RTB
Workshop Report

Enhancing Results Based Management in RTB by Harmonizing and Strengthening ME&L Systems

RESEARCH PROGRAM ON
Roots, Tubers and Bananas

CGIAR

AL|NE

LED BY
CIP INTERNATIONAL POTATO CENTER
A CGIAR RESEARCH CENTER

Bioversity International

CIAT International Center for Tropical Agriculture
Since 1967 Science to cultivate change

cirad AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPMENT

IITA Transforming African Agriculture

Contents

Acronyms

A4NH	Agriculture for Nutrition and Health CRP (IFPRI)
ACAI	African Cassava Agronomy Initiative
ADPs	Agricultural Development Programmes (Nigeria)
BASICS	Building a Sustainable, Integrated Seed System for Cassava in Nigeria
BBTV	Banana Bunchy Top Virus
BXW	Banana *Xanthomonas Wilt*
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CIP	International Potato Centre
CRP	CGIAR Research Program
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
ELQs	Evaluation and Learning Questions
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GLDC	Grain Legumes and Dryland Cereals CRP (ICRISAT)
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IDOs	Intermediate Development Outcomes
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
IPAPEL	Provincial Inspectorate of Agriculture, Fisheries and Livestock
ISC	Independent Steering Committee
LAMP	Loop Mediated Isothermal amplification
ME&L	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MEL	Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Platform
MIS	Management Information System
NARO	National Agricultural Research Organisation - Uganda
NARS	National Agricultural Research Systems
NASC	National Agricultural Seed Council (Regulator) - Nigeria
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPPOs	National Plant Protection Officers - Nigeria
NRCRI	National Root Crops Research Institute -Uganda
NRCRI	National Root Crops Research Institute - Nigeria
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction (amplification)
PMOs	Project Monitoring Officers
PMU	Program Management Unit
POWB	Program of Work and Budget
PTF	CGIAR Research Support Platform
RPA	Rural Participatory Appraisal
RTB	CGIAR Research Program on Roots, Tubers and Bananas
SC	CGIAR System Council
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SDSR	Single disease stem removal
SMB	CGIAR System Management Board
SMO	System Management Office
SPIA	CGIAR Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SRF	CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016-2030
Sub-IDOs	Sub-Intermediate Development Outcomes
TOC	Theory of Change
VSES	Village Seed Entrepreneurs
YIFSWA	Yam Improvement for Income and Food Security West Africa Program

Executive Summary

The workshop entitled 'Enhancing Results Based Management in RTB by Harmonizing and Strengthening ME&L systems' was held from 22 to 25 May (2018) in Ibadan. Participants included the RTB CRP and representatives from A4NH, GLDC and the 5 program participant centers: CIP, Bioversity, CIAT, CIRAD and IITA.

Background

In 2017, the second phase of the CRPs was designed to operationalize the CGIAR Strategic Results Framework (SRF) through stronger results-based management and sound accountability. RTB has a high-level of complexity in its multi-stakeholder, multi-crop, and multi-country strategy. The program is articulated through a nested set of theories of change (ToC) at program, flagship, cluster and project levels. These nested ToCs define the expected causal pathways from delivery of research outputs that contribute to the IDOs and sub-IDOs and are linked with system level goals and targets.

In 2018, the System Council approved a set of common indicators as part of the CGIAR annual reporting cycle. At the same time, CRPs have been implementing their own management strategies and associated M&E systems. Each participating center is at a different stage in formulating and implementing centre-wide management and information systems aligned to the CRP data needs.

Continuing to build on lessons learned at the regional level, RTB, encouraged by CIP and IITA, organized a reflection, learning and action-oriented workshop to present a vision and approach towards a harmonized ME&L system, gain familiarity with a set of system level indicators, the RTB CRP ME&L system and associated indicators and institutional indicators of the participant centers. In addition, it was a collaborative effort to strengthen the existing MEL systems at the Center and CRP levels through the identification of key roles, responsibilities and opportunities for synergies. It was anticipated that the workshop would help to forge a road map for rolling out a harmonized ME&L system for RTB, aligned with its participating centres and to the system.

Harmonizing and Strengthening ME&L Systems

The workshop built on existing RTB structures and processes. The intention was to facilitate aggregation across different centres, the CRP and drive more effective decision-making, learning and accountability. The system-level harmonized indicators introduced to participants provided an opportunity to construct a common framework, shape a vision, and discuss and agree approaches and tools to facilitate reporting within a system where data could be aggregated. The harmonization process is crucial to enable this. Concurrently, the workshop also provided an opportunity to align institutional goals and targets for results at each participating centre with the approved system-level output and outcome indicators.

In line with the key messages conveyed by the CGIAR Platform for Big Data in Agriculture during the 2017 Convention, the aim included promoting harmonization, standardization and interoperability of systems.

Common indicators and a harmonized approach across the system

The first day of the workshop introduced participants to the expectations and requirements for an integrated monitoring and reporting system. The nine new common system-level indicators introduced to participants were accompanied by new annual reporting templates, outcome case studies and the aspiration of an online reporting system with dashboards that will make available online, the information reported by all the CRPs and Platforms (CRPs/PTFs). Participants were able to pose questions and have them answered to build an understanding of the rationale behind the indicators and the expectations that this type of reporting will provide to system actors such as the SMB and SC.

Information on the new set of program performance management standards was also presented and is scheduled for approval by the System Council in November 2018. The SMO proposal elaborated on the concept that CRPs/PTFs will be assessed against these standards using a "pass or fail" approach. It is expected that program performance assessment will be linked to subsequent budget allocations. Currently it remains unclear how these program performance management standards fit into the 3-year CGIAR business plan cycle formulated and in discussion by the SMB and SMO.

Harmonization and Aggregation of Indicators in complex ME&L Systems

Experiences from non-CGIAR programs including a multi-donor trust fund ($300M+, 12 donors, 80 projects, 4 regions) were shared. This opportunity presented an approach and key milestones achieved in the design and implementation of a results-oriented ME&L system that included multiple management and geographical levels, regional programs and projects, similar to CRPs.

An overview of the RTB ME&L system was presented and progress made on its implementation was shared. The RTB ME&L system includes tracking of research and output delivery including capacity development (Sphere of Control), monitoring stakeholder behavior, outcome stories and assessments such as evaluation (Sphere of Influence) and ultimately adoption and impact studies (Sphere of Interest).

ME&L Systems in the RTB Community

Each RTB participant center shared experience on institutional M&E systems, online reporting and dashboards, alongside complementary experiences presented by A4HN and GLDC CRPs. These presentations facilitated a greater understanding of alignment between CRP and Centre reporting frameworks, indicators and processes including key aspects related to data management. Participants shared their insights into what aspects of their own ME&L systems were working well, others that may be working less well and their concerns and challenges with the move to a fully harmonized system. These insights are helpful to illustrate how to deal with various challenges and provide solutions to address them. They also illustrated the vast potential within this community to learn from one another. Different centres and different CRPs are at different stages in their development towards a more harmonized system. The approach that RTB has taken to work both within the CRP but also

engage constructively with center ML&E practitioners and leaders is enormously encouraging, building a common ownership.

Users of the ME&L System

The results from a survey administered prior to the workshop were presented to illustrate the different stakeholders/users of information generated through monitoring and evaluation activities and their positioning within the system from projects, clusters, flagships, RTB CRP to SMB and SC. This helped biophysical and social scientists to understand the variation in data and reporting required from the ME&L system to meet the needs of different stakeholders. It also provided further rationale why a harmonized data gathering and reporting system will capitalize on efficiencies and drive decision making more reliably.

Identifying ELQs at CRP, Flagship and Cluster Levels

Use of evaluation and learning questions (ELQs) in conjunction with the critical review of system level indicators illustrated gaps and requirements in methodology and tools for data reporting that RTB would need to address to enable them to report effectively. Data quality assessment mechanisms and protocols were also discussed by participants. Participants brainstormed evaluation and learning questions that the ME&L system is expected to answer for them at different tier-levels. These questions helped to frame the kind of information and analysis required for different users of the ME&L system. Grounding ELQs in a theory of change allows questions to be tied to specific causal pathways (comprising results, assumptions and risks). This approach was novel to many in the workshop and warrants greater attention in the future, particularly in a complex ME&L system.

Overall participants voiced support for the introduction of common indicators at the system level, harmonization as an approach, collaboration and integrated work across centers, the use of ELQs to guide the choice of indicators suitable to answer important questions, and the value of ME&L in design and effective decision-making. There was consensus on designing the system from the bottom up whilst considering the requirements placed on projects. Challenges included, a) a disconnect between ME&L capturing results mostly in the sphere of influence and interest when a large portion of the results are actually within the sphere of control (e.g. typified by the inclusion of a smaller number of indicators relevant for research versus a larger number reflecting development outcomes), b) recognition of a perturbing lack of resources for ME&L in the system, c) a significant shift from results based management to performance reporting and d) the interoperability of different MIS and other knowledge/financial platforms.

Harmonized indicators & outcome case studies - practical alignment/ action for reporting

On the second day a subset of common indicators was presented in much greater detail. Detailed indicator reference descriptions, disaggregation criteria, guidance sheets and templates for their implementation accompanied the common indicators. The CGIAR's Results Reporting Resources Site was presented as a resource guide for all participants.

Output Level Indicators
C1: Number of innovations by stage
C2: Number of Formal Partnerships
C3: Number of direct participants in CGIAR activities
C4: Number of People trained
C5: Number of CGIAR research papers published in peer reviewed journals
C6: Altimetry's
I-3: Number of policies[1], legal instruments or investments modified in design or implementation, informed by CGIAR research

Discussions by participants were captured indicating key clarifications sought and perspectives on the practicality of the indicators for their use. In general terms participants welcomed the indicators and were willing to work with them. Participants also assessed the levels of alignment between their Centre/CRP indicators and the common indicators and identified common or similar indicators, and clear differences in indicators. Participants' perspectives illustrated a much greater degree of alignment than was initially expected with system indicators. This was partly because of the broad definition of the common indicators and because of the pursuance of a tool (i.e. outcome/impact case study) to more specifically address the spheres of influence/interest and the evidence required depending on the maturity of having achieved the indicator. Indicators that did not align from each of the centers were also identified and discussed in detail as to whether they were still of high importance to the RTB CRP or to a specific center to be included.

Indicator Alignment Group Work

Group work with the participants started with a sub-set of 3 specific output indicators which were interrogated as fully as possible. Definitions were discussed and clarified, indicator reference sheets and the data expected analyzed, data collection tools and methods of reporting revised and roles and responsibilities discussed in preparation of the CRP Review of Performance report due in July 2018. Participants sought to identify, tools used for each indicator and the adaptations or refinements necessary to ensure consistency around data collection, who and how data will be collected and who would report by when.

