Background

The CGIAR Independent Science and Partnership Council's Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) has an advisory role, primarily to CGIAR members through the Fund Council, on issues relating to the impact of CGIAR research activity. In October 2015, SPIA issued a call for expressions of interest for *Documenting adoption of Natural Resource Management (NRM) practices*[1]. This work package sits within a broader SPIA-managed program of *Strengthening Impact Assessment in the CGIAR* (2013 - 2016). More than 60 EoIs were submitted, representing contributions from over 200 researchers from a wide range of institutions around the world. The EoIs were reviewed in November 2015, and invitations to a group of approximately 25 researchers were issued for participation in a workshop in Rome on 16th and 17th December 2015.

The goal with this work package[2] is to demonstrate the viability of systematically tracking and documenting the outcomes from NRM research, using a multiplicity of approaches (e.g. expert opinion focus groups, surveys, frontier technologies[3] of remote sensing or drones) to estimate current levels of adoption a subset of high-priority NRM practices. The goal is to produce a report, for donors and CGIAR stakeholders, that summarises reliable information on NRM research outcomes that have been verified and that can be attributed to the work of the CGIAR.

Objective of the workshop

The central objective of the workshop is to broker credible and feasible collaborations across a number of interested parties that we judge to have a comparative advantage in contributing to this work. A workshop is necessary to help overcome three challenges to effective work in the area of documenting adoption of NRM practices. First, we perceive that there are often **communication** challenges within the CGIAR; between the CGIAR and the wider body of external researchers; and across disciplines which can limit effective collaboration. By bringing together interested individuals with good ideas (demonstrated in their EoIs) we can contribute to a better collective understanding of the potential for collaboration. The second challenge is one of **coordination**. The ISPC, as an independent scientific advisory body for the CGIAR, is able to help coordinate the collection of data in ways that individual centers or CRPs may not be in a position to do. The third challenge is that of finding the **optimal level of independence**. On the one hand, institutions that are completely independent of the CGIAR may not have the specialist skills, networks and experience that CGIAR researchers bring to the table for our priority NRM practices. On the other hand, a degree of independence from the competitive pressures within the CGIAR that may result in adoption estimates being biased upwards (e.g. through the selection of sites for sampling), is a healthy thing.

Expected outputs

1. Agreement on an overall plan for funding new data collection efforts that meet these challenges using the most appropriate mix of methods feasible for the timeframe (Jan 2016 – June 2017).
2. A small number of focal points will be appointed, to liaise with SPIA over the following two months (mid-Dec to mid-Feb 2016) to develop implementation plans and contracts for funding to carry out the work.

---

[1] Access the documents relating to the call for EoIs at http://impact.cgiar.org/outcomes/natural-resource-management
[2] SIAC Activity 2.2. More information on specific objectives and activities can be found on http://impact.cgiar.org.
[3] Refer to SIAC Activity 1.2 for MSU-led SPIA effort to test innovative approaches. http://impact.cgiar.org/methods/nrm-technologies

Agenda – Ethiopia Room (Building C, 2nd Floor, Room 285)

