



Inception Report

Evaluation of Results-Based Management in CGIAR

June 2017

Evaluation Team

Robert Vandenberg
Seerp Wigboldus

This evaluation has been commissioned by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR.

The Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR encourages fair use of this material provided proper citation is made.

Correct citation: CGIAR - IEA (2017): Evaluation of Results-Based Management (RBM) in CGIAR – Inception Report. Rome, Italy: Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR

<http://iea.cgiar.org/>

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	3
1. Introduction.....	4
1.1 Origins, purpose and users of the evaluation	4
1.2 Evaluation Purpose and Stakeholders.....	4
1.3 Purpose of the Inception Report.....	5
2. Background.....	6
2.1 External Organization Review	6
2.2 Notable Milestones to Date in Implementation of RBM	7
2.3 Piloting RBM in Selected CRPs	8
3. Evaluation Scope and Questions	9
3.1 Focus and Scope.....	9
3.2 Evaluation Criteria Used to Structure the Inquiry.....	9
4. Evaluation approach and methods.....	12
4.1 Evaluation approach	12
4.2 Evaluation methods	12
4.3 Evaluation Challenges and Mitigation Strategies.....	16
5. Organization and timing	17
5.1 Roles and responsibilities.....	17
5.2 Quality Assurance.....	18
5.3 Workplan and Timeline	18
5.4 Evaluation Deliverables.....	19
5.5 Dissemination Plans	19
 Annexes	
Annex A: Principles of Good RBM Practice	20
Annex B: Document Review References	22
Annex C: Evaluation Matrix	23
Annex D: Evaluation Team Profiles	28
Annex E: Work Plan.....	29
Annex F: Timeline of RBM related events.....	31

Abbreviations

CRP	CGIAR Research Program
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
IDO	Intermediate development outcome
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IEA	Independent Evaluation Arrangement (Rome)
ILAC	International Learning and Change (CGIAR initiative)
ISPC	Independent Science and Partnership Council
KII	Key Informant Interview
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
RBM	Results-Based Management
RG	Evaluation Resource Group
SRF	Strategy and Results Framework (CGIAR)
SLO	System-Level Outcome (CGIAR)
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

1.1 Origins, purpose and users of the evaluation

CGIAR is a global agricultural research partnership that implements research through a network of 15 research Centers and their partners. The 2016-2030 CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF)¹ guides the CGIAR research agenda through the CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs). The CRPs started their operations in 2010-12. The second phase of programs (Phase II) was launched in December 2015 with release of a guidance note² and programming began in January 2017.

The CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) is responsible for System-level external evaluations of CGIAR. In the first four years of IEA's operation, evaluations of all 15 CRPs were completed. Drawing on the results of these evaluations, IEA is in 2017 organizing evaluations and reviews that will contribute to an evaluation of the System as a whole planned for 2018. The evaluation of Results-Based Management (RBM) in CGIAR is one of these³.

1.2 Evaluation Purpose and Stakeholders

RBM is new in CGIAR and represents a major shift in its research management. The primary purpose of this evaluation is to learn lessons from the recent experience of CGIAR in introducing and implementing different aspects of RBM, including orientation towards outcomes. The evaluation will provide evaluative evidence and lessons as an input to implementing an RBM framework during Phase II of the CRPs. It will explore the main drivers, and approaches⁴ in moving towards RBM, the constraints that have been experienced or perceived, and what has been achieved so far in conceiving and implementing aspects of RBM in CGIAR's research context. The evaluation will formulate recommendations to CRPs and their respective research Centers, and to the System governing bodies for increasing the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness for further iterations of RBM.

The main stakeholders of the evaluation will be:

- **CGIAR System Council** - for decision making on strategic direction and fund allocation;
- **CGIAR System Management Board and Office** - for guidance to CRPs when developing the RBM framework in the current year and beyond, and stewardship on accountability and strategic decision making on RBM at the System level;
- **CRP and Center management and staff** - for lessons learned to increase the effectiveness of and incentives deriving from RBM;
- **CGIAR Center's Boards and CRP oversight bodies** - for lessons learned for oversight on RBM;
- **CGIAR research partners** - for lessons learned for accommodating RBM in partnerships; and
- **Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC)** - for lessons learned regarding strategic issues on RBM at CRP and System level.

¹ CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016-2030

² 2017-2011 CGIAR Research Program Portfolio (CRP2) – Final Guidance for Full Proposals, December 19, 2015

³ The IEA's evaluation schedule is presented at its Website <http://iea.cgiar.org/evaluations/> where reports of completed evaluations can be found.

⁴ During Inception Phase consultations, it became clear that not all stakeholder groups (donors, research Centers, CGIAR System managers, CRP staff, etc.) have the same understanding, or level of commitment, to RBM. In other words, there is no single RBM "approach" but rather a number of discernable adaptations and efforts and trends.

1.3 Purpose of the Inception Report

The purpose of the Inception Report is to provide an agreed, appropriate and clear evaluation design building on the approved evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)⁵. The Inception Report is a road-map for the conduct of the evaluation, for guiding the evaluation team, for informing the evaluation stakeholders, and for helping to assure evaluation quality.

⁵ The ToR can be found under the following link: http://iea.cgiar.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/IEA-RBM-TOR-Final_17May2017.pdf

2. Background

2.1 External Organization Review

By mid-2000s, CGIAR funding had become precarious. Donors were demanding more consistent results-orientation, and coherent performance management across all funded research programs. In 2008, an independent external review of CGIAR emphasized that in keeping with universally accepted standards for good governance, CGIAR needed to adopt results-based management (RBM) among other essential changes. As articulated in the 2008 review documentation⁶, an RBM approach was expected to help CGIAR and its member Centers do the following:

1. signal priorities using a System-wide overarching strategy and results framework and encourage greater research alignment;
2. measure performance of outcome achievement using a limited number of key indicators and time bound targets;
3. use ongoing monitoring and periodic evaluation to collect credible performance information and inform results-based reporting;
4. further develop information systems to support performance management needs and underpin aggregation of indicator-specific data for higher-level results;
5. assure that management decisions are evidence-based and aligned with long-term strategic objectives;
6. strive for continuous performance improvement in delivering research products that are policy and program ready for use by others;
7. support decentralized authority and adaptive management (organizational culture that encourages learning, risk-tolerance, innovative, and flexibility);
8. achieve predictable, stable funding, and funding growth in areas determined to be of highest priority;
9. support harmonized administrative processes to reduce transaction costs; and
10. motivate staff and attract partners.

Following that external review, as part of a comprehensive organization reform process, RBM was embraced by the CGIAR System. In an aspirational statement of resolve, managing for results was one of the four core reform principles committed to by the CGIAR System in late 2009⁷, and embracing RBM principles became a “flagship initiative” of CGIAR’s top management⁸. As part of this commitment, CGIAR members resolved to share responsibility for managing results, and to collaboratively monitor and evaluate progress in achieving measurable outcomes. Among the essential commitments made were to develop and use the following:

- a common strategy and results framework;
- a harmonized performance monitoring system;
- a common system for reporting performance information, and

⁶ *Bringing together the best of science and the best of development*. Chapter 12, Managing for Results, CGIAR Independent Review of the CGIAR System Technical Report, November 2008

⁷ *Voices of Change*, The new CGIAR, 2009

⁸ From interviews during the inception phase of this evaluation

- results-based performance agreements.