Number and type of Innovations	No of trainees and participants	No of partnerships
Clarifications and examples needed on what constitutes an innovation. Period for refinement and harmonization of the definition was suggested	Add center/organization as disaggregation criteria to track links between training and centers	Risk of double counting across centers (system of verification required, agreement codes to avoid double counting) and for inter CG partnerships
Methods to assess gender and youth relevance need to be harmonized across the portfolio	Participant consent to collection and use of personal data at registration point may become an issue	Inclusion of formal and informal partnerships (some of the latter most meaningful)
Stages of maturity are not necessarily sequential. Innovation processes should not be presented as linear	Issues with double counting of participants need to be addressed if we want meaningful and usable data	Reporting on multi –year agreements
	Age of trainees/participants could be considered. Need to adopt standard definitions (e.g. youth)	Benefits of partnerships are not captured here

---

[1] I- 3 - Number of policies/ laws/regulations/ budgets/ investments/curricula (and similar) modified in design or implementation, informed by CGIAR research

Detailed Analysis of methods and tools for each of the priority indicators

The penultimate day of the workshop included a further two rounds of analysis of common and specific (or different) indicators. A common action plan was developed to prioritize reporting on common indicators across RTB and the data collection tools and instruments necessary to provide the data. Alongside, roles and responsibilities were assigned both at different centers but also at different levels across RTB, from project, to cluster, to flagship and program levels to embed the alignment and to ensure consistency across the entire program. It was agreed reporting should be an ongoing activity, with integrated systems embedded into daily routines to maximize efficiency and to institute training features on the MIS platforms that were continuously accessible. Groups voted to include additional specific indicators that were either relevant to the RTB CRP or relevant to specific centers e.g. agribusiness models and job creation, phases or stages of value chains, indirect job creation assessments and attribution challenges of a specific model. Further training for those in RTB to ensure consistent understanding across indicators is likely to be helpful and further enhance reporting at the center level. Participants expressed a significant appetite to become familiar with both the indicators and the online reporting platform in different ways.

Plans of actions were drawn up by the teams in relation to refinements to methods, tools and data collection approaches to ensure consistency across the whole portfolio and enable aggregation of the data from common indicators to be reported. Part of this formed a shorter and part a longer-term action plan for the PMU to report on the annual review of performance report, this July (2018) and into the future.

Outcome Case Study Work

In addition to the indicator work, further work was done to present information on the CGIAR common outcome/impact case study template being proposed as a means of documenting evidence in the sphere of influence and interest. Three case studies were worked through by three different groups: BASICS project on seed systems in Nigeria, Banana *Xanthomonas Wilt* (BXW) Management and Improved Surveillance of Banana Bunchy Top Virus (BBTV) Incidence. Actor maps and changes associated with actors were developed, and appropriate indicators and evaluation and learning questions posed to guide how indicators would be used to compile evidence. This enabled participants to have a working knowledge of how to compile an outcome case study, and what type of evidence is necessary at different stages of maturity. It also enabled clarifications to be lodged that will need further attention from the system office.

Working smarter: Ideas and opportunities for resource mobilization

The final day of the workshop focused on the issue related to adequate funding for ME&L activities. An area of anxiety for participants is how to mobilize the funding needed to collect data, particularly in relation to the evidence that is being requested from the SMO, to substantiate the progress made towards the delivery of outputs and the achievement of outcomes. The budgets for ME&L at project level are extremely modest and overstretched. Participants were presented with examples of project-based approaches used to mobilize

resources for ME&L. Participants worked in groups to identify ideas and opportunities that might form attractive concepts for external funding.

Six groups identified ideas ranging from identifying; the key drivers of sustainability for clonally propagated crop seed systems to; adoption rates of CG-RTB varieties to; assessing the efforts made with CG contribution to develop the capacity of NARS (including challenges to measuring policy influence), to mobilizing funds to implement institutional approaches for ME&L, to factors influencing youth agribusinesses. Groups worked systematically through identifying outputs expected, partnerships and tools (some resources/contact persons already present to engage closely with) and next steps to turn these exciting ideas into potential proposals to leverage funds to do quality ME&L across RTB.

Conclusions

In concluding the meeting, the majority of participants found it relatively straightforward to understand and identify alignment of common indicators with center results and targets, and RTB program priorities. There appeared to be significant potential synergies in the common indicators proposed, albeit with some further clarifications requested from the System Office. The approach of harmonization and consistency across CRPs, centers and projects was optimistically received and the use of evaluation and learning questions in conjunction with indicators helped to ensure that all users of information and data could be delivered through a more organized approach. A clear plan in conjunction with the RTB PMU from here until 25th June facilitates the opportunity to populate the 2018 review of performance and on-going data collection embedded in daily routines in the longer-term. PMU through training and guidance will help to ensure a greater understanding and buy in to a harmonized system. It will also be necessary to scrutinize the MEL platform, its interoperability with centers, the system, RTB projects and MARLO. Participants requested to be kept up to date with feedback on the outputs of this workshop to enable all participants in RTB to be fully aware and capacitated to play their role in a harmonized system for RTB. The post-workshop evaluation illustrated satisfaction with the approach to harmonization for RTB and an enthusiastic commitment to deliver.

Enhancing Results Based Management in RTB by Harmonizing and Strengthening ME&L Systems

INTRODUCTION

RTB currently includes a nested set of theories of change (ToC) at program, flagship, cluster and project levels. These nested ToCs define the expected causal pathways from delivery of research outputs to the IDOs and sub-IDOs and depict the contributions of all program participants and the CRP as a whole to the system level goals and targets. In 2018, the System Council approved a set of common indicators as part of the CGIAR integrated framework that includes results reporting and performance management. Concurrently, CRPs have been implementing their own management strategies and associated M&E systems. Each participating centre is at a different stage in formulating and implementing centre wide management and information systems aligned to the CRP data needs.

The 4-day workshop on "Enhancing Results Based Management in RTB and Program Participants by Harmonizing and Strengthening ME&L Systems" was organized in Ibadan for the 22nd to the 25th of May 2018.

The main objectives included:

1) To socialize experiences on designing and implementing complex ME&L systems and foster shared understanding on data management across levels (sites, countries, regions) and entities (projects, centers, CRP) as part of the implementation of an integrated RBM framework;
2) To validate strategic evaluation and learning domains/questions linked with nested ToCs for flagship project and cluster levels;
3) To harmonize and refine a set of common indicators that will serve RBM purposes at different management levels (projects, centers, CRP);
4) To identify and agree on cost-effective best practices for data management (including collection, processing, reporting and storage) that will be tested for informing the selected set of indicators;
5) To strengthen communication and collaboration among ME&L personnel within and across Centers for a successful implementation of Center and CRP-level M&E systems;
6) To agree on a roadmap for rolling out the harmonized ME&L system.

The concept note introducing the context and a more detailed presentation of the expected results from the workshop is available at this link.

SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS

1. COMMON INDICATORS AND A HARMONIZED APPROACH ACROSS THE SYSTEM

The first day of the workshop was characterized by the opening session and welcome from IITA and the introductory sessions that helped set the scene. CGIAR System Organization expectations and requirements for an integrated monitoring and reporting system were presented and discussed. Experiences from programs that had to deal with similar level of complexity while setting up their monitoring and evaluation systems were shared. A brief overview of the key milestones achieved in the design and implementation of an ME&L system for RTB was presented.

The presentation of the results of the survey administered prior to the workshop, identified the list of key stakeholders/users of the information generated through monitoring and evaluation activities. The first day closed after the exploration of the usefulness of the evaluation and learning questions as an approach to identify the key areas to be addressed through monitoring and evaluative approaches in a harmonized, complex, multi-tiered programme.

Opening of Workshop and welcomes from Robert Asiedu (Director, Research for Development, for IITA-West Africa) and Hilde Cooper (DDG, IITA Corporate Services).

This workshop was sponsored by both IITA and CIP DG's and agreed at the last Independent Steering Committee of the RTB in Dar Es Salaam in September 2017. It comes at a time when IITA celebrates its 50th Anniversary with 4 regional hubs in West Africa (Nigeria), Southern Africa (Zambia), Central Africa (DRC) and East Africa (Tanzania). IITA is a multicultural organisation with 46 nationalities and 1,200 nationally recruited staff. IITA is a project-based institution with little unrestricted funding, reflecting the position of other RTB centers. Results reporting is important and essential to illustrate to donors the results of the center and IITA recognises the value of harmonization efforts at the system level and looks forward to the progress made at this workshop.

Context and Principal Expectations from the Workshop from Claudio Proietti - RTB PMU Manager.

Centres are being requested by CRP management and the SMO to provide systematic information on product delivery and results achievement. Simultaneously, they are developing their institutional and strategic plans and internal reporting systems. In the past years, changes in the type and format of information to be reported have been experienced. However, these changes rarely consider the technical and organisational challenges that need to be overcome for successful implementation. Expectations from ME&L are often over ambitious and the level of funding significantly inadequate. However, harmonized systems present opportunities not only to support management and to communication processes but to introduce efficiencies. An opportunity to share learning and refine approaches and tools, should contribute to effectiveness and efficiency and allow to make a case for commensurate resources to be allocated to these activities. RTB is in a good position to address these challenges with the guidance provided by the SMO.

This workshop is expected to provide a clearer understanding of ME&L frameworks at different levels and their interlinkages. The strategic use of evaluation and learning questions should help guide best fit monitoring and evaluation approaches for RTB. Raising awareness on a select set of indicators will enable better identification and assessment of their aggregation potential both at the center and CRP levels. The analysis of these indicators, and the assessment of gaps and requirements in methods and tools related to these indicators will help both reporting and guide data management. Data quality assessments for the short and longer terms should help familiarise participants on the data quality required. Whilst the workshop is unlikely to provide a 'finished and delivered' harmonized ME&L system, it will provide a plan for a road map to achieve this collaboratively and enable reporting on some of the common indicators for the Annual Review of Performance report expected in July 2018.

Link to Claudio's presentation

Summary of System level perspectives from Julia Compton – Consultant SMO.

SMO set out an approach to results reporting and program performance management to drive credible improvements in data collection and visualization and provide assurance to funders and stakeholders. Results are important but cannot be interpreted to make system level comparisons. The SMO identified that both for performance and results the objectives are not to compare CRPs. Furthermore, results-based management has to consider that there is a significant time lag between output delivery and outcomes (often beyond the life of the CRP) and attribution/contribution is highly complex and influenced by many partners and factors.

Traditionally research portfolios have varied risks and returns - some research lines will succeed and provide returns on the whole investment, others will not. There is an acknowledgement that monitoring targets may lead to goal displacement and gaming. In reflecting on the past, past outputs are not predictive of future outcomes (especially in research and in the agricultural sector).

