages: from identifying needs, setting priorities, and designing research objectives, to monitoring and dissemination of results and outcomes. To what extent do stakeholders have ‘ownership’ of the project and its outcomes?
- b. The extent of linkages and collaboration between CGIAR Centres and CRPs on the one hand, and **National Agricultural Research Systems**⁸ on the other. Has the project contributed to increased capacity throughout these NARSs?
- c. What partnerships have been established with the **private sector**, and who has benefitted from these (how/why)?

5) CGIAR Centres and CRPs monitoring and evaluation system. This part of the review is included to understand whether the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system(s) adopted by CGIAR Centres and/or CRPs (where relevant) are effective in generating, keeping track of and providing necessary information. The assessment will largely be based on examining the quality and quantity of data and analysis provided by CGIAR during the desk and field stages of this review. Where data, monitoring processes or information provided appears to be lacking in quality or quantity, recommendations for improvements will be made. Included here could be a review of:

- The CGIAR M&E criteria and procedures as far as this is practical, and how they are applied to capture deliverables from EC-IFAD funded CGIAR projects;
- The quality of the CRPs’ M&E provisions, including to what extent the CRPs were implementing them, the quality of their monitoring plans, and the likelihood that they provided a transparent, credible and rigorous framework for assessing progress in delivering results (milestones, outputs and outcomes)
- The quality and consistency of log-frames, indicators and baseline studies.

⁷ If FOs inclusion is not relevant for the selected project (e.g., because the project is focussed on other beneficiaries), other actors, associations, or stakeholder groups will be considered in a similar manner.

⁸ Understood as a multi stakeholder group including research, extension, farmers, NGOs and civil society, private sector traders, manufacturers, government at different levels etc.

4. Reporting and knowledge management

Language

All reports will be in English.

Proposed reporting outline

1) Case study proposal

A proposal for the selection of projects to be analysed in-depth during the Phase 2 of the review (field research) will be developed at an early stage of the desk review (Phase 1) as outlined in section 3. This will be done by applying the refined selection criteria to the whole portfolio of funded projects, and by carrying out a first rapid evaluation. By doing so, it is possible to identify the most suitable experts for the case studies, and commence preparations for the field visits, in a timely manner.

The proposal will be submitted for validation by IFAD and the EC.

2) Desk Study report

This is a written report based on the analysis of all the projects funded by **DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968** structured around the four ROM review criteria (impact, sustainability, efficiency, and effectiveness).

The programme report will include a sub-section for each review criterion. The facts should be described and interpreted, analysing them in accordance with the key questions pertinent to each criterion. Each sub-section will end with the performance rating for the criterion. Details from individual project analyses will be summarised in annexes.

3) Case study reports

Report length: The main text of each case study report should not exceed 20 pages, plus Annexes, plus an Executive Summary of no more than 4 pages with fully cross-referenced findings and recommendations.

Report structure: Each case study report will be structured as follows:

- 1) **Executive Summary:** a tightly drafted, to the point, free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should be short, no more than four pages. It should focus mainly on the key purpose or issues of the review, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text that follows.

- 2) **Introduction:** this should describe the project to be reviewed and the case study objectives and review questions.
- 3) **Body of the report:** The report should contain a clear narrative relating to the main themes and learning questions specified for the case studies (outlined above under stage 2). This should be substantiated by reference to the sources of evidence used.
- 4) **Main lessons and recommendations:** These should be the subject of a separate final chapter. Lessons should relate to the theme areas but also to other areas of significant learning which are relevant for policy and practice. Recommendations should be realistic, taking into account the circumstances in the context of the project, and the resources available. They could concern policy, organisational and operational aspects.
- 5) **Annexes:** Each review report will include the following annexes:
 - The names of the case study authors and their host organisations (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person);
 - Map(s) of project implementation area;
 - Calendar of visit and list of persons/organisations consulted;
 - Literature and documentation consulted;
 - Other annexes as required, but kept to a minimum.
 - Received comments on the draft case study report.

The draft case study reports should be sent for comments to the relevant CGIAR centres by each team of reviewers. The reviewers will be responsible for addressing the CGIAR centres comments on the draft report as appropriate. The responses of the CGIAR centres should be attached to the reports as an annex.

4) Case study synthesis brief

The case study synthesis will be a brief report of 6-10 pages summarising the findings across the case studies, highlighting cross-cutting lessons, recommendations, and outstanding issues.