DAY 1 – Weds 16th Dec		
08:30	Registration	Collect passes from reception at FAO
09:00	**1. Welcome / Introductions** **SPIA presentation on expectations**	**Tim Kelley** **James Stevenson** and **Nuri Niyazi**
09:30	**2. Six priority NRM practices:** What are they? What do we know about their adoption? How observable are they?	**Jenny Lovell:** AWD **Mike Jacobson:** Agroforestry **Rachid Serraj:** CA **Sander Muilerman:** Cocoa ICPM **Kizito Mavzimavi:** Micro-dosing **Rachid Laajaj:** ISFM
10:45	Coffee	
11:00	**3. Surveys:** What data do we already have in the pipeline? What can we build on? What are the problems with relying on survey data?	**Aslihan Arslan:** Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique **Stein Holden:** Malawi **Alberto Zezza:** LSMS-ISA countries **Rosina Wanyama and Anil Bhargava:** Kenya **Benard Ngwene:** Kenya, Rwanda **Sarah Mine:** Can farmers provide reliable data on their own practices? *Information sharing from across the group on all other relevant surveys that are already planned*
12:45	Lunch	
14:00	**4. Remote sensing:** What can it do for us? What can it not do?	**Benjamin Koetz:** Sentinel-2 satellite and applying earth observation to agricultural monitoring **Tor-Gunnar Vagen:** Detecting agroforestry adoption **Parvesh Kumar Chandna:** Detecting AWD adoption **Kai Sonder:** Detecting conservation agriculture adoption *Respondent:* *Erik Lindquist*
16:00	Coffee	
16:20	**5. Drones, cell phones and other measurement innovations:** What are the barriers to their use for measuring NRM adoption?	**Cesar Arango**: Drones for measuring AWD adoption **James Stevenson** (for Frederic Kosmowski): Drones for measuring crop residue retention on soils **Andre Butler**: Pros and cons of cell phone-based surveys
18:00	**Reception:** 8th Floor, Indonesia Room	
DAY 2 – Thurs 17th Dec		
08:30	**6. Re-cap and overnight eureka moments**	
09:00	**7. Expert opinion estimates:** Soliciting estimates on adoption using focus groups with "experts" - SPIA experience to date	**Lakshmi Krishnan**
09:30	**8. Geo-referencing the data**	**Melanie Bacou** and **Tim Johnson**
10:30	**9. Plenary discussion about group work expectations**	
10:45	Coffee	
11:00	**10. Small groups in breakout rooms** (inc. lunch 12:30 – 13:30 8th floor, Indonesia Room)	*We will assign you to one of the following 5 small groups:* *1) Agroforestry; 2) CA Africa; 3) CA Rest of the World; 4) AWD; 5) Micro-dosing, ISFM and ICPM*
14:30	**11. Groups present back to plenary and discussion on next steps** (inc. coffee at 15:30)	
17:00	**CLOSE**	

Participants

Confirmed			
Arango	Cesar	Univ Los Andes	cesarangomez@gmail.com
Arslan	Aslihan	FAO	Aslihan.Arslan@fao.org
Azzari	Carlo	IFPRI	c.azzarri@cgiar.org
Bacou	Melanie	IFPRI	mel@mbacou.com
Bhargava	Anil	Michigan	anilbhar@umich.edu
Binam	Joachim	ICRAF	J.Binam@cgiar.org
Brück	Tilman	IGZ	brueck@igzev.de
Butler	Andre	IFMR	andre.butler@ifmr.ac.in
Cavatassi	Romina	FAO	Romina.Cavatassi@fao.org
Elven	Sarah	SPIA	Sarah.Elven@fao.org
Holden	Stein	NULS	stein.holden@nmbu.no
Hughes	Karl	ICRAF	k.hughes@cgiar.org
Jacobson	Michael	Penn State	mgj222@gmail.com
Johnson	Tim	IFPRI	Timothy.Johnson@cgiar.org
Karimov	Aziz	CIMMYT	az.karimov@cgiar.org
Kelley	Tim	ISPC	timothy.kelley@fao.org
Koetz	Benjamin	European Space Agency	Benjamin.koetz@esa.int
Krishnan	Lakshmi	ISPC	Lakshmi.Krishnan@fao.org
Kumar Chandna	Parvesh	IRRI	p.k.chandna@cgiar.org
Laajaj	Rachid	Univ Los Andes	rlaajaj@gmail.com
Lindquist	Erik	FAO	erik.lindquist@fao.org
Lovell	Jenny	UCSC	greencollarjenny@gmail.com
Mavzimavi	Kizito	ICRISAT	K.Mazvimavi@cgiar.org
Mine	Sarah	Datu	smine@daturesearch.com
Muilerman	Sander	IITA	s.muilerman@cgiar.org
Mutenje	Munyaradzi	CIMMYT	m.mutenje@cgiar.org
Nguyen Ngoc	Thuy	Nong Lam University	nnthuy@hcmuaf.edu.vn
Ngwene	Benard	IGZ	Ngwene@igzev.de
Niyazi	Nuri	ISPC	Nuri.Niyazi@fao.org
Nkonya	Ephraim	IFPRI	e.nkonya@cgiar.org
Paolantonio	Adriana	FAO	Adriana.paolantonio@fao.org
Rejesus	Rod	NCSU	rod.rejesus@gmail.com
Serraj	Rachid	ISPC	Rachid.Serraj@fao.org
Sonder	Kai	CIMMYT	K.Sonder@cgiar.org
Stevenson	James	ISPC	James.Stevenson@fao.org
Vagen	Tor-Gunnar	ICRAF	tvagen@gmail.com
Vater	Ira	ISPC	ira.vater@fao.org
Vlek	Paul	Independent	p.vlek@cgiar.org
Wanyama	Rosina	Tegemeo	rwanyama@tegemeo.org
Zezza	Alberto	World Bank LSMS-ISA	azezza@worldbank.org