Having considered all the challenges and limitations, the aim of the SMO is to improve and harmonize the current reporting system to facilitate access to evidence that is traceable and presents 'at-scale' impacts linked to top level system goals. Information captured will be consolidated through a MIS and illustrated through dashboards - examples were included. The intended changes are summarized below:

- Nine common reporting indicators were introduced;
- Outcome/impact case study – reporting tool for stages of maturity, linked to system outcomes and ensuring incentives for more at-scale studies;
- New annual planning and reporting templates for CRPs and Platforms (use of W1/2, efficiency improvements, reflection on SRF targets, cross cutting issues);
- New performance-based reporting against a set of standards measures;
- Results dashboard to provide overview of progress and detailed information.

The roll out process for the implementation of these changes started this year and is facing some challenges:

- New system introduced after end of year reporting.
- Various MIS systems (MEL, MARLO - interoperability issues).
- Many bilateral projects, different timescales and reporting cycles, bilateral reporting priority.
- Data lags for communication (impact studies reporting innovations of previous years).

Other aspects that need to be considered are:

- Good quality reporting and evidence takes significant time and resources.
- Annual reporting requires high quality and evidenced data.
- Performance management standards can include coverage and quality of reporting.
- The system requires electronically filed, accessible documentation and ways to find it.
- Roles and responsibilities for data checks still to be determined.

Program performance management standards

A presentation was made on the program performance management standards. They have been introduced to strengthen high quality program performance management, to provide assurance to System Management Board (SMB) and System Council (SC) that investments can be made with confidence across the system. Final approval is expected in November 2018 by the System Council (SC). The main characteristics of the program performance management approach will be:

- Harmonized standards across the system, including basics such as accessible documentation, not always fixed by appraisal.
- Advocate pass/fail assessment of performance standards and not comparison among CRPs. Pass required to get next cycle of funding.
- Limited set of 5-6 program performance standards for each business cycle.
- Focus on high priority issues agreed by SC and SMB.
- Linked to risk management and research quality frameworks.
- Standards required would be raised over successive business cycles.
- Performance management complements and builds on other elements (e.g. evaluation).

Link to Julia's presentation

Questions and answers

1. What is the evidence that performance indicators actually work? What is the evidence that these new indicators are going to work?

- Common indicators for results reporting have been chosen for being aggregable, credible, applicable to many, etc.
- Performance standards that are directly related to program management will measure the performance of the CRPs. Nevertheless, some donors have specific demands to keep certain results-related indicators.

2. Interoperability – how does the systems office see this being fixed in the future?

- Resources will need to be committed to address technical fixes – MEL uses the UN system for regions and MARLO uses the WB system → so they have different codes. Patient and systematic compatibility will be required to enable these systems to talk to one another. Discussion started to find common vocabularies, control lists for items to be shared.

3. Outcome/Impact case studies – can you elaborate on these a little bit

- In the past there were indicators at every level, including impact indicators → these results were not credible; time lag in getting real outcomes at scale and very high costs to measuring results through impact assessment methods – difficult to get at the notion of contribution to change.
- Trying to improve the templates – requesting the inclusion of a table with narrative in the annual reporting template. E.g. 50M women with a more diverse diet and cite publications

- In the future outcome/impact study template – different stages of maturity from outcome to impact. - stages from research → adoption → impact.

4. Will reporting negative results jeopardise possibility of future funding
- Negative results are important; don't want them to be undervalued – use performance management tools to ascertain performance-based allocations

5. Projects at centre level are following centre level targets. Will we still be trying to achieve targets? What happens to impact measurement?
- It's fine for projects to set their own targets but at the system level moving away from target-based monitoring

6. Is the feature for performance monitoring going to be available for projects?
- The tools (e.g. MEL) will allow projects to monitor these things at their level, but projects will not be expected to report on these explicitly

7. The reporting requirements are a moving target; can you allow opportunities for consultation/input into the process?
- There have been consultations – e.g. on the indicators
- Not sure what the links are between ground, MEL CoP and other levels of decision-makers
- May need to understand these much better
- On the common indicators - there have been consultations but then at some point they were circulated. They are not perfect - there is an intention to have an improvement round, to the extent possible.

8. Is there mechanism for looking at centre contribution to the results for common indicators?
- In the disaggregation section there is a mechanism

9. How do we ensure credibility of the data?
- Project documents should be made available online
- SMO is asking for evidence to support claims (e.g. stage of development for innovations, outcome case studies). Evidence should be made available online
- Random checks of this evidence – still working out how this should/could work – this may make people more serious about the figures they are using/including

2. HARMONIZATION AND AGGREGATION OF INDICATORS IN COMPLEX ME&L SYSTEMS

Examples of other non-CGIAR programs were presented and shared to participants to illustrate other complex programs where multiple aligned levels were all feeding into a consolidated monitoring and reporting system. Subsequently the session presented a brief overview of the design and the progress on implementation of the RTB ME&L system focusing on the sphere of control, sphere of influence and sphere of interest levels. These informative presentations were complemented by presentations on the M&E systems and approaches from each of the centres IITA, CIP, Bioversity and CIAT alongside other CRPs who included A4HN and GLDC.

Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT) experience from Andre Ling - ALINE

LIFT is a multi-donor trust fund ($300M+, 12 donors, 80 projects, 4 internal regions), it has multiple levels (national, regional programmes and projects) all feeding into annual reporting on a common set of indicators. In some ways this is similar to the SLO, CRP, Flagships and Clusters structure. At each level, Theory of Change (TOC), Evaluation and Learning Questions (ELQs) and Measurement Frameworks (MFs) were developed. Each region has its own unique context, and relationship to higher levels. As projects came on board, they were able to align their indicators and understand how they were contributing in the overall framework.

The use of evaluation and learning questions was used to ensure that at different levels the information requirements were articulated carefully, and the harmonized and additional indicators were used to identify if these data requirements could be effectively answered. Utilising these ELQs at different levels ensures that you have appropriate indicators at each level and that users of the system can be reassured that their key questions are being addressed in data capture priorities. LIFT is characterised by a combination of aggregated and non-aggregated data cascading up the system at various levels. At national levels they are the synthesis of evidence coming out of project and programme level data - annual reports and also national level survey at household level results. Use of ELQs, indicators and synthesis lead to learning. Structured synthesis of practical evidence informs programming cycles at multiple levels.

Link to ALINE presentation

RTB CRP ME&L system from Claudio Proietti – RTB PMU Manager

The presentation on the RTB CRP ME&L system identified different levels of design and implementation of the system for RTB needs. In line with the concept developed by the SMO and MEL CoP, this integrated framework identifies the three spheres used to differentiate the responsibility/result levels. Even though this is presented as a linear model, the results can be visualised concurrently.

- **Sphere of control** - direct outputs of the research, such as research innovations and services. The ME&L actions include tracking quality of research, output delivery, capacity building interventions
- **Sphere of influence** - use of research outputs and practices. The ME&L actions monitor stakeholder behaviour (project research initiative), outcome stories (research teams) and outcome assessments such as evaluations or adoption studies.
- **Sphere of interest** - at a distance from the projects but using the outputs and result in outcomes such as improved well-being, economic system and health. The ME&L actions include monitoring a sub-set of different approaches such as impact studies, embedding this as part of the research process and where appropriate including SRF and SDG type indicators.

By moving from a disciplinary based structure (RTB Phase 1) to a cluster-based structure and subsequently flagship projects (RTB Phase 2), RTB has been able to connect and promote synergies across centres but also across disciplines within centres. This has included strengthening outcome orientation at the cluster level, non or less linear impact pathways, outcome level changes such as changes in knowledge, emerging new practices, changes in policy, direct benefits and impacts with an increased importance of multidisciplinary approaches and integration.

A bottom up approach was used to develop TOCs at different levels, beginning with the Cluster level development (challenges and aims, research products, partnerships and impact pathways including expected impact ex ante IA). An expert consultation defining research priorities was organized and a subset of clusters, participated in an in-depth exercise of validation and refining of the cluster concepts at the global and regional/country level (RBM pilot). The theories of change and other strategic elements defined at the cluster level were consolidated at the flagships and CRP level.

Nested sets of TOC established the development of the M&E framework organized around two main components: Output monitoring and outcome monitoring. For the implementation of each component, specific approaches and tools were identified.

A MIS named MEL has been developed to enable output planning, reporting and deliverables, and tracking of output level delivery and data visualisation. Outcome level reporting using common outcome indicators and linkages across management levels, and geographies is under improvement.

Recognising that RTB funding is 80% W3/bilateral and 20% W1/W2, most M&E systems are already established at the project level and this works as a disincentive to coordination and alignment with Center and CRP structures and requirements. The risk is that the CRP generates a burden of double reporting which is unsustainable and unaffordable. RTB promotes a well-integrated a model that is able to use most of the information generated at the project level for cluster, flagship and CRP needs.

Link to RTB presentation

3. ME&L SYSTEMS IN THE RTB COMMUNITY

Presentations from IITA and CIP centres were made on institutional ME&L systems. These presentations set the scene for what has been done so far, what has worked for them, what has not worked for them, how the information has been generated and used. CIAT, Bioversity, A4NH and GLDC provided commentary on their experiences seeking to develop and harmonize their own M&E systems.

A working session enabled participants to identify what was useful in building their awareness of different ME&L systems across the community of institutions that are part of RTB and what were the challenges faced during implementation of these efforts. This session by some distance illustrated the potential in RTB to learn from one another given the different stages of development that all centers and RTB teams.

IITA Presentation – Rosen Rwampororo – Head M&E Unit, IITA

IITA has are 165 projects utilising 43 common indicators or KPIs (8 are contextual). The institutional results framework based on multiple theories of change reflects IITA's 2012-2020 strategy and includes 12 required indicators (9 CGIAR common indicators) all described in their indicator reference sheets. IITA uses an enhanced MEL platform, focused on monitoring but incorporating evaluation and the performance of projects. This system is being pilot tested with actual data from BASICS, ACAI, YIIFSWA, and Cassava Weed Management currently. The data platform automatically aggregates across projects to inform IITA results for different KPIs and dashboards (institutional level, CRP level, Hub Level and Project Level). Information is being used for project

performance-based data, complemented with scientific studies and evaluation for accountability and learning. Evidence is also used for reporting to CGIAR and Donors and National Governments, Hub Directors and IITA Management.