2.2 Notable Milestones to Date in Implementation of RBM

Early notable achievements in introducing RBM across the System and within the CRPs included:

- a) development of an SRF (first SRF was approved in 2011, second in 2015);
- b) introducing theories of change (ToC) to better understand expected impact pathways from outputs to outcomes at intermediate level and to impacts;
- c) defining System objectives and targets at the level of development outcomes;
- d) setting up of an independent evaluation facility, the IEA, and
- e) setting up systems to enable monitoring and reporting on progress towards outcomes.

Development of these elements of an RBM approach has evolved through three cycles of CRP appraisal and approval⁹. The latest iteration of CGIAR's strategic results framework, for the period 2016-2030, was approved in May 2015. It defines the highest system-level goals, the SLOs, and their intermediate development outcomes (IDOs), which were designed to “enable researchers to think through the contexts in which their outputs might contribute to development outcomes”¹⁰. Sub-IDOs represent a third level of outcomes nearest to CRP research results where outcomes are planned for a shorter timeframe.

In preparation for the latest SRF, the CGIAR System Management Office designed an accountability framework for the CRP portfolio to support implementation of RBM¹¹. Targets were set for all levels. The SRF 2016-2030 also identified focus areas that cut across all programs, namely, gender and youth, climate change, capacity development, and policy and institutions.

A results orientation, including defining outcomes and identifying performance targets has shaped the design of monitoring and evaluation systems at CRP level. For the second phase of CRP implementation, all programs were expected to develop their own RBM approach, aligned with guidance provided as part of the CRP call for proposals¹². The guidance calls for CRPs to:

- develop a results framework describing theories of change and impact pathways for the CRP, and in greater detail, for flagship project components;
- describe linkages from delivery of outputs to anticipated outcomes, and the related risks;
- prepare a M&E plan focused on outcomes; and
- detail reporting templates and responsibilities.

The results framework is expected to describe how each CRP conceptualizes CGIAR's approach to RBM, and how each CRP will operationalize RBM in its own context.

Most recently, work in rolling out RBM across all programs has focused on development of an

⁹ Original proposals in 2010-2012, extension proposals for 2015-2016 and the 2nd phase of CRPs in 2016 for 2017-2022.

¹⁰ CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016-2030, Version 18 May 2015, page 21.

¹¹ Ibid. This accountability framework is summarized on pages 35-36.

¹² See Guidance, pg 26-29: http://library.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10947/4127/CGIAR-2ndCall-GuidanceFullProposals_19Dec2015.pdf?sequence=1

integrated performance management system and a set of indicators for regular monitoring and reporting on performance, particularly on results at outcome level.

Senior managers interviewed during the inception phase of this evaluation, considered that the process had been complex and fragmented. They highlighted several challenges for adoption of RBM, including a significant change in funding context. During Phase I the level of core funding (Windows 1 and 2) allocated to the CRPs varied considerably by program, and overall core funding shrunk as proportion of total funding. In Phase II, core funding to CRPs is only about 18 percent and therefore most funding comes to Centers from bilateral sources and is subject to various donor rules. This makes it more difficult for CGIAR to coordinate and manage performance around a single set of research objectives and strategic results.

2.3 Piloting RBM in Selected CRPs

To further encourage and support the RBM approach, in 2014, five CRPs were selected as implementation pilots¹³, and extra costs incurred by these CRPs associated with the piloting were funded. These pilots were selected based on proposals assessed for the quality of their RBM implementation plan and the extent to which outcomes were to be measured. Each CRP piloted RBM in its own way. The CRP RBM pilots, while all different, provide learning and lessons regarding implementation of the RBM approach in a research context. At the time of this evaluation, implementation of 2 of these 5 pilot CRPs has ended. Three remain active. In parallel with the pilots, other CRPs also planned and implemented elements of an RBM approach.

¹³ The five CRPs were: Roots, Tubers and Bananas (RTB); Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CAAFS); Humid Tropics (HT); Global Rice Science Partnership (GRISP); and Aquatic Agriculture Systems (AAS).

3. Evaluation Scope and Questions

3.1 Focus and Scope

This evaluation will focus at System level and at the level of the 15 CRPs to assess experiences on how CGIAR has moved towards an RBM approach, how elements of RBM have been implemented to date, and how CRPs have responded to the request to set up RBM systems in Phase II. While CRPs represent the programmatic approach in CGIAR, the evaluation will also explore how Centers have embraced the RBM approach as they participate in CRPs.

In more depth, the evaluation will assess the experience from the pilot implementation of RBM in CRPs. It will assess the extent to which lessons have been learned and invested as CGIAR proceeds with RBM implementation across its entire program.

The evaluation will focus on the time span from the initiation of RBM in 2009 and the first round of CRPs, until the present, April 2017. Specific aspects of implementing RBM that the evaluation will cover are explained by the evaluation questions and further detailed by the Evaluation Matrix (see Annex C). In summary, the scope of this evaluation includes:

- early system design and adaptation of RBM for CGIAR's unique research context;
- lessons learned from piloting the RBM approach by CRPs and related research Centers;
- management systems that support RBM application; and
- looking forward: refining applications of the RBM approach.

3.2 Evaluation Criteria Used to Structure the Inquiry

This evaluation will focus its assessment on relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. Use of evaluation criteria with recognized definitions is standard evaluation practice. CGIAR has its own evaluation standards issued by the IEA¹⁴. These standards, including their evaluation criteria, were developed for the evaluation of research programs. Because this evaluation assesses a strategic management approach rather than a research program, the evaluation criteria adopted by the IEA - and their definitions - do not fully apply. For use in this evaluation, the definitions of relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness have been adapted from the IEA standards as summarized in Table 1.

¹⁴ CGIAR Standards for Independent External Evaluation, IEA, Jan 2015, Annex 2

Table 1 Definitions of evaluation criteria

Evaluation Criteria for the Evaluation of a Management Approach
<p>Relevance – The extent to which objectives and design of the object being evaluated (the RBM approach as adopted by CGIAR) align with a) current global approaches, policies, and concerns, b) the needs, policies and priorities of intended beneficiary groups within the CGIAR System, and c) the working conditions of CGIAR staff and partners.</p>
<p>Efficiency – The extent to which the RBM approach adopted by CGIAR has supported and improved the efficiency of organizational performance and administrative process within the CGIAR System related to strategic planning and prioritization, proposal selection, resource attraction and allocation, contracting, and supporting partnerships, etc.</p>
<p>Effectiveness – The extent to which the RBM approach adopted by CGIAR is making progress towards its objectives and is expected to achieve them, considering the exploratory nature and risks inherent when introducing new organization-wide operational performance management, policies and guidelines.</p>

Impact and sustainability are evaluation criteria used to assess achievements further along the results change: ultimate impact, and the prospective for long-term society-wide changes to be maintained. They are not appropriate criteria for this evaluation which is assessing a management approach and RBM’s potential to help the CGIAR System be more efficient and effective.