5) KM products

A suite of knowledge products will be developed, including a readily digestible brief (approx. four pages) covering the whole review process, highlighting results achieved, and key lessons learnt in providing guidance for future activities (for policy makers and development practitioners) on maximising getting research into use, and increasing development impact.

Additionally, there will be a 4-page brief covering each of the four selected case studies to provide key results achieved (including from the farmer perspective), lessons learned (from project design to results), scaling up potential, and guidelines/advice to development practitioners on how to use the results. This could include the development of practical decision

support and planning tools (to be decided and designed in consultation with IFAD and EC DG INTPA). These will be accompanied by shorter ‘snapshot’ briefs (two pages).

The suite will also contain an overview 2-minute video covering the evaluation and key lessons learnt. Upon request by IFAD and/or EC DG INTPA, similar short videos can be developed for each of the case studies, with additional costs depending on the video product it is agreed to produce (see [here](#) and [here](#) for an example of the use of animation at a cost of approximately 38k euro and 5k euro respectively). Videos will be hyperlinked to the web-based briefs.

The knowledge products will be both paper and web based (electronic). The electronic knowledge products will be widely disseminated i.e. published on websites of IFAD and CGIAR organisations. They will also be shared through social media, and where possible linked to international ‘awareness days’ e.g. World Food Day, International Day of Awareness on Food Loss and Waste Reduction, International Day of Rural Women, etc, in order to reach a wider audience.

In addition, a sharing event will be organised for IFAD and partner organisations as well as other interested parties. The event could take a “hybrid” form. The event would include presentations, discussions, a Q&A session, etc.

5. Proposed expert roles, responsibilities, and profiles

Title	Role and responsibilities	Profile indication
Team leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for oversight of the methodology of the desk analysis of projects and the selection and implementation of case studies. • Lead further refinement of analysis framework for the portfolio analysis and case studies. • Provide methodological support and advice to portfolio analysis team and case study experts. • Review the draft and final reports of the case study teams. • Synthesise the findings of the case studies and recommendations for EC into the case studies synthesis brief and KM products • Liaise with project coordinator in the administration and management of the above tasks. • Responsible for Agrinatura knowledge management; e.g. ensuring inclusion of Agrinatura institutes’ prior ARD experience, lessons learnt, expertise etc in the review (particularly in recommendations) • Oversee the delivery of all stages of the review and guarantee quality management • Ensure timeliness of deliverables • Problem identification, progress chasing and problem solving as required • With project coordinator: select CVs of other team members for validation by EC and IFAD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior researcher with extensive experience (at least 10 years) in agricultural development project evaluation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Knowledge of impact evaluation ○ Experienced in analysing impact pathways ○ Understanding of ROM evaluation criteria and their application • Experienced in the management, coordination and implementation of agricultural development projects, including field experience • A generalist who, by training or experience, has developed in-depth knowledge and understanding of the multi-disciplinarity of complex societal development related research • Good knowledge of the CGIAR system • Experience with reviewing CGIAR research programmes • Ability to synthesise research outputs by team members and summarise lessons and recommendations relevant to policy makers, donors, and CGIAR centres • Strong communicator

Project coordinator and administrator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for planning and coordinating the review • First point of communication with EC and IFAD • Coordinate call for expression of interests and CV's of Agrinatura review team • With Scientific team leader: responsible for selection of CVs of other team members for validation by EC and IFAD • Organise briefing and debriefing sessions • Responsible for budget management • Responsible for contract management • Keep oversight of the implementation schedule • Oversee timely travel arrangements by team members • Responsible for financial reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong coordination and communication skills (essential) • Understanding of development project implementation and evaluation (desired)
Knowledge Management and Communications specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare a short KM action plan and lead and guide the development of knowledge management products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to synthesise research outputs by team members and summarise lessons and recommendations relevant to policy makers, donors, and CGIAR centres as well as other interested audiences. • Able to package content in various formats to suit various audiences • Able to identify best methods of disseminating knowledge products and information obtained from the review.