Link to IITA presentation

CIP Presentation – Julius Okello and Godfrey Mulongo – IA and M&E specialists, CIP

CIP has a SSA MEL strategy with a dedicated team working to harmonize collection and reporting of monitoring data, using standardized metrics for impact assessment and building the capacity of the regional M&E team to collect quality data and manage data processes. Four institutional programs/strategic objectives: nutritious sweetpotato, seed potato for Africa, game changing solutions and resilient food systems have many projects implemented at the regional level that report through project level performance indicators, to program level indicators to regional CIP-SSA regional indicators. These are aligned with system level indicators. MEL data is used by:

   a) CIP Program leaders to monitor implementation and evaluate progress and outcomes;
   b) CIP Managers to coordinate, share knowledge products, learning and project design;
   c) donors and the development community for accountability, transparency and value for money.

CIP SSA is developing templates from quarterly reports, to country and donor project reports. They use dashboards and ensure communication with the RTB MEL platform. The process is labour intensive with efforts required to build the capacities of officers to implement the system. There is project vs system wide competition on ME&L with different levels of understanding.

Link to CIP presentation

Comments and other experiences

Elisabetta Gotor (Foresight and Ex-Post Impact Assessment Cluster Leader) highlighted that Bioversity is involved in 9 CRPs. They unpacked their projects and grants and mapped deliverables against institutional outputs contributing to organisational outcomes and impact. They also audited all the indicators being collected by projects and how this collection was operating. They are working on developing a common TOC for the monitoring system itself and a common ontology. This will lead to asking if Bioversity is using the same kinds of indicators, and working towards harmonization across centres, identifying the minimum and what is good to have.

Janelee Waldock (M&E Specialist) provided an overview of CIAT M&E system and thinking.

Amanda Wyatt (Program Manager A4NH) shared that A4NH is involved in 5 CGIAR centres and two academic institutions. The emphasis is on measuring flagship level but centres want to measure at project levels against specific timebound research outputs, towards 2022 outcomes. The platform they use is MARLO and they used it for the Annual Report and POWB. A MIS will enhance preparedness for Impact Assessment and Evaluation. A4NH is contributing in the development and adaptation of MARLO. She was very impressed in what the centres had invested in harmonizing their systems and was interested in the PMU enabling an ME&L system to enable flagship leaders to manage more effectively.

Enrico Bonaiuti (ME&L Specialist, ICARDA) provided an update on GLDC's perspective. It is useful to have all research information in one place, where searchability of the data is possible and all systems are linked or interoperable. The configuration of the M&E system planned for GLDC is project based but he takes away useful lessons from this session that will be applicable to GLDC. It is hoped that these sets of indicators from the system office prove to be useful.

Feedback from group work on what seems to be working well and what appears to be more challenging from the previous presentations

Participants worked in groups to think through what they learned from different centre presentations and indeed commentary both from other CRPs and centers. The top priorities for a harmonized system included managing performance, reporting impact to donors and communicating impact more widely. Participants reflected on what was working well and what was not working well in their systems. Recurrent themes, included software features including tools or platforms, interoperability of platforms, data aggregation and weak internal ME&L cultures and capacities. Other areas such as avoiding double reporting, timely feedback loops, managing data from different sources were mentioned.

The table below provides some insights into the positive aspects identified by participants and the challenges facing them in establishing functional harmonized reporting systems.

Positive Aspects taken away from the RTB community presentation (What is working well)	Challenges identified at various levels in creating a harmonized system that operates effectively (what is not working so well)
1. Learning how to get effective management buy-in (and ideas for this shared in the presentations) 2. Aligning IITA activities to country focus/priorities 3. Establishment of the ME&L system pulling in the lower level approach 4. Buy in from managers 5. Being able to define a common set of indicators from different projects 6. CIP is a bottom-up approach with a higher likelihood of adoption	Mangement 1. Interoperability of M&E systems of centers with RTB 2. Enforcement for participation/Incentives for scientists 3. Amount of time and effort necessary to collect and consolidate indicators not planned or accounted at the onset 4. CIP system might not succeed unless there is buy in at the top management 5. Funding modality impact on performance culture 6. Incentives + HR needs (dedicated ME&L experts, experienced) 7. M&E culture in general – weak, needs strengthening via trainings, etc. CRP Level 1. Common language to be reached (Bioversity) 2. People still focused on the system but unclear who is actually reading the documents? Difficult to make assertions on the quality of the documents. 3. Planning the deliverables - not part of an integrated planning process with the reporting being very difficult 4. Data Aggregation challenges

Positive Aspects taken away from the RTB community presentation (What is working well)	Challenges identified at various levels in creating a harmonized system that operates effectively (what is not working so well)
	Cluster Level 1. Cluster looked at as a reporting tool 2. Buy in from users challenging 3. Need easy to use tools and process tracking Project Level 1. IITA - system might have difficulties in adoption at the lower levels 2. How does system office define a project? Platforms and Interoperability 1. Difficulty using the MEL platform for reporting 2. Huge challenges in getting people to enter their data into the system 3. Once you put information in the system you can't see it; 4. Earlier 150 words abstracts as part of the narrative was useful now it's optional so not used by everyone 5. If the system is made useful at the project level it will actually become useful for most of the people who currently just put info in and feel it is not useful to them.

4. USERS OF THE ME&L SYSTEM

A short survey was administered (19 respondents) prior to the workshop to gather information on how the existing ME&L systems are currently working, what challenges they face and how these challenges should be addressed. The objectives of the survey were also to identify who the key users of the ME&L system are and understanding how to understand the expectations of the system and for whom at different levels. A balance between interdependence and different priorities at each level was also sought. Tables were organised by level, including project, canter, cluster, flagship and CRP. Users were asked; *who are the main users at this level? What information do they need from the ME&L system?*

Link to Stakeholder Survey Results presentation

Participants worked across centers and defined the needs of users of the system at their level and what information they need. Below are a series of tables of the synthesized information on Users and Needs by participants.

Project level	
User	**What information do they need**
Donor	Performance reports Financial reports Future funding priorities Obligations Publications Feedback
Institutions	Lessons learned Financial report Future funding publications
Partners	Lessons learned Feedback
PMU	Lessons learned Feedback ← strategic decision making
CRP	Financial report Future funding publications
End users	Feedback

Flagship	
Users	**Uses**

Management and flagship leaders	Info aggregation (reports)
	   - Resource mobilisation
	   - Facilitate communication and collaboration
	   - Ability to filter information and find what is useful
	   - Find highlights/outcome stories

Stakeholders (partners, donors)	Communication, tools, aggregated information

Cluster	
Users	**Uses**
Flagship leaders Project Management Users Cluster team and leader	- Report to workplan - Information on plan of work and budget (POWB) - Deliverables, outputs, intermediate outcomes - Team profile

Other points:
   • No perceived users beyond cluster/flagship/CRP
   • Questionable quality of documents
   • NRS and the implementing partners do not know whether any of the data exists, so they cannot use it and it is not searchable
   • Staff who are project based do not understand the MEL system, hence cannot use it	

Centre level	
Users	**Uses**
Senior management team	Programme outcomes Project level performance Outcome case studies and impact studies Publications/data CGIAR indicators
Communications (internal/external)	Key research outputs Outcome case studies and impact studies Publications/data
Board of directors	Programme outcomes Outcome case studies and impact studies CGIAR indicators
Donors	Project level performance Key research outputs Outcome case studies and impact studies Publications/data CGIAR indicators
Hub/region/country directors/leadership	Programme outcomes Project level performance
Program leaders	Programme outcomes Project level performance Publications/data
Government	Regional reports and outcome studies

System level	
Users	**Uses**
System office Donors, governments CRP management committee CRP steering committee Board of Trustees of lead centre	Information on accountability Information on performance Information on activities and budget Key highlights of research results Outcomes

5. IDENTIFYING ELQs AT CRP, FLAGSHIP AND CLUSTER LEVELS

Participants still sitting in their groups reflecting different levels were encouraged to brainstorm evaluation and learning questions that the ME&L system is expected to answer at the different levels. These questions will be used to check the TOCs at various levels and identify whether the questions can frame the kind of information and analysis required for different users of the ME&L system. Grounding ELQs in a theory of change allows questions to be tied to specific causal pathways (comprising results, assumptions and risks). Different TOCs at different levels are intended for different users. They present different levels of detail and can guide us toward different questions.

[Link to the ALINE presentation](#)

Evaluation and learning questions

Teams at different levels (tables) in the workshop looked at capturing a small subset of evaluation and learning questions. The intention was to use these to enable cross checking of the indicators that were being reviewed later in the workshop. These questions help to translate information into knowledge which can be used for decision making. Indicators don't tell much on their own, they may convey what happened or how much of something happened, but they do not tell us why or how that change took place. They often lack contextual, comparative and causal analysis that takes them from data/information into knowledge. The review process of selected indicators should be systematically done throughout the program.

Level	Questions
CRP	• What were the most successful approaches to promote behavioural change? • How many households adopted RTB related innovations • What is the contribution of CRPs to the coherence of research in the CGIAR landscape? • What are the increases in readiness of innovations targeted by projects in RTB portfolio • What are the best practices in supporting projects to enhance their use of innovations they work at scale?
Centre	• What is the cost/benefit of _____ project or program? • What is the cost benefit of _____ M&E activity? • Do we have the right size of staff/critical mass to be successful in our research programs? • Should we continue X research program? (based on M&E findings) • What is the extent to which our innovations have been adopted? By who?
Flagship	• What is the best way to aggregated information at the FP level? • What information is essential? • What is the return on investment for each RTB flagship? • How many scientists know what flagship they contribute to? • What is scientist satisfaction with their flagship in RTB? • What is the Flagship contribution to each component of poverty reduction (income change, food safety, productivity, nutrition)?
Cluster	• How can MEL system help to classify deliverables by type?

Level	Questions
	• Can MEL system categorise the relationship between technologies and users?
Project	• Effectiveness - has the project been able to produce the desired results? • Impact - did varieties released improve HH income levels? • Sustainability - Have target beneficiaries taken ownership of project products? • Relevance - How did the intervention address the needs of targeted beneficiaries?

Participants felt there was a palpable disconnect between what we say we do in ME&L and what we actually do – they highlight the importance not as a data capture framework and tool but as a planning tool so that a clear understanding of what we are trying to measure is integrated into the design of the project/program. The use of the ELQs makes the system focus on what an indicator is going to answer and avoids jumping from activities to indicators without thinking through what it is appropriate to measure. Understanding users is important but some are active users and others are passive. This shapes the interests or priorities that we are serving. The lack of decision making based on data is disheartening. It is important to design the system bottom up considering the needs of the projects who are supposed to be feeding into the project. Much was learnt about the new common indicators, and our internal approaches for alignment. An agreement on the shortage of financial resources led participants to sincerely ask how they could possibly do this.