3.2.1 High-Level Issues and Related Evaluation Questions

The high-level issues that the evaluation will address, four related key evaluation questions, and how these issues and questions relate to relevance, efficiency and effectiveness are summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Key evaluation questions

High-Level Issues	Key Evaluation Questions	Related Evaluation Criteria		
		Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness
System design and adaptation of RBM for CGIAR’s unique research context	What were the drivers and objectives of CGIAR’s RBM approach and do they align with a) the needs and priorities of the CGIAR System, b) the working conditions of CGIAR staff and partners; and c) current global approaches and policies?	✓		
Lessons learned from piloting the RBM approach by CRPs	Did the CRP pilots of RBM implementation provide relevant learning for the CRPs themselves and for CGIAR?	✓	✓	✓
Management systems support and enabling environment for RBM application	Did support at System, Center and CRP management levels facilitate successful implementation of RBM?		✓	✓
Refined applications of the RBM approach to support rolling-out across CRP portfolio	Reflecting on the experience of introducing and mainstreaming RBM so far, how can this approach optimally be used to help CGIAR contribute to it’s research mandate and expected system level outcomes			✓

3.2.2 Sub-Questions of Inquiry

Sub-questions to structure the further exploration of the key evaluation questions have been

developed through a consultative process during the inception phase. The questions and sub-questions presented in the terms of reference for this evaluation were first discussed within the evaluation team. The draft Inception Report, including a draft list of questions was then submitted for consideration to five resource persons who are familiar with CGIAR’s work and its RBM efforts. The four key evaluation questions, and the 12 related sub-questions that were subsequently agreed to, are listed below. Note that the evaluation team may adjust these sub-questions further as the evaluation progresses.

1. What were the drivers and objectives of CGIAR’s RBM approach(es) and do they align with a) current global approaches and policies, and b) the needs and priorities of the CGIAR System, and c) the working conditions of CGIAR staff and partners?
 - 1.1. What was the motivation (“the drivers”) to introduce RBM in CGIAR, and do these drivers remain relevant today or have they changed?
 - 1.2. How was the RBM approach(es) conceptualized by the System Organization for the unique research context in which it works?
 - 1.3. Was the purpose for introducing the RBM approach(es), and the operational way in which this was done (e.g. the choice of related processes, frameworks, etc.), part of a shared vision, and shared values, understanding, and efforts among key stakeholders?
 - 1.4. Has RBM been adequately adapted for CGIAR’s unique type of business (support of research), and aligned with the needs and priorities of the Centers, the CRPs, and CRP Flagships?
2. Did the CRP piloting of RBM implementation provide relevant learning for the CRPs themselves and for CGIAR?
 - 2.1. Do the CRPs that piloted RBM provide a representative cross-section of CGIAR research and therefore a valid and relevant “experiment” in the application and adaptation of RBM in the CGIAR context?
 - 2.2. Did the RBM pilots help improve strategic decision-making and efficiency within the CRPs?
 - 2.3. What key lessons were learned from the CRP pilots on how best to implement an RBM approach at CRP level, and the limitations faced?
3. Did support at System, Center and CRP management levels facilitate successful implementation of RBM?
 - 3.1. What have been the key factors stimulating the implementation of RBM, and which key factors have hindered RBM?
 - 3.2. What supporting systems (e.g. M&E, data and research management processes, incentive and rewarding mechanisms) have been put in place to help CRPs and their related Centers to implement RBM?
 - 3.3. Are such supporting systems (sub-question 3.2) being appropriately designed to help further application of the RBM approach across the CGIAR portfolio?
4. Reflecting on the experience of introducing and mainstreaming RBM so far, how can this approach optimally be used to help CGIAR contribute to its research mandate and expected system level outcomes?
 - 4.1. Is the RBM approach, as currently conceptualized and implemented, likely to contribute to CGIAR’s delivery of results from research towards CGIAR’s SLOs?
 - 4.2. Considering CGIAR experiences, plus relevant RBM experiences elsewhere, how can RBM optimally help CGIAR contribute to its identified system level outcomes?

4. Evaluation approach and methods

4.1 Evaluation approach

The approach for this evaluation will be **non-experimental** and rely on **mixed methods**. The approach has **participatory** characteristics. Although led and facilitated by an external evaluator, a) interviews with an appropriate reference group during the inception phase, b) planned focus group discussions, c) a validation workshop, and d) direct involvement by IEA as manager of the evaluation, assures that representative groups of stakeholders will be directly involved in evaluation design, implementation and reporting. This participatory approach is supported by the range of data collection methods chosen, regular feedback loops from CRP representatives to the evaluation team, and direct input from a range of key informants directly involved in implementing CRPs (see Section 4.2).

The evaluation approach is also **utilization focused** in that there is clarity from the onset as to who the evaluation is for (see Section 1.2) and how it will be disseminated and used (see Section 5.5).

The **formative** nature of the evaluation entails that the evaluation team will examine whether the RBM approach is achieving efficiency and effectiveness expectations that were part of its initial *raison d'être*. The evaluation's findings, conclusions and recommendations are expected to help guide CGIAR and its members as they, together, continue to conceptualize, experiment, adopt and adapt RBM across the CGIAR System.

4.2 Evaluation methods

The research methods applied will be primarily **qualitative**, with a quantitative element limited to descriptive statistics, mostly of secondary data. Data collection and analysis for the evaluation will be mostly **desk-based** rather than visiting CRP research sites. To ensure that findings, conclusions and recommendations are based on a representative range of stakeholder viewpoints, consultation using interviews and focus groups will be included. Evidence will be triangulated by using more than one tool to answer each sub-question and obtaining testimony from more than one source on each topic. Conclusions will be drawn objectively and based on evidence.

In addition to internal review and discussion, the evaluation will draw from experiences outside CGIAR, relying on literature, as well as the team members' own experience and that of external experts to be interviewed. This will seek to relate the CGIAR experience and requirements to those of other organizations that have learned from embracing the RBM approach.

The data collection and analysis **methods** that will be used by the evaluation are summarized below and then detailed in the sub-sections that follow:

- document review;
- establish theoretical framework for RBM in a research context;
- key informant interviews (KIIs);
- internal case studies;

- reference studies;
- focus group discussions (FGD);
- validation workshop

4.2.1 Document review

Document review relies on a range of relevant and available CGIAR internal documents plus other external documents. During the inception phase, more than 40 documents were identified, located, and filed electronically (see Annex B for a partial list). These documents will be complemented by others as the evaluation proceeds and stakeholders identify important additions.

A methodical review of these documents by the evaluators provides background information on the history of RBM in CGIAR, and information on CGIAR structure and organizational culture relevant to RBM. Document review allows the reconstruction of expected program logic, builds an understanding of context and implementation activities completed to date, and provides evidence of progress made towards expected changes, challenges faced and lessons learned. A review of identified external documents allows the evaluators to draw on experience from elsewhere, and will offer technical guidance related to RBM implementation across other complex organizations. Of interest will be documentation on the following:

- strategic CGIAR documents on drivers for change, results-based strategy and laying out the rationale for RBM;
- system guidelines on RBM (including for monitoring, evaluation, learning and impact assessment);
- CRP Proposals including sections describing Theories of Change;
- selection of RBM pilots, implementation, and lessons learned;
- reviews and reports which cover aspects of RBM;
- Fund Council and Consortium Board meeting minutes;
- performance measurement both at CGIAR system level and CRP level;
- external guidance and lessons learned related to RBM in a research context; and
- extracts from completed CRP evaluations on aspects of management relevant to RBM.