Stage 1: Desk review		
Title	Role and responsibilities	Profile
Team leader (will also lead desk review)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead desk study stage of the review • Finalise specified research questions related to application of ROM evaluation criteria (impact, sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency) • Coordinate coherent approach of desk review by all researchers involved • Lead development, and ensure timely delivery of desk study review report • Consolidate main outcomes and findings to feed into final review report • Support development of proposal for field research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior researcher with experience in development project/programme evaluation using ROM evaluation criteria -(at least 8 years of experience -indicative) • Good coordination and communication skills • Ability to synthesise findings in concise report
Desk review researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out a desk review including literature relevant to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 13 funded projects under the “Putting Research Into Use for Sustainable Agriculture and Resilience” programme (see annex 3) • Apply ROM evaluation criteria (impact, sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency) • Ensure timely development of concise desk review report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers with experience in project/programme evaluation using ROM evaluation criteria • Background in one or several fields of the activities to be reviewed (at least 5-6years’ experience -indicative) • Experience in research for development project implementation • Ability to synthesise findings in concise report • Good knowledge of the CGIAR system is desirable

Stage 2: Case studies		
Title	Role and responsibilities	Profile ⁹
Case study expert 1 (team leader)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead one of four selected case studies • Finalise desk review of literature related to case study; thereby applying ROM evaluation criteria (impact, sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency) • Lead preparation and implementation of field mission • Follow methodological approach and research questions for field case study focussed on the analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research into use (incl innovation uptake and scaling-up) ○ Impact pathways from an economic, environmental, social, and public policy perspective ○ Partnerships ○ CGIAR M&E system(s) • Ensure timely delivery of draft and final report • Responsible for quality of case study report • Contribution to the case study synthesis brief 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant experience in the implementation of agricultural development projects, including field experience in low-income countries (essential) (8-10 years of experience -indicative) • Experience in development project (impact) evaluation, incl. understanding impact pathways • Experienced in the evaluation of agricultural research projects in low- /middle-income countries • Good understanding of links between research outputs and outcomes, and development outcomes • Experience with the CGIAR system (desirable)
Case study expert 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement, with case study team leader, one of four selected case studies • Follow methodological approach and research questions for field case study focussed on the analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research into use ○ Impact pathways from an economic, environmental, social, and public policy perspective ○ Partnerships ○ CGIAR M&E system(s) • Contribute to timely delivery of high quality draft and final report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background in the (technical) field of the project to be analysed (5-8 years of experience -indicative) • Good technical knowledge and understanding of the selected case studies (to be announced in September) • Experienced in development project evaluation • Experienced in analysing ‘Research into use’ within the field of the selected case study • (Field) experience in the implementation of agricultural development projects is desirable.

⁹ Note: the requirements apply to the team of two experts. The division between the two experts is indicative. The exact distribution of experience, knowledge and skills will depend on proposed team composition.

6. Proposed timeframe

Date	Activity	Responsible
June 2022	Selection of scientific team leader by Agrinatura EEIG to be validated by EC-IFAD	Agrinatura EEIG, plus IFAD-EC
July 2022	Inform relevant CGIAR Centres about the review	IFAD
August 2022	Complete and sign contract	IFAD, Agrinatura EEIG
August/September 2022	Selection of desk study team by Agrinatura EEIG to be validated by EC-IFAD	Agrinatura EEIG, plus IFAD-EC
5-16 September 2022	Refinement of desk study analysis framework	Agrinatura EEIG
Week c/w 19 September 2022	Start desk review	Agrinatura EEIG
21 October 2022	Submission proposal selected case studies for field work	Agrinatura EEIG
Week c/w 31 October	Selection of case study teams by Agrinatura EEIG to be validated by EC-IFAD	Agrinatura EEIG
Week c/w 14 November 2022	Case study briefing meeting Brussels/Rome	EC/IFAD/Agrinatura EEIG
21 November – 24 February 2023	Field mission window. Anticipated 3 week mission per case study	Agrinatura EEIG
15 December 2022	Submission draft report desk review	Agrinatura EEIG
27 January 2023	Submission final report desk review	
3 March 2023	Submission draft case study reports to CGIAR centres / Alliances for comments	Agrinatura EEIG
Week c/w 20 March 2023	Draft final case study reports to EC-IFAD	Agrinatura EEIG
Week c/w 3 April 2023	Debriefing meeting	EC/IFAD/Agrinatura EEIG
21 April 2023	Deadline final report and knowledge products	Agrinatura EEIG

ANNEX 2

DCI-FOOD/2015/360-968 Putting Research into Use for Sustainable Agriculture and Resilience (PRUNSAR): Support to International Agricultural Research for Development - CGIAR Component”.

Description of the action.