6. HARMONIZED INDICATORS & OUTCOME CASE STUDIES - PRACTICAL ALIGNMENT AND ACTION FOR REPORTING

Introduction to the Common or System Level Indicators – Claudio Proietti – PMU Manager

An overview of the common indicators and SRF targets was introduced to participants. In doing so, the definitions in indicator reference sheets, the main disaggregation criteria, and further descriptions were also included. At the same time, a link to the *CGIAR's Results Reporting Resources Site* was shared. This website provides direct access to templates, guidance sheets and other useful information for the 2018 CRP reporting cycle. For example, for the indicator on the number and type of innovations by stage, the linkages with the outcome case studies were presented. It was highlighted that relevant evidence is required when an innovation is reported in stages 3 and 4.

Link to presentation

SPHERE OF CONTROL	SPHERE OF INFLUENCE	SPHERE OF INTEREST
C 1 - Number of innovations by stage C 2 - Number of formal partnerships C 3 - Number of direct participants in CGIAR activities C 4 - Number of people trained C 5 - Number of CGIAR research papers published in peer reviewed journals C 6 - Altmetrics	I 1-2 - Projected uptake: ex-ante assessment of people/hectares to benefit from current investments: "Recommendation domain" I 3 - Number of policies/ laws/regulations/ budgets/ investments/curricula (and similar) modified in design or implementation, informed by CGIAR research	OUTCOME STUDY **Short summary supported by appropriate evidence** List of references • Lorem I, et al. 2017. *Title*, (Journal) • Research project report dated XXX • Times of India article (2 Mar. 2017) containing report of Ministerial speech • E-mail from xx to yy dated 2. Feb. [2016] **Linked with SRF and IDOs** Quantification • Actual counts or estimates from a particular study (please provide reference) • Extrapolated estimates

Comments by participants

C1: Innovations

- Probably the most complex indicator in terms of reporting, by volume and diversity
- Definition of what constitutes an innovation need to be further refined
- Definition of types also need to be refined
  - New and adapted varieties cultivars and breeds - different traits in different agro-ecologies (mostly well-defined/understood)
  - Production systems and management practices (high level of aggregation so left ambiguity as to how much detail required to assess these indicators by stage)
  - Other types or sub-types are required e.g. mechanisation not specifically mentioned in no. and stage of innovations. It should appear in 'production systems and management practices' section.
  - Social science - a lot of policy work, social science work (RCTs) - a lot that could be complemented in this category. PIM team - to review and see if everything is covered in there.
  - Knowledge related products that feedback into innovation processes → want to go back to SO to clarify these further
  - Research → much more elaboration and explanation required. Methodology innovation and tools (this was clearly understood)
  - General request for more examples from system office and provide more justification on why the given categories were selected
  - Some of these indicators are driven by donors' existing reporting frameworks (e.g. USAID). So there is further work to define these to the point where we're comfortable
  - Use of gender (gender in the innovation itself) and youth relevance need to be harmonized to be used across the portfolio
  - There are techs and innovations that may not go all the way from stage 1 to 4. Linear approach will not always work
- Within the limitations section of the guidance: The focus is NOT on volume of innovations - (e.g. every minor genetic variation need not be reported) - but a clearer view on the pipeline of innovations that makes sense to the research community.
- It would be valuable to be able to go into more depth into the research process. Most of what we have listed here is just the very end of the research process.
- Useful to be thinking about pipelines of outputs that are moving towards maturity. If we made a comparison with commercial R&D e.g. success rate of matured commercially viable innovations is 1:49,000 attempted – need to be cognisant of benchmarks from elsewhere.
- In terms of piloting collection of M&E data. In some case we may just be collecting data on one innovation - but often there is a lot of important data that comes with it - number of sites, number of people involved, which would be part of the evidence that gets provided in the outcome study to justify maturity for a particular stage achieved.
- What is the appropriate level of aggregation for each type of innovation - e.g. for genetics we are asked not to focus on each individual variety but on a group of varieties that address a specific context/set of needs/traits - but this could be different for other types.

Reporting by 25th of June on this indicator

The group suggested a further discussion with SMO to clarify definitions and provide more examples. PMU should define an internal communications strategy and meet with cluster leaders on this indicator. Further information is needed on how the SMO define stages – as this was more ambiguous. A list of innovations for 2017 reporting is being consolidated by the PMU and the evidence being assembled. Need support from Flagship leaders and scientists to complete this list. Collaboration with EiB is needed to check if stage gate approach proposed for breeding programs may support / be consistent with the approach proposed for this indicator. In

relation to clarity between RTB and centres, some outreach should be done with center focal points on breeding and seed systems -- really key to avoid double reporting requirements. Collective agreement required for reporting and we will need agreement across all levels. If we can get agreement together on what we understand by the stage, then we can take it to SO for any clarification.

C2: Partnerships
- Move toward formal partnerships NOT partners in general or informal partnerships.
- Risk is this doesn't capture the important partners and informal partnerships that are integral to the work that centres are doing.
- Raise this as a clarification to SO on best practice to collect and report on this to system level.
- There is a risk of double counting here which we have to be careful of.
- What do we need to do to make this information more relevant to the centres.
- Need to distinguish what we need to have and what we would like to have. We need to be careful about differentiating these to avoid making it more complex than is worthwhile?

C3&C4: No of direct participants and trainees
- Disaggregation by sex is included in information sought.
- Providing evidence: difficult to ensure that all projects have supporting evidence at this stage.
- How is the verification going to happen of the numbers - is someone really going to check? How and what frequency is meaningful?
- Data availability - guidance on how long the data should be maintained; when do we want to dispose/destroy the data - how does this tie in with GDPR, etc.
- When we think about open events like field days the guidance provided suggests using estimates.
- Expect there to be some kind of resource allocation to support the verification of the data.

C5: Publications
- This is one of the only really scientific indicators.
- Can we somehow include more African journals? We count papers in peer-reviewed journals? There should be a list of which journals are peer reviewed and which are not? The guidance doesn't specify which is which.
- We should have guidance on tagging - e.g. to include centres for example.
- You can get a paper accepted in 2017 and only published in 2018. In the year that it becomes available or accessible on a repository is the year in which it is reported.

7. INDICATOR ALIGNMENT GROUP-WORK

Participants reviewed the set of indicators in use/ under definition in each centre and compared these indicators with the SO common indicators. The aim of the group work was to assess the level of alignment between Center indicators and common indicators and identify possible matching and clear differences. Groups pulled out which indicators mapped against their institutional indicators and mapped them into a spreadsheet, as did the RTB program. The outputs of the group work are presented at this link.

Where indicators from centres were considered very important but not aligned or explicitly captured in the ones proposed by the SMO, the group reflected on whether these indicators should be included for cross-center aggregation as part of RTB program.

Centre: CIP

CIP focuses on its results-oriented strategy that is organized around Strategic Objectives. The alignment with these indicators was quite strong. Most of the indicators were focused on the control and interest levels with a few at the influence levels. Three indicators did not map quite as well.

Centre: Bioversity

Bioversity has a set of indicators at the impact level and a set of leading indicators that contribute to the impact level. There is a greater emphasis on changing capacity of partner organisations. There were two indicators that mapped less well.

Centre: IITA

IITA's institutional indicators mapped well with all the system level indicators. There were four that mapped less well.

Group: RTB

The focus on the use of results (innovations) this can be partially addressed through the outcome studies (linked to stage 4 innovations). The Sphere of influence - not really covered at the same level of control and interest, not because of lack of indicators/tools but lack of a systematic way of actually looking at changes at this level. Two indicators were found to map less well.

Non-aligned indicators of interest across the centres

Indicator	Centre
6. Output Indicator: Number of new jobs created in the agribusiness models scaled out by value chain	IITA
7. Output Indicator: Number of Agribusiness models in the priority crops and livestock supported by IITA scaled out by stakeholders	IITA
11. Output Indicator: Number of IITA supported research Programs and innovations that have mainstreamed gender in their activities (E.g. During design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages)	IITA
4. Output Indicator: Number of people benefiting from IITA priority commodities that have been Biofortified (bred for higher micronutrient content or improved nutritional quality of food products along the value chains)	IITA
Amount of certified, quality declared seed produced	CIP
Number of hectares with improved CIP supported crops	CIP
Amount (in tons, of farm produce) of CIP supported crops produced (yield) in target countries	CIP
Hectares managed under sustainable intensification	Bioversity
`Genetic diversity' of # priority crop species and their wild relatives safeguarded and made available for use	Bioversity
Number of released varieties	RTB
Strengthening seeds systems (evaluative approach)	RTB

8. DETAILED ANALYSIS OF METHODS AND TOOLS FOR EACH OF THE PRIORITY INDICATORS

Further work was undertaken in groups working on 3 priority common indicators. Participants were organised by tables each working on a single indicator. Participants were assigned specific indicators and had access to all reference materials, indicator workbooks, guidance from the SMO, templates in which to report and guidance on the feedback required. The objectives of the session were to review what kinds of methods and tools teams were already using to collect data that related to the SMO indicator, they were asked to check and see whether these methods and tools required refinement or improvement to enable accurate and harmonized reporting, and to identify the roles and responsibilities within centres to collect, systematize and report on this information. The questions participants were asked to answer were

- a) What tools will be used and what adaptations will be made?
- b) Who and how will data be collected?
- c) Who will be reporting and by when?

With this information, it was expected that RTB will have a clear action plan in collecting information for the 2018 Review of Performance report as well as enabling a longer-term plan for harmonizing the RTB ME&L system to continue with ongoing reporting to address all the system level indicators by July 2019.

Results of group work on priority outcomes/indicators

Indicator: # of trainees and participants

Challenges	Solutions	Who	What required	By when
With the current structure it is difficult to track the linkage between training/trainees/participants and Center/Organization	Add Center/Organization as disaggregation criteria	CG system/CRP PMU		In MEL we may track using the organization of the main supervisor of each training
Information about youth (age) → even though not everyone needs this now it is worth including for the future - based on a cut-off point of what constitutes 'youth'.	Need to agree on the definition of youth - what is the age cut-off point Need to include a field not mandatory for age	CRP PMU	Ensure consistency with SMO	TBD
Participants consent on use of their personal data is required - can be collected at the time when they are registering for training - this could be embedded in the registration format	Need to find a balance between each individual centre needs/interest and RTB needs. A formatted sheet could be included to grant consent.	Center / Projects	Revise formats for training registration, list of participants and agreement for consent to keep and use data	
Data quality - 'disaggregability' - we should not be counting participants	When data on individual participants are not collected the	CRP PMU	Clarify with SMO	

Challenges	Solutions	Who	What required	By when
again on each day - but how do we do this when we need to disaggregate by age/sex if we are working with an average	level of accuracy will be lower. Need to verify if this is acceptable?\n\nWe need to understand the cost of collecting information at the individual level and assess the return we get in terms of how the information can be used.			
When asked to track number of people in a training - we can't guarantee the same people were there in the same rounds - so can't we just count unique participants?	The guidance says don't pick the highest number but take an average across the days			Clarified
We don't always use project names - so include agreement number, or BUS	Technical solution to be discussed with MIS teams	CG system/CRP PMU		
Need a definition on how to differentiate CRP vs centre implementation		CRP PMU	Clarify with SMO	

Plan for reporting by 25th of June

- PMOs need to work on coordinating the efforts to make sure everything gets completed on time
- We have already criticised the indicator # of participants. Nevertheless, some donors are asking for these numbers and projects funded through window 3 and bilateral funding are often collecting this data.
- First responsibility for generating the data is with project leader; then the cluster leader will contact all the people concerned; then the PMO will check it. So we are using the list of projects mapped under RTB and cross-check against it.