A data collection template will be used to collect key points from each of the selected documents and these will be coded for ease of reference to the evaluation questions. The documents reviewed become distinct lines of evidence for the evaluation team.

4.2.2 Establish a theoretical framework

The evaluators will use document review, consultation and peer review to draft a theoretical framework – in the form of one or more Theories of Change – that help clarify why CGIAR embraced the RBM approach as the central management feature of the post-2008 CGIAR System. This Theory of Change (ToC) will attempt to relate the drivers for change to the management and research outcomes that are expected. Reconstructing the logic for introducing RBM will draw from internal sources. Technical guidance for using a ToC, impact pathways, and RBM principles will also come from external sources e.g. John Mayne’s work on using impact pathways and a ToC to depict and describe change logic.

The evaluators outlined a short-list of good practice principles for results-based management during the inception phase, and these are presented in Annex A. These principles will be further elaborated during the inquiry phase of the evaluation. Together with a ToC, these principles will be used by the evaluators to structure the assessment of what has been achieved so far by CGIAR related to RBM.

4.2.3 Key informant interviews

Interviews with identified key informants allows evidence to be collected broadly across CGIAR and each of its Centers to assess the extent of cross-Center learning and how this is informing RBM implementation. Questions will be designed to elicit information that is not available from published documents, and where relevant, to triangulate or clarify information from published documents. The KIIs will be e-mail and Skype-based rather than face-to-face, and target those individuals deemed best placed to be able to reflect knowledgeably on RBM implementation progress to date: CRP and Center management and researchers, staff in CGIAR System-level management, and external stakeholders and experts.

First exploratory interviews were carried out during the inception phase of this evaluation with individuals in senior positions to gather their input on evaluation design. The inception phase also benefited from written comments sent at a time of finalizing the ToRs of the evaluation.

A complete list of who will be interviewed as part of the data collection phase of the evaluation will be agreed among the team and the Evaluation Manager. To protect confidentiality, views expressed by those interviewed will not be attributed to the individuals.

Interview guides will be used to prepare for the KIIs and notes from these interviews will be transcribed and coded for ease of reference to the evaluation questions. Summary notes from these interviews becomes a distinct line of evidence for the evaluation team.

4.2.4 Case studies

Three of the CRPs that were supported financially to pilot RBM, have been selected as in-depth RMB implementation case studies for this evaluation as detailed in Table 3. These CRPs continue to Phase II. The CRP leaders have agreed to collaborate with this evaluation.

In addition there are two other case studies, to be done with a somewhat more limited depth. Case study 4 is another CRP financially supported by CGIAR to pilot RBM. Although this CRP has already ended, sufficient contacts and documentation is available. The fifth case study is of a CRP that was not among the five financially supported RBM pilots. However, the FTA (Forest, Trees and Agroforestry) CRP took self-initiative to embrace aspects of RBM, it remains active, and willing to collaborate with the evaluators.

Table 3 – Details of Case Studies for this Evaluation

CRP Selected as an Internal Case Study for this Evaluation	Lead Center for the CRP	Supported by CGIAR as a RBM Pilot	Other Details
1) Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS)	The International Center of Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)	Yes	Still active as one of the global integrating programs. CIAT also participates in some 10 other CRPs, and CCAFS itself has participation from all 15 Centers.
2) Roots Tubers and	The International	Yes	Still active as one of the agri-food

Bananas (RTB)	Potato Center (CIP)		systems programs. CIAT, IITA and Bioversity International are also directly involved.
3) Global Rice Science Partnership (GRiSP)	International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)	Yes	Still active as RICE CRP (one of the agri-food systems program). AfricaRice and CIAT are also directly involved.
4) Aquatic Agriculture Systems (AAS)	WorldFish	Yes	This CRP closed but contacts and documentation are available. WorldFish leads a new FISH CRP (agri-food systems program)
5) Forest, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA)	Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)	No	Still active as one of the agri-food systems programs. Has done RBM piloting on its own and therefore valuable as a 5 th case study. World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF) also directly involved

A detailed review of RBM implementation experience within these CRPs will involve mapping out and understanding, and comparing processes used in each case, and exploring the experience also from the participating Centers' perspective. The ToC developed by the evaluators will be used to structure the assessment of what has been achieved, challenges, and lessons learned for each case.

The evaluators will use a template to structure these case studies so that short reports can be easily assessed as a single evidence package. Once each draft case-study report is completed (10 pages or less) they will be shared with appropriate peer reviewer(s) within the relevant CRP. Once all case studies are completed, the evaluators will use a meta-analysis to identify common observations across the case studies, and explain patterns and exceptions, and in this way, draw overall findings. The case studies and their meta-analysis become a distinct line of evidence for the evaluation team.

4.2.5 Reference study

How other centers, in comparison with CGIAR, have embraced RBM (or not) provides potential learning, which can be valuable input for CGIAR. The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) benefits from Government of Canada core funding. RBM compliance expectations come with this funding. The IDRC offers the evaluators a reference study. Documents from IDRC, will be examined to understand the RBM implementation challenges, adaptations, and successes experienced by that organization.

4.2.6 Focus group discussions

Two small group discussions or working sessions focused on specific evaluation questions and the issues that are related to these questions will be organized. These can be virtual using Skype application or face-to-face. Summary notes from these FGDs become a distinct line of evidence for the evaluation team.

4.2.7 Validation workshop

Once preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations have been outlined in a zero

draft of the evaluation report, a workshop will be organized where these are presented for discussion, validation, and, if needed adjustment. The means of running the workshop (virtual or face-to-face) and the participants will be determined during the data collection phase of the evaluation. If face-to-face meeting is not feasible, a series of Webex-facilitates consultations would be a suitable alternative.

4.3 Evaluation Challenges and Mitigation Strategies

Too Early to Evaluate RBM – This approach has only recently been introduced within CGIAR and full implementation has not yet been achieved. The evaluation will not be able to assess how the approaches to RBM adopted by CGIAR, its CRPs, and related research Centers, have influenced the research and development outcome of CGIAR’s overall program, nor the outcomes of the CRPs.

Mitigation – The ToR for this evaluation is clear that the purpose is early learning at the interphase of eight years of preparatory orientation and full rolling out (2018 and beyond). In other words, the purpose is not assessment of a single RBM approach, yet to be fully implemented, for its effectiveness.

Case Study Limitations – Because two of the five CRPs that have piloted RBM have closed, there will be limitations for KKIs, FGDs and even documentation for these cases.

Mitigation – It is expected that there will be sufficient data available for the remaining three pilots and that these will serve as comprehensive case studies. The case studies will also be complimented by at least one reference study and a range of KIIs

Lack of Consensus – It is expected that across CGIAR and its members, the evaluators will find a lack of consensus on the value of RBM, what it entails, and how it should be implemented. The perceptions and experiences of CGIAR stakeholders may reflect many different realities and interpretations of RBM. There will be a lack of consensus as to which RBM approach is best suited to CGIAR. This will pose challenges to the evaluators when collating findings and summarizing conclusions and recommendations.

