

Website



Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council

Assessing the impact of CGIAR research

HOW WE WORK ▾ | PUBLICATIONS ▾ | COMMUNITY ▾ | ABOUT ▾ | HOME



LATEST NEWS

Open positions at CGIAR Centers

CIAT, CIMMYT, and CIP are looking for socio-economists and M&E specialists. More information on the [Grants and other Announcements](#) page.

Workshop on poverty impacts of CGIAR research

[Poverty studies](#) authors, and experts will come together in July 2014 to reflect on methodological challenges in measuring poverty impacts of CGIAR research. More information on the [Events](#) page.

CGIAR IMPACT BLOG

22

Jul 2014

Drones to monitor and map adoption outcomes?

by Frédéric Kosmowski, SPIA Research Associate

...
[Read more](#)

[Database of impact evaluations](#)



WHERE IS THE EVIDENCE?

ex post Impact Assessments (*ex post* IAs) of research activities of the CGIAR mapped geographically, with filters for System Level Outcomes (SLOs) and types of research activities. [View the map](#)



[DEFUSION AND IMPACTS OF](#)



Donor demands

IAFP meeting, Minneapolis

25 July 2014



CGIAR

Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council

Donor demands survey - 2005 round

Objectives

1. Donors' needs vis-a-vis impact information from the CGIAR
2. Preferences for types of impact metrics and assessment methods
3. How epIA results inform donor decisions

Main findings

- Many factors influence donor decisions, e.g., political priorities, continuity in funding, perceptions of scientific quality); epIAs important for maintaining confidence in the CG System and defending overall CG budget (conceptual vs instrumental use).
- Desire for: greater clarity and transparency in epIA studies; broader coverage in research domains, e.g., beyond CGI; and, greater focus on mission level impacts and magnitude and distribution of benefits.
- Some skepticism about the accuracy of some past economic returns based studies.

2014 Donor demands survey

Repeat of 2005, baseline for SIAC 2013-2016

Objectives

- How and whether use of *ex post* IAs has changed/evolved over time
- Current perception of CGIAR *ex post* IAs
- Are (and how) some of these changes in use and perception related to actions on the issues identified in 2005 (e.g. publications, DIIVA, etc.)
- Additional actions required, particularly as it feeds into SPIA strategy

2014 Donor demands survey

Target respondents and process

- 36 donors to the CGIAR, 7 bilateral donors
- 13 fully completed responses, 3 partially completed
- Includes Belgium, BMGF, Canada, EU, France, Germany, IFAD, Norway, Switzerland, US, World Bank
- More of a qualitative analysis, with follow-up personal interviews

2014 Donor demands survey

Key findings

Key IA objective: donor priority has not changed over time. Want demonstration of whether and by how much research outputs contribute to development goals; assign credible benefit values to the impacts of research & compare to cost of investment

Donors using epIAs: help justify continuity of funding to CGIAR (by assigning credible benefit...)

Factors and information sources influencing funding decisions: Weak signal that epIAs done by Centers are not valued as much as SPIA commissioned/managed studies. Intend to probe why



2014 Donor demands survey

Key findings



SLO-related IDOs of most relevance: Increased crop, livestock, and fish productivity; improved dietary intake; increased carbon sequestration; decreased degradation of soil, water, and air. Some key donors to the system did rate last 2 “L”.

Information overload? A lot of information coming out of the system. What’s most relevant for them to read? E.g. some donors unaware of DIIVA. On the other hand, some work gets picked up consistently (Lancet nutrition series mentioned by 3 donors).

Questions? Ideas?