Indicator: # of Partnerships

Challenges	Solutions	Who	What	By when
Double counting of partnership between centres	Put in place a system of verification	CG system/CRP PMU	Set up verification system	
	Use agreement codes to avoid double counting	NA	include in report template	Done
Omission of important partnerships because they lack an MoU#	Include formal and informal partnership	NA	include in report template	Done
Reporting on multi-year agreements	Include start and end years; clarify whether we are counting 'active partnerships' - i.e. same partnership each	NA	include in report template	Done

	year			
	Clarify whether the indicator is for 'active partnerships' or 'contracts signed in the given year'	CG system	Provide clarification on this	ASAP
Inter-CGIAR partnerships are also important - clarity on this	Include option for Inter-CG partnerships OR make it more explicit by mentioning it in the 'what is excluded' section	CG system	Make a decision on this	
Increased capacity of partners is not captured here	Need a new indicator to address this	Centres/CRP	Need to develop an indicator for this	

Plan for reporting by 25th of June

What	How	By When
Gather the required data as per template (see below)	Engage focal points from each centre (PMOs in coordination with Grants and Contracts and local offices) to extract information on contracts	By 25th of June

Additional feedback:
- Reporting should be an ongoing activity – data should be populated at the time to be used once in the year
- The systems for capturing data should be integrated into the ongoing day to day work
- Training on the features of platforms like MEL that would make it more useful for those involved in projects/operations

Discussion and Clarification Sought:
- Should we include contact information on the partner in the template? Should we have consent clause for capturing data on partnerships?

Proposed template
- Partnership Title
- Name of partner
- Contact details
- Geographic scope
- Type of organisation
- Type of partnership (Formal, Informal, With other CG centre)
- Agreement number
- Phase
- Details
- Start year
- End year
- CRP
- Flagship
- Consent to use of their data

Indicator: # of Policies

The group highlighted the alignment of this indicator with several indicators included in Center/RTB frameworks.

Indicator	Centre
# research strategies developed by IITA supported projects that inform government policy and institutions at national and sub-national levels	IITA
#policy advocacy strategies influenced by IITA supported projects to increase private sector participation along the value chain	IITA
Number of government-led projects/program funded to scale-up CIP supported food-based approaches	CIP
Number of government-led projects/program funded to scale-up CIP supported food-based approaches	CIP
Number of CIP supported crops and products included in national food security related policies and initiatives	CIP
# of policy and practice recs adopted into national practice over 5 years in target countries; associated outcome stories (linked to a specified land area whenever possible; see SO indicator)	Bioversity
At least 4 National and International bodies (including Governments and International Financial Institutions) and 4 Development actors (INGOs, NGOs, grass root organizations, etc....) promote gender-responsive whole diet and sustainable diets approach within their policies, programmes, and investments.	Bioversity
# of policies, regulatory frameworks or programs leaded by government agencies, NGOs, and/or private sector in relevant topics (e.g. RTB seed systems, quarantine and protocols for safe germplasm movements, agriculture for nutrition initiatives, standards	RTB

Challenges and solutions

Challenges	Solutions	Who	What	How	By when
Difficulty in entering data to identify if the data entered is related to policy or legal instruments	More clarification/adjustment	CG system	More clarification		
Lack of convincing evidence especially at stage one	Gather acknowledgements or citation of uptake from next users	Scientists responsible at Center level and PMO	Actual evidence (e.g., meetings, citations, email corresponding, etc)	all available channels of communication	31-Dec
No standardized tool	Proposed reporting template	done	NA	NA	25-Jun
'Taking up' is too vague; it can be considered as output/outcome	To be explained by the short narrative (as proposed in the template)	Included in the template	NA	NA	NA

Challenges	Solutions	Who	What	How	By when
Stage one in process is not sufficiently clear	Stage one of outcome/impact case study needs to be split further -see the proposed reporting template (adapted from USAID Document on Policy)	Included in the template	NA	Center websites	NA

Support required to report on this indicator:

What	Who	When
Share the revised template (see annex)	PMU	01-Jun

Additional feedback:

- Reporting should be an ongoing activity - not something that is urgently required once in the year
- The systems for capturing data should be integrated into the ongoing day to day work at Center level as an outcome story (example from CIAT was shared)
- Training on the features of platforms like MEL and other reporting templates that would make it more useful for those involved in projects/operations

Reactions from participants

- Useful to have a template but we also need to be clear what kind of evidence that we need and have clear/stronger guidance around this
- Some kind of citation policy document that can help to generate evidence about the contribution that has been made
- What is the timeframe for looking at the incorporation of policy recommendations into government? Need to be conscious that it could take years.

Groups considered the indicators that did not fall into the categories that were identified by the SMO. A discussion on why additional indicators were needed and what the incentives were continued. Groups concluded that some of the indicators could be reformulated and included in system indicators and some awareness raising would be necessary to provide information and explanations to scientists and users. Views were shared that suggested both modifying definitions for greater clarity and ensuring that there is always a systematic way of data collection that is relevant to centers and that could be applied in areas that are relevant, for example to 'seed systems' – since many centers are struggling to track varietal releases consistently.

Indicator: Agribusiness models and jobs

Although only IITA proposed this indicator, there is a recognition that similar data is already collected by projects across other centres and may also be relevant to those that don't in the future.

Indicators	Centre
# of agribusiness models in the priority crops and livestock scaled out by stakeholders	IITA
# of new jobs created in the agribusiness models scaled out by value chain	IITA

Challenges and solutions

Challenges	Solutions	Who	When
Definition - what do we count as a business model	Engage concerned individuals from different centres sharing past experiences of how they have used stages and work through to reach consensus (e.g. through webinar)	PMU	Within next 6 months
Definition - what are the phases/stages of value chains	Review relevant literature and arrive at a standard that can be agreed to. Could also use webinars (as above)	PMU	Within next 6 months
Attribution: the success of the model also depends on the business acumen of the businessperson adopting the model	Opportunity to qualify the results to acknowledge other contributors to the achievement of the results	PMU + centre ethics committee	Within next 6 months
Capturing indirect jobs	Too complex/costly to do as part of routine monitoring - but this could be done through an impact assessment. This would also require resources to ensure it is credible and robust.	PMU	Within next 6 months

Participants had an interesting discussion on what constitutes a business model and agreed these can straddle the whole value chain or a small segment of the value chain. Examples were examined: a) sweetpotato silage used for pig, dairy and other livestock feed. While it is an innovation in the value chain, the model is for a part only of the same value chain; b) sweetpotato puree. This innovation also refers to a subsection of the value chain.

Template for reporting was drafted for consideration further.

Participants working on single indicators developed an in-depth awareness of each of the indicators, they were able to raise clarifications in the definitions and descriptions for each indicator and in some cases these clarifications will be pursued from the SMO and in others from the PMU. This also enabled the group to think through the methods and tools they are using for existing indicators – some of which are very similar in nature to the system indicators. The concept of consistent data capture methods and tools was better understood in order to be able to aggregate data. This is a major step in making operational a harmonized system in a complex programme. It is likely that the PMU will have to work very closely ensuring that all groups at different levels collecting data have demonstrated consistency in methods and data collection tools, an ability to ensure data is entered and curated on line and can be both aggregated and searchable to generate a diversity of reports that may be needed by different users of data in the system. Whilst the capacity building costs for this are high at the onset it is likely to yield dividends and efficiencies across the system and enable a much closer collaboration and integration between interdisciplinary teams across different centers. Good progress against these objectives was made, and participants gained value in working through the indicators to understand the process, and

identify how they may use the process in the future to generate data and information against both institutional, system and CRP level indicators in singular processes rather than the double reporting and duplicative efforts that now persist across the CGIAR. The accuracy of the data should enable both the attention of management teams and an ability to make evidence driven decisions. The RTB PMU has an action plan for the immediate reporting needs in July 2018. The PMU will need to continue to build on this plan, ensuring that it becomes a routine daily activity across RTB and the centers to enable a much more elaborate population of the Annual Review of Performance reporting due in July 2019. Additional resources, and innovative approaches will be required to ensure that RTB CRP teams at every level have the capacity and clarity to contribute to this plan moving forwards.

9. OUTCOME CASE STUDY GROUP-WORK

In order to familiarize the participants with the outcome case study approach. Three projects were identified and used as examples to work up what would be required for an outcome case study. Guidance was provided to understand the case studies by breaking them down into actor outcomes and using ELQs to define the kinds of questions that each case study was expected to answer. These were then cross-checked against indicators to satisfy the teams that their indicators would be effective at providing data to help answer these ELQs.

Link to introductory presentation

The following guiding question were shared with the groups:
1. What is the higher-level outcome that this outcome case study is contributing to?
2. Who are the key actors in the system and what are the changes/outcomes associated with them?
   a. This is mainly related to the sphere of influence.
3. What are the key evaluation and learning questions you would like this outcome study to answer.
   a. Think about the different audiences
   b. Think about important cross-cutting dimensions.
4. What information do you already have to help you answer these questions?
   a. Think about the indicators and data collection tools we've been discussing up until now
5. What other information might you need to answer these questions and complete the outcome study?

Case study 1: BASICS

The first table summarizes the information related to key stakeholders and expected changes.

Main outcome: **An industry/processor-responsive pipeline of improved varieties is available to the Nigerian seed system**	
Actors	**Changes expected if project is successful**
Researchers	Know what consumers demand Develop rapid seed multiplication technology (for breeder and foundation seed) Train seed companies to multiply seed
Breeder seed companies (Go-seed and NRCRI)	Rapid seed multiplication (for breeder and foundation seed)
NASC (regulator)	Seed certification Establish a seed certification policy and protocol Increased capacity to deliver certification service
Policy maker	Simplify varietal release policies (including cross-country) Create an enabling environment for seed entrepreneurs
Processors	Adoption of improved varieties Provide feedback to researchers Increased volume and price of quality produce Establish contract growing systems Changed attitudes of processors toward improved varieties
Farmers	Adoption of improved varieties Buying seeds to replenish stock Sell true-to-type produce to processors (same varieties)
Seed companies	Regular replacement of seed Stock Awareness of business opportunities VSEs raise awareness amongst farmers about improved varieties
Consumers	Buying the processed product
Partners (CRS, NRCRI, Context)	Train partners, processors and VSEs Awareness creation Develop tools, guidelines and manuals Conduct market assessments Facilitate linkages between partners

The second table presents the ELQs that have been formulated and the indicators that may help in answering those questions.