Mitigation – The evaluators will consult across different stakeholder groups. Where consensus is lacking, this will be noted as part of the evaluation findings. Where there is consensus, this will also be noted. And where there is a lack of consensus, the evaluators will work to identify the most credible and prominent positions articulated by groups of stakeholders.

Relevance of External Experience – CGIAR is a unique and complex organization. Comparable experiences, and the relevance of experience elsewhere on applying RBM in a research organization, may be limited. Lessons learned and technical advice from external literature, therefore, may be of limited value to this evaluation.

Mitigation – The evaluators will consult a wide range of sources and technical guidance and seek from this the knowledge and lessons learned that may be of relevance to CGIAR. The participatory approach of this evaluation will assure wide consultation and peer review of any conclusions and recommendations made.

5. Organization and timing

5.1 Roles and responsibilities

The **Evaluation Manager** will be responsible for planning, initial design and management of the evaluation. An IEA Senior Evaluation Officer will manage the evaluation and an IEA Evaluation Analyst will support the team in coordination, information gathering and providing inputs to analysis. The IEA will also be responsible for quality assurance of the evaluation process and outputs, and dissemination of the results. The IEA will take an active role in the preparatory phase of the evaluation by collecting background data and information, carrying out preliminary analysis, and identifying a list of appropriate key informants.

The **Evaluation Team Leader** has final responsibility for the evaluation report and all findings and recommendations, subject to adherence to CGIAR evaluation standards. The evaluation team leader is responsible, with the collaboration and cooperation of the full team, for submitting the deliverables as outlined in Section 5.4.

Table 4: Responsibilities of evaluation team and IEA

Team Member	Main Responsibilities
Sirkka Immonen Evaluation Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial planning, overall design, and approved terms of reference • Management of the evaluation • Contracting and approval of consultant’s payment • Active involvement during preparatory phase • Final approval of inception report • Quality assurance of the evaluation process and outputs • Approval of final report • Dissemination of final report
Robert Vandenberg Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team effectiveness • Contribute RBM subject matter expertise • Lead development of evaluation matrix • Lead design and implementation of methodology • Lead drafting of inception report and evaluation report • Lead data collection and analysis • Adherence of team to CGIAR evaluation standards • Completion of deliverables on time
Seerp Wigboldus Senior Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide subject matter expertize on research for agriculture • Input into and validation of the evaluation matrix • Provide input into evaluation design • Assist with drafting evaluation report • Lead development of conceptual framework • Confirm interview protocols • Data collection and analysis • Contribute to final report
Sophie Zimm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide input on evaluation design during inception phase

- Evaluation Analyst**
- Team scheduling, coordination, logistics
 - Coordination of KIIs and interview note taking and filing
 - Information gathering and collation
 - Provide inputs to analysis

5.2 Quality Assurance

The IEA Evaluation Manager is responsible for overall quality assurance of the evaluation process, its outputs, and the dissemination of the evaluation results. All evaluation products will be reviewed internally by the IEA and will be subject to peer review. The Team Leader helps to assure quality by adhering to approved CGIAR evaluation standards, and to a professional Code of Ethics¹⁵.

This inception report describes the methodology to be used by the evaluation team. It explains how the evaluation is designed to achieve its purpose. It serves as a comprehensive research design and detailed workplan and as such supports quality assurance.

The findings of the evaluation report will reflect systematic analysis and be substantiated by evidence. The conclusions will be reasonable judgments, based on findings, and substantiated by evidence, and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.

5.3 Workplan and Timeline

The evaluation is scheduled to take place between May and September 2017. A detailed workplan is presented in Annex E. The following is a summary of the workplan phases, with the timeline and responsibilities shown in Table 5:

- **Phase 1 – Preparation:** Team established and the ToRs drawn up (completed in February to March 2017)
- **Phase 2 – Inception:** Exploratory interviews are carried out and the inception report prepared (completed by end-May)
- **Phase 3 – Inquiry:** Work described in Section 4 is completed. Preliminary analysis will be carried out during this phase (May to July)
- **Phase 4 – Analysis and Validation:** Main analysis, and the findings agreed and shared with key stakeholders (August)
- **Phase 5 – Reporting and Dissemination:** Analysis completed and evaluation report prepared (September) and then communicated and used (beyond September)

Table 5. Schedule, products and responsibility

Phase	Period	Main Products	Responsibility
1) Preparation	Feb – March	Final ToRs Confirmed evaluation team	Evaluation Manager
2) Inception	April – May	Inception report	Team Leader with input from team
3) Inquiry	May – July	Interviews, documents reviewed, focus groups, team meeting	Team Leader and Senior Evaluator with input from rest of

¹⁵ The Team Leader is a credentialed professional evaluator registered with the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) and as such adheres to the CES Code of Ethics. <https://evaluationcanada.ca/ethics>

			team
4) Analysis	July	Analysis of data gathered	Team leader and Senior Evaluator with input from rest of team
	August	Presentation of preliminary findings and validation workshop Feedback from main stakeholders	Evaluation team Evaluation Manager
5) Reporting	July – August	Draft Evaluation Report	Team Leader and Senior Evaluator with input from rest of team
	September	Final Evaluation Report	Team leader
	October	Evaluation Report approved for dissemination	Evaluation Manager

5.4 Evaluation Deliverables

The **Evaluation Report** (maximum 70 pages plus annexes) is the main output of the evaluation. It will present the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, based on the evidence collected and analysed. The recommendations will be informed by evidence, clearly formulated, strategically relevant and targeted to specific stakeholders in CGIAR for guidance and action. The main findings and recommendations will be summarized in an executive summary.

5.5 Dissemination Plans

Presentations will be given by the evaluation team members to targeted audiences for disseminating the findings of the evaluation report. The dates and level of effort involved for this dissemination have not yet been finalized. Involvement of the evaluation Team Leader in these dissemination presentations will be contracted based on a negotiated level of effort to be agreed with the Evaluation Manager and IEA.

The IEA will interact with the System Management Board and Office for development of a response to the evaluation. The response will include an action plan for addressing recommendations that may be targeted to specific bodies of the CGIAR System. The System Council will be the ultimate recipient of the evaluation report and the response. The evaluation report and the response will be public documents made available to the System Council.

Annex A: Principles of Good RBM Practice

The definition of RBM, and the technical terms associated with this approach (outputs, outcomes, performance measurements, etc.), are normally aligned with guidance work coming from the OECD¹⁶. These global definitions and the overall RBM approach implied have been widely embraced by development donors. This has provided a consistent management language. And yet each program and organization must adapt the RBM approach to its own context and needs. For example, RBM in CGIAR’s agriculture research context involves research questions, learning, testing and innovative technologies that may take 20 years to unfold and contribute to sustained impact.

What is labelled as RBM has evolved over time, and recommended best practice continues to morph and be reinvented. While performance measurement of progress toward achievement of expected results remains the core of RBM, complexity acceptance and systems thinking are more in vogue than ever.

