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Qo4RD was developed in 2017, adopted in 2018, and revised in 2020. The Framework was designed to help:

- Developing research strategies and programs
- Establishing a new research portfolio
- Monitoring and evaluation systems
- Designing performance management standards

4 key elements of the QoR4D Framework are the starting point for the operationalization process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Credibility</td>
<td>Effectiveness (Fit for Use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Framework has been operationalized in assessing major new programs of research (Initiatives) in CGIAR and has also been utilized in evaluation of past and ongoing research.
## QoR4D in the CGIAR Context

### Key Elements

1. **Relevance**
   Importance, significance, and usefulness of the research objectives, processes, and findings

2. **Scientific Credibility**
   Research findings be robust and that sources of knowledge be dependable and sound

3. **Legitimacy**
   The research process is fair and ethical and perceived as such

4. **Effectiveness (Positioning for Use)**
   Research generates knowledge, products, and services that lead to innovations and provide solutions
QoR4D: Relevance

Relevance refers to the importance, significance and usefulness of the research objectives, processes and findings to the problem context and to society, associated with CGIAR’s comparative advantage to address the problems.
QoR4D: Effectiveness

**Effectiveness (Positioned for Use)** means that research generates knowledge, products and services with high potential to address a problem and contribute to innovations and solutions. It implies that research is designed, implemented and positioned for use within a dynamic theory of change, with appropriate leadership, capacity development, diversity of research skills and support to the enabling environment to translate knowledge to use and to help generate desired outcomes.

To achieve target outcomes, the research requires a clear path to impact in one or more of the Five CGIAR Impact Areas, regardless of where it sits across the spectrum from fundamental to applied research.
Institutional acceptance of the QoR4D – Science Leaders’ perceptions

Should the QoR4D framework be part of the One CGIAR Agenda?

88% Yes

12% No
Science Leaders’ perceptions of the QoR4D

Which of the four elements has been the easiest to mainstream into your planning and management practice?

- Relevance, 42%
- Scientific Credibility, 23%
- Effectiveness, 8%
- Legitimacy, 8%
- Not applicable, 19%
Operationalising elements of the QoR4D for Evaluation (CRP 2020 evaluations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors per Document</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents per Author</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-authored documents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors of multi-authored documents</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>4663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors of single-authored documents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Appearances</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>6900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>4672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author’s Keywords (DE)</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>2386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keywords Plus (ID)</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>2635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average citations per year per doc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average citations per documents</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years from publication</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources (Journals, Books, etc)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP Annual Reports</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scientific Credibility:** currently very high. Future scientific credibility at risk (funding complexity)

**Scientific Legitimacy**, good, but with some disbalance and potential tension noted
Effectiveness: What outputs and outcomes have been achieved and what is the importance of identified results?

What outputs and outcomes have been achieved and what is the importance of identified results?

- Milestones: Accomplishment Ranges from 50–90%
- Delivering measurable contributions to the Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs)
- Slight challenges related to funding structure hamper effectiveness
- Well-managed with timely reporting

Examples of delivered Sub-IDOs:

- Closed yield gaps through improved agronomic and animal husbandry practices
- Conducive agricultural policy environment
- Enhanced genetic gain
- Increase capacity of beneficiaries to adopt research outputs
- Increased resilience of agro-ecosystems and communities, especially those including smallholders
Effectiveness: Innovations

Digital & Tech-Driven (PIM, CCAFs)
Weather & Climate Information system (CCAFS) and a Digital platform for video-based agricultural extension in Ethiopia (PIM)

Management, Frameworks and Systems Strengthening (LIVESTOCK, FISH, RICE A4NH, PIM)
In detail, Woreda/district participatory land-use planning for pastoral areas in Ethiopia (LIVESTOCK); Community Fish Guards (CFGs) enhanced compliance in coastal biodiversity conservation in Bangladesh (FISH); involving private sector to improve multiplication and marketing of high-quality seed (A4NH)

Genetics, Breeding & Improved Varieties (MAIZE, A4HN, RICE, WHEAT, RTB)
In detail, stress-tolerant varieties & hybrid seeds (MAIZE); elite winter-wheat lines (WHEAT); Development & dissemination of improved varieties (RICE) Ten Iron-bean varieties as well as Aflasafe (A4NH)
Effectiveness

**Partnerships**
- Diverse partnership and collaboration modalities increase effectiveness and added value, expanded research scope
- Subject to volatility

**Governance and Management**
- Missing coherent program designs due to systemic CGIAR constraints
- Helped translate research into impact
- Role of Independent Steering Committee (ISC) perceived as positive, demonstrable effectiveness in its governance role and supportive ISC advisory function

**Theory of Change**
- Useful for planning, regularly reviewed, but not used for management
- Requirement for obtaining W1/W2 funding
Operationalising the QoR4D for Proposal Assessment

- Developing criteria that adequately address all four elements
- Ensure anticipated outcomes and impacts are well captured in criteria, even at the ex-ante stage
- Criteria should align well with the Proposal template and be “fit for purpose”
- Developing a scoring system that can adequately separate proposals
- Criteria should link closely to criteria used for later evaluation of projects
Criteria for proposal assessment

1. Defined research problem
2. Demand driven initiative
3. Measurable with milestones
4. Theory of change
5. Feasible, innovative & rigorous
6. Analysis of tradeoffs & impacts
7. Lead to transformative change
8. Ethics
9. Gender, diversity & inclusion
10. Risk framework
11. Capacity statements
12. Capacity development
13. Project management
14. Transparent costing
15. Research products
16. M & E
17. Impact assessment plan

Credibility
Relevance
Effectiveness
Legitimacy

Esdhborn Principles
Partnerships
QoR4D used to review 33 Initiative Proposals with a total investment of US $1,339 M*

* 3-year target funding in US $ millions

→ Target funding for the CGIAR portfolio for the 2022–24 business cycle, in line with the funding envelope presented within the approved Investment Prospectus.

ISDC Members: 9
Subject Matter Experts (SMEs): 56
Total Reviewers: 65

Female: 43%
Male: 57%
Lessons learnt across the Portfolio

Credibility

• Stronger emphasis on development outcomes and pathways to impact in proposal design led to less attentiveness to some of the underpinning best practice in presenting scientific research. Future Initiative proposal processes should put more emphasis on identifying knowledge gaps that inhibit development followed by the research questions and their underlying hypotheses.
Lessons learnt across the Portfolio

Relevance

• Extensive consultation using codesign approaches resulted in a dynamic portfolio that resonates with funders, implementers, & beneficiaries
• Difficult to determine depth of partnerships in co-design and leverage
• Need more solid scientific justifications outlining why the research is needed supported by rigorous approach to research questions that align with development needs
Lessons learnt across the Portfolio

Effectiveness

• For the first time in CGIAR’s history the entire research portfolio was built to deliver on one overarching strategy with each Initiative purposefully designed to fill existing knowledge gaps. However, some Initiatives identify divergent drivers and propose contradictory solutions.

• Comparative advantage used inconsistently and not focused on outcomes and potential impacts. Look to apply a rigorous CA framework in the future to demonstrate wise stewardship of scarce investor and partner resources to maximize total impact.
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