ELQs	Indicators
How have project innovations contributed to more effective seed systems?	# of innovations introduced by the project by stage
Has a mechanism been established to multiply breeder seed? • Are researchers and seed multipliers applying accelerated seed multiplication protocols	# of dedicated entities established to multiply breeder seed #of partnerships established between key entities
How effective was the project in achieving the policy changes? • What seed system policies affecting cassava have been enacted?	# of policy changes introduced by stage (with explanation and details)
Is there a functional linkage between Breeders, Breeder Seed Multipliers and Seed Multipliers? • Have appropriate seed certification policies and protocols been enacted • How many seed producers are actively producing seeds nd are they feeling it is a sustainable business? • What is the year-to-year change in the quantity of certified breeders seed, foundation seed produced and purchased	# of entities registered with NASC to produce seed Volume of seed (type) produced by each actor (seed multipliers and breeders) # of farmers buying these varieties disaggregated by age and sex
How have women and youth been integrated into the seed system?	# of participants in market promos disaggregated by age and sex # of seed multipliers and VSEs disaggregated by Age and Sex
What are the major bottlenecks and challenges to be addressed?	
• Which varieties are liked by processors? • What are the key drivers of highly adopted varieties? • Is the produce relevant and totally address the consumers preference or demand?	
Can processors serve as surrogate seed companies/as conduits for improved varieties?	
Are the VSEs and seed companies making profits from seed production and sales?	

Case study 2: BXW management

The first table summarize the information related to key stakeholders and expected changes.

Higher level outcome Loss reduction through use of labour efficient technologies	
Actors	**Changes**
Actors: • Donors, consumers, government, Bioversity/IITA, NARO/NARS, NGOS, Farmers organisations, politicians, farmers	
NARO, NARS, NGOs	Changes in knowledge and practices
NGOs, farmers organisations, politicians	Policy/practices $
Farmers	Practices/skills (efficiency)

The second table presents the ELQs that have been formulated and the indicators that may help in answering those questions.

Key ELQs	Information required
How much labour and money can be saved, and loss avoided for ALL actors?	Existing: Publicly available data (statistical bureau); baseline studies; interviews with traders; interviews with farmers; number of bunches; budget (all levels); labour hrs (in comparison); adoption studies
Who was engaged to reach farmers?	
What factors would limit adoption of good practices?	Additional: Information from publications, reports, statistics

Case study 3: Improved surveillance of BBTV incidence

The first table summarizes the information related to key stakeholders and expected changes.

Only few indicators were identified.

Actors	Changes	Expected outcome	ELQs	Indicator/ Tools +
BA34: NPPO+ADPs+ NARS+NPPO	Incidence of Disease	Provide planting material diagnostic tools		Records of trainings
	Use of Crop Disease Surveillance app			Use recorded in real time
ADPS+NPPO	Receive training + engage farmers	Scouting, diagnosis, mapping, eradication, of diseased plants train farmers on clean planting material provide clean planting material raise awareness at community level information dissemination - messaging policies - quarantine produced	How many trained so what? Numbers of capable of scouting, diagnosis, mapping, etc how much clean planting material disseminated? How many farmers successfully trained? So what? What volume of clean planting material produced? Planted? Sold? At what price?	
NARS (Trained by IITA)	Provide clean planting material	Provide clean planting materials training on clean planting materials low cost production methods track disease spread and promote micropropagation methods track performance of clean planting material, train farmers of ADPs	How many trained? So what? Men/Women? What intelligence on spread + tracking? How much clean planting material produced, disseminated, to whom? How many ADPs or farmers trained - clean planting methods, macro-propagation methods	
Media	Training materials provided by IITA	Awareness raising programmes and strategy communicated reach n? so what? Self-reported feedback from listeners? Info on 'what to do?' 'where to go?' 'how to help?' how efficient a means to teach farmers?	How many campaigns broadcasts? (modules on clean planting material, awareness raising, what to do, low cost production materials) What audience reach? Men/women? So what? How cost effective and how efficient a way to communicate? Any feedback - mobile to radio?	

Actors	Changes	Expected outcome	ELQs	Indicator/ Tools +
Farmers	have raised awareness	Stop using infected material eradicate infected material seek clean planting material and adopt it increase own production of clean plant material farmer entrepreneurs selling clean plants learning macro-propagation techniques report farmer to farmer info flows	How many farmers? What volume of improved material replacing eradicated mats/geography? Volume of clean plan mats produced? Disseminated or sold? Cost of clean plant mats produced, revenue generated from sales increase in area of clean plant material/ yield and incomes number of women, men, where, survey quantitative, qualitative	

The opportunity to work through the outcome case study with examples helped establish the process that would be required to report in this format. It was highlighted that this will require evidence of having contributed to outcomes. Using the examples also provided scientists and M&E experts had a chance to work together and share ideas and solutions and agree on areas where further clarification is sought to ensure accurate and timely reporting.

10. WORKING SMARTER: IDEAS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

An area of anxiety for the majority of participants is how to mobilize the funding needed to collect data, particularly in relation to the evidence that is being requested from the SMO, to substantiate the progress made towards the delivery of outputs and the achievement of outcomes. There is no mention of additional funding being provided, and program teams and MEL officers and focal points are extremely thinly stretched with inadequate budgets and much political support.

An idea was presented to participants to enable groupings of projects with some common threads that could be used to more systematically capture data across different tools and methods to fulfil the requirements of both the centres as well as the SMO and be attractive to fund externally, or in collaboration with SPIA and other bodies of the system.

An example drawn from two IFPRI initiatives called Gender and Agricultural Assets Project (GAAP I and GAAP II) which focused on gender assets in agricultural projects and developing a project-based Women Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) respectively was presented. These two portfolio approaches looked at 8 and 13 projects simultaneously to study various aspects related to them and were supported by external resources.

Link to ALINE presentation

Ideas for resource mobilisation on M&E (Round 1)

Once the GAAP case studies were presented, the group was asked to think carefully about potential groupings of their work to identify ideas that may be used to develop project proposals. They were asked to get really creative, think out of the box, challenge themselves to think differently. Participants worked in three groups and had two rounds of discussion. The results of each group x round are presented below.

Key drivers of sustainability for clonally propagated crops seed systems

Seed systems development is an area of work where it will be possible to examine together several different projects implemented by different centres.

Proposal development should be driven by specific research questions, for example:

1. **What are the key drivers of sustainability for clonally propagated crops seed systems?**
   a. Keywords to be considered: #scaling up, #food and nutrition security; #women, #youth
2. **What are the approaches that have been implemented to address identified gaps/challenges?**
   a. Recognising the value of documenting and communicating findings for replication and scaling

Some key outputs expected for this set of studies:

- Tools for assessments (creation and collation of tools)
- Documenting business models and innovations
- Replicable M&E approach for other CRPs and R4D programs
- Replicable/scalable models and innovations to be shared with other stakeholders

Partnership to build on:

- PIM looking at regulatory framework - already a couple of studies have been done in Nigeria (Cassava), in Vietnam (Cassava) and in Kenya (Potato). But we don't have a big picture and don't know what the learning questions we want to answer.

Additional reflection:
- Role of cluster 5.1 in this type of initiatives should be strengthened. Communication with flagships and clusters need to be enhanced to build consensus and synergies. It is possible to leverage our own funding as well as additional funding BUT need to think about a broader focus on M&E, not just IA.

Assessment of seed system innovations and models
- Identify and test ELQs/indicators for measuring the success of seed system -related initiatives
- Sets of case studies/projects (including models outside of RTB portfolio that could be of interest - other geographies, other organizations)
- Systematic data collection to support internal project learning and adaptation (lessons transferable to other projects or helpful to design new models)
- Identify bottlenecks - what the ongoing initiatives plan to address and what they are facing as key challenges
- Meta-analysis and learning across project level
- Including gender analysis

Next steps:
- Cross-check what is already happening
- Cross-check what we already have
- Liaise with RTB seed systems group

Additional comments:
- Focus should be on evaluating what is already working but also on how to move toward more systematic approach to data collection in this arena and build something that will be helpful in the future.
- Need to think if and how tools and information generated may be taken up by entrepreneurs. Inclusion of pilots in different geographies and contexts could be included
- Establish a list of names who might want to work on developing this idea further.

Adoption rates of CG-related RTB varieties
The first idea that was discussed in the group was around the adoption of CG-related varieties.

- What are the adoption rates of the varieties of vegetatively propagated crops (co)developed by CG
  - What are the mechanisms for successful adoption of these - potentially from a gender perspective
  - Identify contact people in each centre to follow up on this
- Significant experience working on the tracking of adoptions. New methods available (DNA fingerprinting) but need for a lot of resources. Also, the basic tracking of material is the first step - and there is very weak tracking of this.
- If we ask about adoption - we're getting into something that is almost beyond what we set out to do. We need a basis for deciding when it's appropriate to look at this. This should happen right at the start, at the stage of even coming up with a project/technology/innovation.

The group also discussed the challenges in measuring policy influence and the role of research.

- Policy and data management - how could strengthening national statistical offices bring greater returns on donor investment and increase quality
  - And look at limitations in our attempts to influence policy
  - Very little known about ways/tools/mechanisms to influence policy
  - Need a broader view across the system to see what is successful and what is not
  - Need a tool that helps us to do this
  - How to influence policy - who would we need to work with and at which levels? What collaborations? What characteristics of orgs required to achieve influence?
  - Analyse way to analyse policies based on research to see what benefits are derived and how this links to long-lasting governments

Ideas for resource mobilisation on M&E (Round 2)

Assess CG role in the development of NARS capacities

- Continued interest in Capacity Development initiatives and their results but poor data management and monitoring systems
- Quantitative vs qualitative approach to data collection and analysis. Need for integrated methodologies - to see what actually happens to people who get trained and understand what the long-term results are
- Mandate of CG to work with NARS - so to evaluate throughout the years - to what extent has CG actually contributed to capacity of the NARS - e.g. 6-7 centres working with NRAS and multiple projects - no concerted effort to work on this - not just focus on projects but actually contribute to NARS as an institution
- Who will fund? This is a mandate of the CG - so could perhaps demonstrate good use of the funds; demonstrate best practices in working with NARS. Donors would likely be interested.
- Training is a very central piece of our work but this would give us a more meaningful way of looking at what it's being achieved.
- Is the CG model the most appropriate one? E.g. there are other approaches NARS-NARS, universities, etc. Some use individual models - but don't have institutional focus.
- This could be broadened even further to look at NARS capacity building more generally and then CG within this. Could also look at human capital development - e.g. NEPAD, gaps in science tech people, what institutions producing them, what kind of further capacity/training is required
- African Union Strategy 2050 for Science and technology capacity enhancement - this may provide a framework to develop a proposal

How to mobilize fund to institutionalize existing tools

The group discussed if the harmonization and promotion of data management tools across the system could be a sellable topic for resource mobilization.