For this evaluation, it is necessary to define good-practice principles of RBM. This “check-list” will be used by the evaluators as a criteria-based standard to compare, contrast and ultimately assess the RBM approaches and tools used by CGIAR and its partners. Below the evaluators provide a working definition of RBM by identifying 8 good practice principles¹⁷. The assertion is that if all or most of these principles are being embraced by the CGIAR System Office, the CRPs, and ultimately by the Centers that partner through the CRPs, then this approach is likely to be valued by stakeholders and help to support program effectiveness. The evaluators expect these principles will be adjusted, further elaborated, and strengthened based on discussions with key informants during the inquiry phase of this evaluation:

Eight Principles of Good RBM Practice

- Consistent leadership** – Consistent system-level, senior leadership is necessary to promote RBM and full engagement in this approach. There must also be clearly identified champions at the CRP and Center levels who have the commitment and capacity to successfully advocate RBM.
- Results focus** – A focus on being accountable for achieving results is the central preoccupation of RBM. This brings new or adapted tools and methods: results frameworks, logic models, theories of change, performance measurement plans, data collection methods, better reports, etc.
- Commitment to measurement** – Performance measurement using indicators is at the heart of RBM. A practical approach to indicators, baselines and targets; sensible measurement of progress, achievement and contribution; and investment in credible M&E systems, are hallmarks of RBM.

¹⁶ See OECD/DAC glossary of RBM terms at <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>

¹⁷ These principles have been influenced by many writers. See for example: Best Practices in Results-Based Management: A Review of Experience. A Report for the UN Secretariat, Volume 1, Mayne, J., 2007.

- **Change in organizational culture** – RBM is a unique way of doing work. It requires a willingness to be transparent, to share, and to invest in performance metrics, participatory review, and reporting excellence. An RBM culture is well defined, promoted and consciously supported.
- **Systems thinking** – Constant scanning of the implementation environment, clarifying and testing assumptions, finding connections and synergy across pathways of change, acknowledging complexity, and navigating towards outcomes amidst complexity
- **Investment in information systems** – RBM is data-heavy and requires improvements to electronic information systems, user-friendly interfaces, and direct alignment with monitoring and evaluation plans. Ongoing development of info systems is required.
- **Investment in learning** – Results information supports learning, efficient and effective management, and credible reporting. An adaptive RBM approach is built through regular review of performance, assumptions and risk, and updating expectations.
- **Wide participation** – Pushing ownership and decision-making to the frontlines, empowering staff by having them design RBM systems that are practical, and providing sufficient opportunities and support for participation in performance review and adaptation.

Annex B: Document Review References

The documents that have been collected and filed for use by this evaluation are listed below. An initial and preliminary review of these documents by the Team Leader took place during the Inception Phase. Other documents may be added to this list during the data collection phase of the evaluation.

CGIAR system level

Birner, R. and Byerlee D. (2016): Synthesis and Lessons Learned from 15 CRP Evaluations. Rome, Italy: Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of the CGIAR.

CGIAR (2016): 3rd System Council Meeting documents for Agenda Item 3: Setting up a Portfolio Performance Management System for CGIAR Research

CGIAR (2016): System Framework.

CGIAR (2015): 2017-2011 CGIAR Research Program Portfolio (CRP2) – Final Guidance for Full Proposals, December 19, 2015

CGIAR (2015): CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016-2030. Version 18 May 2015.

CGIAR (2011): A Strategy and Results Framework for the CGIAR.

CGIAR (2009): Voices of Change. The new CGIAR.

CGIAR (2008): *Bringing together the best of science and the best of development*. Independent Review of the CGIAR System. Technical Report.

Hubbard Decision Research (2014): Proposal from Hubbard Decision Research for the Initial Scoping and Planning of the Development of Decision Tools and Performance Metrics

Immonen, S. and Cooksey, L. (2014): Using performance measurement to assess research: Lessons learned from the international agricultural research centers. *Evaluation* 2014, Vol. 20(1) 96– 114.

ISPC (2012): Strategic overview of CGIAR Research programs. Part I. Theories of Change and Impact Pathways.

Mackay, R. and Horton, D. (eds.) (2007) (2nd Edition) Institutional Learning and Change in the CGIAR: Summary record of the workshop held at IFPRI, Washington, DC, February 4-6, 2003. ILAC Working Paper 1, Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.

CRP level

CRP Proposal Documents for Phase I, Extension Phase and Phase II

CRP Annual Reports

IEA CRP evaluations and CRP commissioned evaluations

Center level

Hubbard Decision Research (2014): A plan for quantifying the impact of decision analysis. (commissioned by ICRAF)

External documents

Feinstein, O. (2014): Improving Results-Based Management in ILO. Challenges and Opportunities.

Mayne, J. (2008) Building an Evaluative Culture for Effective Evaluation and Results Management. ILAC Working Paper 8, Rome, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative.

Mayne, J. (2007): Best Practices in Results-Based Management: A Review of Experience. A Report for the United Nations Secretariat. Volume 1: Main Report

Annex C: Evaluation Matrix

System design and adaption of RBM for CGIAR’s unique research context [relevance]			
1. What were the drivers and objectives of CGIAR’s RBM approach(es) and do they align with a) the needs and priorities of the CGIAR System, b) the working conditions of CGIAR staff and partners; and c) current global approaches and policies?			
Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources of Data	Method of Data Collection
Motivation and purpose 1.1 What was the motivation (“the drivers”) to introduce RBM in CGIAR, and do these drivers remain relevant today or have they changed?	1.1.1 List of drivers articulated by the System	Internal documents	Document review
	1.1.2 Extent to which these drivers are felt to remain relevant today by the System and its key funders	Key informants a) Center & CRP, b) System, c) governing bodies c) funders	Key informant interviews (KIs)
	1.1.3 Level of congruence between objectives of CGIAR’s RBM approach(es) and experiences of good practise elsewhere	Internal and external documents, IDRC or/and other reference studies	Document review plus comparative analysis
Conceptual understanding 1.2 How was the RBM approach(es) conceptualized by the System Organization for the unique research context in which it works?	1.2.1 Existence of one or more conceptual models or narratives (e.g. logical framework, theory of change, conceptual narrative) that explain how the RBM approach was expected to enhance organizational effectiveness and impact	Internal documents (plus external documents as technical cross-reference), and key informants	Reconstruct conceptual model(s) that capture reform vision and confirm via internal consultation
	1.2.2 Degree of clarity as to what the RBM approach is expected to achieve in CGIAR	Key informants a) Center & CRP, b) System, c) funders	Key informant interviews and comparison of views
Consensus across partners 1.3 Was the purpose for introducing the RBM approach(es), and the operational way in which this was done (e.g. the choice of related processes, frameworks, etc.), part of a shared vision, and shared values, understanding, and efforts among key stakeholders?	1.3.1 Extent to which the original vision for adopting a RBM approach was shared by CGIAR System Partners, and most notable, by its member Centers	Key informants a) Center/CRP, b) System	Key informant interviews
	1.3.2 Extent to which the latest System Organization vision and objectives for using a RBM approach (Phase II) are supported across member Centers	Key informants from Centers and CRPs	Key informant interviews
	1.3.3 Extent to which the introduction of RBM raised expectations among Center and CRP staff, and degree to which these expectations are being met	Key informants from Centers and CRPs	Key informant interviews
Adaptation by System 1.4 Has RBM been adequately adapted for CGIAR’s unique type of business (support of research), and aligned with the needs and priorities of the Centers, the CRPs, and CRP Flagships?	1.4.1 Extent to which the requirements of RBM processes align with the needs and priorities of the Centers, the CRPs, and CRP Flagships	Key informants from Centers and CRPs	Key informant interviews and analysis of alignment
	1.4.2 Extent to which there has been room for adaptation of RBM as general approach, and for application in specific context in which CRPs operate.	Same as 1.4.1	Same as 1.4.1
	1.4.3 Number of practical and accepted innovations and adaptations to the RBM approach that have been introduced by the System Organization (2010 to present) to assure its relevance to CGIAR’s unique research mandate	Key informants a) Center & CRP, b) System, c) funders; plus, internal documents	Key informant interviews plus document review, then parsing to create comprehensive list