8-1-2018_Annex 1.pdf

ANNEX 3

	Projects	Organization and mandate
	Ongoing or recently completed (covered in this report)	
1	Food Resilience Through Root and Tuber Crops in Upland and Coastal Communities of the Asia-Pacific	CIP: The International Potato Centre (CIP) was founded in 1971 as a research-for-development (R4D) organization with a focus on potato, sweet potato and Andean roots and tubers. It delivers innovative science-based solutions to enhance access to affordable nutritious food, foster inclusive sustainable business and employment growth, and drive the climate resilience of root and tuber agrifood systems. Headquartered in Lima, Peru, the CIP has a research presence in more than 20 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.
2	Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) linking agrobiodiversity value chains and climate adaptation empowering the poor to manage risk	Bioversity International: Bioversity International operated as the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute up to 2006, and its mandate is to advance the conservation and use of genetic diversity for the well-being of present and future generations. In 2019, it formed an alliance with the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT).
3	Managing aquatic agricultural systems to improve nutrition and livelihoods	WorldFish: The WorldFish mission is to strengthen livelihoods and enhance food and nutrition security by improving fisheries and aquaculture. It pursues this through research partnerships focused on helping those who stand to benefit the most: poor producers and consumers, women and children.
4	Building livelihoods and resilience to climate change in East and West Africa: AR4D for large-scale implementation of Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA)	CIAT: The International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) works in collaboration with hundreds of partners to help developing countries make farming more competitive, profitable and resilient through smarter, more sustainable natural resource management. In 2019, it formed an alliance with Bioversity.
5	Epidemiology and control of peste des petits ruminants in Eastern and Western Africa	ILRI: The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) works for better lives through livestock in developing countries. ILRI is co-hosted by Kenya and Ethiopia, has 14 offices across Asia and Africa, employs some 700 staff and has an annual operating budget of about US\$80 million.
6	Sustainable and diversified rice-based farming systems	AfricaRice: The Africa Rice Center (AfricaRice) is a pan-African centre of excellence for rice research, development and capacity-building. It contributes to reducing poverty, achieving food and nutrition security and improving livelihoods of farmers and other rice value chain actors in Africa by increasing the productivity and profitability of rice-based agrifood systems while ensuring the sustainability of natural resources.
	Completed and closed	
7	Restoration of Degraded Lands for Food Security and Poverty Reduction in East Africa and the Sahel: taking successes in land restoration to scale	ICRAF: World Agroforestry (ICRAF) is a centre of science and development excellence that harnesses the benefits of trees for people and the environment. In 2019, ICRAF formed an alliance with the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).
8	Food and Fodder Trees for Diversifying Diets and Livelihoods in Eastern and Southern Africa	

	Projects	Organization and mandate
9	Improved productivity through crop-livestock interventions in Eastern DRC and Burundi	ILRI: The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) works for better lives through livestock in developing countries. ILRI is co-hosted by Kenya and Ethiopia, has 14 offices across Asia and Africa, employs some 700 staff and has an annual operating budget of about US\$80 million.
10	Improving the technical foundations of sustainable aquaculture	WorldFish: The WorldFish mission is to strengthen livelihoods and enhance food and nutrition security by improving fisheries and aquaculture. It pursues this through research partnerships focused on helping those who stand to benefit the most: poor producers and consumers, women and children.
11	Africa to Asia: testing adaptation in Flood-Based Resource Management	IWMI: The International Water Management Institute (IWMI) is an R4D organization with offices in 13 countries and a global network of scientists operating in more than 30 countries. The IWMI's mission is to provide water solutions for sustainable, climate-resilient development.
12	Improved crop management and strengthened seed system for drought-prone areas of South Asia	IRRI: The International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) is dedicated to abolishing poverty and hunger among people and populations that depend on rice-based agrifood systems. It aims to improve the health and welfare of rice farmers and consumers, promote environmental sustainability in a world challenged by climate change, and support the empowerment of women and the youth in the rice industry.
13	South-South knowledge transfer strategies for scaling up pro-poor bamboo livelihoods, income generation and employment creation, and environmental management in Africa	INBAR: The International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR) is an intergovernmental development organization that promotes environmentally sustainable development using bamboo and rattan. It has 47 Member States.

ANNEX 4

Desk review framework applied at review 2017-2018

(standard to which output will be delivered, please refer to p 5-8 for the criteria that are relevant for this review)



Assessment criteria -
desk study_2017-2018