Evaluation of RMB in CGIAR – Inception Report

Lessons learned from piloting the RBM approach by CRPs [relevance and efficiency]			
2. Did the CPR pilots of RBM implementation provide relevant learning for the CRPs themselves and for CGIAR?			
Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources of Data	Method of Data Collection
2.1 Do the CRPs that piloted RBM provide a representative cross-section of CGIAR research and therefore a valid and relevant “experiment” in the application/adaptation of RBM in the CGIAR context?	2.1.1 Extent to which these pilots are representative of the 15 CRPs based on a set of comparative criteria	15 CRP proposals	Document review and comparative between pilots and the rest
	2.1.2 Level of investment (financial and human resources) made by the System and the Centers for the RBM approaches piloted by the CRPs	KIs a) Center & CRP, b) System; plus, pilot CRP reports	Key informant interviews (KIIs) plus document review
	2.1.3 Extent to which the pilots successfully addressed each of 8 dimensions of RBM [referring to dimensions as presented in Annex F]	KIs a) Center & CRP, b) System; plus, pilot CRP reports	Document review plus key informant interviews
2.2 Did the RBM pilots help improve strategic decision-making and efficiency within the CRPs?	2.2.1 Extent to which CRP managers and staff perceived that new processes that were part of the RBM approach helped a) motivate staff, b) support learning, c) support interactive processes and strategic thinking, d) shift organizational culture, e) attract new partners, f) attract donors)	Key informants from Centers and CRPs directly involved in piloting	Key informant interviews (plus possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
	2.2.2 Extent to which CGIAR System managers perceived that new processes that were part of the RBM approach improved outcome focus of CRPs in planning and reporting	KIs from Centers and CRPs directly involved in piloting	Key informant interviews (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
	2.2.3 Extent to which RBM seemed to incentivize scientists and research managers to adjust research plans based on learning from results and the quest for improved program performance	Key informants from Centers and CRPs directly involved in piloting	Key informant interviews (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
2.3 What key lessons were learned from the CRP pilots on how best to implement an RBM	2.3.1. Extent to which positive experiences and shortcomings across the technical, human and organizational dimensions of the RBM approach were analysed and shared by the CRP pilots	Key informants a) Center & CRP, b) System; plus, pilot CRP reports	Key informant interviews plus document review

Evaluation of RBM in CGIAR – Inception Report

approach at CRP level, and the limitations faced?	2.3.2 Examples of knowledge-sharing reports documenting lessons, workshops, presentations, etc. used to share experiences and lessons learned from piloting the RBM approach	Key informants a) Center & CRP, b) System; plus, internal documents	KKIs and document review to collect and count specific examples
	2.3.3 Extent of relevant key lessons learned from the 5 CRP pilots of RBM implementation	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs involved in pilots, b) System; plus, internal documents	KKIs and document review to collect, cross-reference, and count number of unique key lessons learned

Management systems support an enabling environment for RBM application [efficiency and effectiveness]

3. Did support at System and center management levels facilitate successful implementation of RBM?

Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources of Data	Method of Data Collection
3.1 What have been the key factors stimulating the implementation of RBM, and which key factors have hindered RBM?	3.1.1 List of factors (with explanations) that have contributed positively or negatively to acceptance and implementation RBM (including financial costs of RBM)	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs, b) System	KKIs (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
	3.1.2 Extent to which RBM adequately considers decreasing percentage of CRP funding coming from CGIAR and increased bilateral funding	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs, b) System	KKIs (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
3.2 What supporting systems (e.g. M&E, data and research management processes, incentive and rewarding mechanisms) have been put in place to help CRPs and their related research Centers implement RBM?	3.2.1 Examples of technical support provided in the following areas: a) theory of change, b) use of indicators and target setting, c) M&E frameworks, d) data management processes, e) independent results-based evaluation, e) reporting templates, f) other	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs, b) System; plus, internal documents	KKIs and document review to collect, cross-reference, and summarize examples for each listed technical area (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
	3.2.2 Examples of human resource and organizational support provided in the following areas: a) HR needs assessment and identification of competency gaps, b) training to build RBM-related competencies, c) identification of champions and sector leaders, d) incentives and reward mechanisms, d) results-based performance agreements with workload implications indicated, e) other	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs, b) System; plus, internal documents	KKIs and document review to collect, cross-reference, and summarize examples for each listed HR and organizational change area (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
	3.2.3 Level of investment (financial and human resources) made by the System, the Centers and CRPs for the RBM approaches piloted by each of the 5 CRPs (same as indicator 2.1.2)	KIs a) Center & CRP, b) System; plus, pilot CRP reports	Key informant interviews (KIIs) plus document review
3.3 Are such supporting systems (sub-question 3.2) being appropriately	3.3.1 Number of relevant key lessons learned from the 5 CRP pilots of RBM implementation (see indicator 2.4.1) that are now being embraced across Centers and within CRPs	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs, b) System; plus, internal documents	KKIs and document review to collect, cross-reference, and

Evaluation of RBM in CGIAR – Inception Report

designed to help further application of the RBM approach across the CGIAR portfolio?			count number of key lessons learned now being embraced
	3.3.2 Extent to which Centers and CRPs consider themselves sufficiently resourced for RBM without jeopardising priority research work	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs, b) System	KKIs (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
	3.3.3 Extent to which CRPs find RBM guidance to be helpful, achieve results, and equip staff with better performance information to engage in AR4D	Same as 3.2.1	Same as 3.2.1
	3.3.4 Extent to which instructions for Phase II proposals concerning RBM are perceived by Centers to be sufficiently comprehensive, clear, and practical	KIs a) Centers and Phase II proposers; plus, proposal instructions provided by System	Key informant interviews plus document review (plus possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
	3.3.5 Extent to which CPRs have developed more effective M&E systems and processes and practice	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs, b) System	KKIs (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)
	3.3.6 Extent to which RBM has helped/hindered CRPs to work with other research groups, government, private sector, civil society and other partners (particularly relating to multi-stakeholder processes: innovation platforms, transdisciplinary research, and multi-actor scaling processes)	Key informants a) Centers & CRPs, b) System	KKIs (plus, possibly a FGD if this can be practically arranged)

Refined applications of the RBM approach to support rolling-out across CPR portfolio [effectiveness]

4. Reflecting on the experience of introducing and mainstreaming RBM so far, how can this approach optimally be used to help CGIAR contribute to its research mandate and expected system level outcomes?

Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources of Data	Method of Data Collection
4.1 Is the RBM approach, as currently conceptualized and implemented, likely to contribute to CGIAR's delivery of results from research towards CGIAR's SLOs?	4.1.1 Extent to which CRP Phase II proposals present detail on results-oriented management, monitoring and reporting that will help support RBM implementation	Phase II proposals	Document review: criteria-based analysis of the proposals (referencing the conceptual model(s) from indicator 1.2.1.)
	4.1.2 Extent to which proposals are becoming more aligned with key principles of RBM approach	Phase II CPR proposals in similar research programming areas and suitable earlier planning documents	Document review noting evidence of key principles featured and qualitative comparison

Evaluation of RBM in CGIAR – Inception Report

	4.1.3 Extent to which the Centers have embraced their own tailored RBM approaches, and their own organizational reforms, to apply RBM	Key informants a) Centers, b) System; plus, internal documents	KKIs and document review
	4.1.4 Ratio and extent of opportunities versus challenges that have been encountered in incorporating performance information in program decision-making and adaptive management in CGIAR’s research context (in combo with other indicators)	Various across all indicators noted above	Meta-analysis by evaluators across data collected for these indicators, plus FGD with key internal stakeholders
	4.1.5 Extent that the RBM approach used so far is perceived to have helped CGIAR more effectively contribute to research outcomes related to CGIAR’s higher level system-level outcomes (see indicators 1.4.1, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 3.2.1, 3.2.2)	Same as for referenced indicators 1.4.1, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 3.2.1, 3.2.2	Same as for referenced indicators 1.4.1, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 plus meta analysis across data collected for these indicators
4.2 Considering CGIAR experiences, plus relevant RBM experiences elsewhere, how can RBM optimally help CGIAR contribute to its identified system level outcomes?	4.2.1 List of recommended RBM support initiatives (with explanations) that can help CGIAR and its member Centers effectively contribute to CGIAR’s identified system level outcomes	Various across all indicators noted above	Meta-analysis by evaluators across data collected for these indicators; plus FGD with key internal stakeholders; plus validation workshop
	4.2.2 Extent to which the recommendations listed for 4.2.1 are considered realistic and potentially effective	Various across all indicators noted above	Meta-analysis by evaluators across data collected for these indicators; plus FGD with key internal stakeholders; plus validation workshop

Annex D: Evaluation Team Profiles

Robert Vandenberg (team leader)

Bob is an International Management Consultant with nearly 30 year of experience as performance management consultant, and he has field-based experience in Africa and Asia. He is also experienced in evaluating of programs and policies, with credentialed evaluator certification from Canadian Evaluation Society, and an accredited adult educator. He has advised clients in several development agencies and in over 20 countries on a full range of programming and management issues at institutional and program level on matters such as: program planning, design, theories of change, monitoring and evaluation, and performance measurement, reporting and accountability. He has also involved in capacity development on these topics and in setting up results-based management in institutions and country programs. His sector and subject matter expertise includes:



- food and nutrition security program design and management in vulnerable, rural settings;
- results-based management and performance measurement systems training and capacity building;
- participatory techniques of data collection and analysis;
- utilization-based and developmental evaluation design and implementation; and
- strategic planning including situation and needs analysis.

Seerp Wigboldus

Seerp works as senior advisor and researcher for the Centre for Development Innovation at Wageningen University & Research, The Netherlands. He has been engaged in research on interdisciplinary collaboration in rural development initiatives and his areas of research interest include: integrative approaches to agriculture, ecosystems & environment; multi-stakeholder partnerships in agrifood innovation; agrifood innovation systems; and responsible scaling of agricultural innovations. He is experienced in planning, monitoring and evaluation for sustainable development, and has worked in a wide range of settings such as organizations, networks and alliances, and projects/programs. In the past 15 years, he has worked as consultant and senior advisor in many missions related to strategic planning, monitoring, evaluation and performance management systems, mainly in developing countries, and his clients have included research institutions, also CGIAR, and international donor agencies



Annex E: Work Plan

Activity/Task	Month and Weeks																							
	May				June				July				August				September				October			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Phase 1 – Preparatory (completed February to March 2017)																								
Phase 2 – Inception																								
• <i>Team formation and orientation</i>																								
• <i>Preliminary document assembly and review</i>																								
• <i>Evaluation questions, sub-questions and matrix</i>																								
• <i>Inception report drafting and consultation</i>																								
• Deliverable – Inception Report				31																				
Phase 3 – Inquiry																								
• <i>Document review and KIs</i>																								
• <i>Establish theoretical framework for RBM approach</i>																								
• <i>Team face-to-face working session (Rome)</i>																								
• <i>Focus group discussions</i>																	19							

Evaluation of RMB in CGIAR – Inception Report

	May				June				July				August				September				October			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Phase 4 – Analysis and Validation																								
• <i>Analysis of data gathered</i>																								
• <i>Draft preliminary findings (prepare presentation)</i>																								
• <i>Validation workshop</i>																								
• <i>Feedback from main stakeholders</i>																								
Phase 5 – Reporting																								
• <i>Prepare draft report</i>																								
• Deliverable – Draft Evaluation Report																								
• <i>Feedback from main stakeholders</i>																								
• <i>Prepare final report</i>																								
• Deliverable – Final Evaluation Report																								
• <i>Communications and dissemination by IEA</i>																								

Annex F: Timeline of RBM related events¹⁸

Overall CGIAR	Time	RBM Specific
Independent review of CGIAR System – initiation of reform process	2008	External review team recommend CGIAR adopt RBM
Annual general meeting of CGIAR in Maputo	Dec 2008	
Commitment to significant organizational reforms	2009	Results-based management introduced as one of 4 core CGIAR reform principles
CRPs CCAFS and GRISP are approved	2011	
Endorsement of CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework by Fund Council	Feb 2011	
Approval of 12 additional CRPs plus Genebanks programme by Fund Council	May 2011 – October 2012	
Frank Rijsberman appointed as CEO	Q1 2012	Open letters about RBM
Dryland Systems CRP approved	March 2013	
	Q4 2012 Q1 2013	First CRP impact pathways submitted to ISPC
	Dec 2012	Document: ISPC publishes strategic overview of CRP ToC and IPs
	Mar 2013	ISPC/CRP workshop on IDOs in Cali
	April 2013	<i>Guide for developing CRP Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs)</i> released by IDO working group
	Q4 2013	RBM pilot proposals submitted to Consortium Office and five pilots selected
Wayne Powell joins CGIAR as Chief Scientific Officer	Dec 2013	<i>Process for developing CRP IDOs</i> released by IDO working group
	2014	Implementation of 5 RBM pilots
CRP extension proposals approved by Fund Council	Nov 2014	Draft RBM Framework, developed by John Mayne
Final guidance for full proposals 2017-2022 for CGIAR Research Program Portfolio (CRP2) released	Dec 2015	
Task Force on Indicators is created	March 2016	Selection of harmonized indicators and associated monitoring plan
Organizational structure changes with approval of new CGIAR System Framework	July 2015	
Changes in CGIAR governance structure	Jun 2016	
Approval of 11 CRPs and 3 Platform proposals for CRP2 by System Council	Sep 2016	
	Nov 2016	Working document: Towards a Performance-Based Management System at CGIAR released
	March 2017	Agreement on new template for CRP Plan of Work and Budget
Establishment of new Task Force under System Management Office to update strategic and results guidance	June 2017	Coordinating development of CGIAR RBM framework, including finalization of indicators

¹⁸ This timeline will be further detailed and validated during the inquiry phase of the evaluation.