- Aim is to define an approach to institutionalise the tools (for data collection/reporting) that we already have to strengthen results-based management in RTB
- Some tools are already available BUT they are not being used.
- It appeared that for this topic the institutional commitment may be more important than the resources allocated. As discussed in previous days, institutional willingness is key to enable whatever tool to be used across projects and by several centres.
- Example of tools are: PATH database + PROMISE database; Seed tracker tool that can be used for multiple crops → we need to harmonise these and establish this. We shouldn't do this multiple time and we shouldn't be using excel sheets. We should have a simple database that can track all this and feed it into MEL or whatever platforms. So that scientists can just report once.

- Data managers should be involved in the definition of strategies to address this topic in a way that adds values to all the centres.
- We have the opportunity to use a whole suite of tools ODK, google, etc., and we must acknowledge that we are using different tools. We may look at the definition of common/harmonized parameters and then share so that the data has a common structure. Currently we have problems in harvesting data even from CGSpace because, unless the librarian puts the required IDs to link the information with other MIS, we can't make the links (e.g. between a publication and the scientist/etc.).

Factors affecting youth agribusiness

There is an incredible work to do to understand factors affecting youth agribusiness

Questions:

- What makes youth agribusiness initiatives work?
- What will attract the youth into agribusinesses?
- What are the successful youth agribusiness models for scaling?
- How can we identify and learn about critical success factors?
- The group discussed the nature of the model(s) - one size fits all or is it more about components
- The discussion focused more on the agribusiness models that IITA is incubating - but it's too early to say much about them

Participants were encouraged to continue to think in this way as they looked for opportunities to mobilise resources across the programme and their respective centres.

CONCLUSIONS

Most centres and RTB participants found it relatively straightforward to examine and align the common indicators with their centre priorities and subsequently not only within RTB at the CRP level but also at levels of flagships, clusters and projects. The alignment exercise revealed synergies across centres in relation to the output indicators, especially innovations and partnerships, and also in relation to outcome case studies that will need to be assembled across centres. This is very encouraging. Participants did not exhibit significant opposition to harmonized results reporting aligned with these indicators (particularly providing feedback in more organised ways) and found a way to also integrate indicators that were more centre specific as part of this reporting process acknowledging the continuing importance of results reporting for centres and in order to answer key evaluation and learning questions in centres and also in RTB (including at different levels).

A series of clarifications were sought from SMO mainly in relation to identifying better descriptive guidance on what belongs within the indicator in question, and whether indicators e.g. "# of Partnerships" should actually contain both formal and informal partnerships. The latter being identified as a category of importance to centres and to RTB. In collaboration with ALINE, PMU will provide feedback to the SMO following the workshop and will provide inputs for the revision and improvement of the indicator guidance sheets. PMU will also work closely with PMOs in centres from now until the 25th June to implement the agreed tasks, facilitate the data collection process on common indicators and complete the 2017/2018 reporting cycle.

Some further follow-up actions agreed at the end of the workshop included:

- PMU will provide structured and supportive guidance around the new requirements for planning and reporting by organizing webinars and sharing learning materials.
- PMU will spearhead the data collection and reporting on indicators for 2017 and beyond. It will be important to prioritise reaching cluster leaders and scientists to make the reporting process digestible and provide clarity on the tools required to report against respective indicators.
- Centres also raised ways in which they could assist to help support scientists e.g. IITA has discussed a capacity building plan at the centre level to be provided to M&E unit so that they can support the scientists in different clusters, etc. It may be possible to include more than one centre in these efforts.
- Webinars on new SMO requirements for planning and reporting and on ME&L functions are likely to be helpful in building capacity and greater ownership.
- PMU, in collaboration with Cluster 5.1, will promote further development of the ideas for funds raising with cluster leaders and key scientists. More innovative ways to mobilize additional resources for broader and more systematic monitoring and evaluation approaches are needed starting with the identification of specific donors with interest in the topics that we are looking at. These ideas will also be discussed with the Management Committee and the Independent Steering Committee to have their buy-in and support for the forward implementation of these concepts.

It is a priority to plan around the MEL platform, much of the functionality is poorly understood and many of the pre-workshop survey revealed the challenges and the expectations from the platform more clearly.

MEL users were encouraged in using the different communication and feedback systems that are already active: (1) chat for real time troubleshooting. (2) GitHub screenshot icon that takes and sends direct messages to

programmers on platform bugs and other issues; (3) discussion forum, where the user can invite other users; (4) online guide, that uses text and screenshots to explain everything about the platform.

Organization of webinars and online courses, will be a valuable opportunity to find ways to integrate the information on new reporting standards with information on the use and functionality of the platform that are less known/used. Two main actions need to be planned in the near future:

- Support learning on MEL functionalities across CRPs/centres including GLDC, RTB, CIRAD, Bioversity, A4NH.
- Actively contribute in the System level group working on interoperability, trying to come up with cross-system tools that may be used across CRPs. Compatibility and harmonization (e.g. MEL and MARLO) is possible and an opportunity for cross-learning without forcing everyone into a single system.

Participants found valuable and creative the work on identifying ideas for outcome reporting in a more systematic and organised way. The outcome case study approach, more than the target-led reporting, may foster collaborative and strategic thinking across clusters and help building on synergies across flagships and clusters. PMU will use the three outcome case studies ideas developed during the workshop and identify whether other themes could emerge from a more organised process that will include what flagship 5 is doing in relation to scaling readiness and scaling process

ANNEXES

1. WORKSHOP AGENDA

Time	Sessions
DAY	**1**
800 to 0830	**Opening session** Workshop opening and welcome to participants by IITA representative
0830 to 0940	**Introduction** Introductory session that sets out main objectives for the workshop
0940 to 1045	**System level perspective on results reporting and performance-based management** Presentation from Julia Compton followed by Q&A
1045 to 1100	**BREAK**
1100 to 1200	**Harmonising indicators and aggregation in complex ME&L systems** Presentations from ALINe and RTB with example of working on complex (multi-level, multi-actor, and/or multi-country) ME&L system
1200 to 1300	**ME&L systems in the RTB community** Presentations from 1-2 centres on their ME&L systems: what's been done so far, what's worked and what hasn't worked, how has information that has been generated been used? Structured group work to facilitate participants reactions to the presentations, reflections on their own experiences (similarities, differences, common challenges, etc.)
1300 to 1400	**LUNCH**
1400 to to 1515	**Users of the ME&L system** Presentation of the results from the stakeholder survey. Clarifying understanding of key users of the ME&L system and their needs (management, reporting, etc.) at each level ● Defining levels ● Defining users at each level ● Defining key purposes at each level
1515 to 1545	**BREAK**
1545 to 1700	**Identifying ELQs at CRP, flagship and cluster levels** Group work and plenary activities to identify key questions that the ME&L system is expected to answer at different levels. To the extent possible, this will be framed in relation to the TOCs at various levels.

Time	Sessions
DAY	**2**

0800 to 0830	**Opening and recap**
	Review of key outputs from day 1:
	    ● Users and their needs (what they need from the ME&L system)
	    ● Key evaluation and learning questions
	
	Reflections/observations from participants/key points to keep in mind during the day.

0830 to 0930	**Aligning currently collected indicators with the common indicators and SRF targets**
	    ● Overview of the common indicators and SRF targets (slide summarizing them on the screen)
	    ● This includes an introduction to the initial/preparatory work done on alignment of indicators

0930 to 1100	**Aligning currently collected indicators with the common indicators and SRF targets - continued** **Group work**
1100 to 1130	**BREAK**
1130 to 1200	**Group work continues (30 mins)**
1200 to 1300	**Feedback from each of the tables - and agreement on priority non-aligned indicators to be picked up later**
1300 to 1400	**LUNCH**
1400 to 1515	**Group work: Analysis of priority outcomes/indicators - Section 1** Participants work in outcomes/indicators - based groups to identify how to aggregate and report indicators across projects, clusters and flagships up to the CRP and System level.
1515 to 1545	**BREAK**
1545 to 1700	**Group work: Analysis of priority outcomes/indicators - Section 1 continuation** Continued from previous session. Presentations back from each of the 3 tables a. What tools will be used and what adaptations will be made? b. Who and how will data be collected? c. Who will be reporting and by when?

Time	Sessions
DAY	**3**
0800 to 1030	**Group work: Analysis of priority outcomes/indicators - Section 2** The session will begin with a recap from day 2 to start addressing a second set of indicators. A list of indicators will be provided to participants and groups will work on specific indicators, addressing challenges, solutions, methods for reporting, roles, responsibilities and next steps. The session will include iterative spaces of group work presentation
1030 to 1100	**BREAK**
1100 to 1300	**Group work: Analysis of priority outcomes/indicators - Section 2 continuation** Continued from previous session. Presentations back from each of the 3 tables a. What tools will be used and what adaptations will be made? b. Who and how will data be collected? c. Who will be reporting and by when?
1300 to 1400	**LUNCH**
1400 to 1515	**Group work: Analysis of priority outcomes/indicators - Section 3** Create a third list of indicators based on the interest of the specific centers and the ELQs established. Work with the list of indicators prepared with participants. Groups will work on specific selected indicators, addressing challenges, solutions, methods for reporting, roles, responsibilities and next steps. The session will include iterative spaces of group work presentation
1515 to 1545	BREAK
1545 to 1700	**Group work: Analysis of priority outcomes/indicators - Section 3 continuation** Continued from previous session. Presentations back from each of the 3 tables a. What tools will be used and what adaptations will be made? b. Who and how will data be collected? c. Who will be reporting and by when?
DAY	**4**
0800 to 0900	**Review of progress made for priority indicators** Summary presentation of group work for Sections 1, 2 and 3. Participants will reflect on the main agreements, roles and responsibilities to complete the 2017 annual reporting process. Revise information needs, roles and responsibilities for other indicators that need to be reported.

Time	Sessions
0900 to 1030	**Visualizing indicators and evaluation challenges in the current funding scenario** Presentation of some challenges for monitoring systems and donor requirements.
1030 to 1130	BREAK
1130 to 1300	**Visualizing indicators and evaluation challenges in a funding scenario** Continuation ... What are the key areas that need support to implement and strengthen the CRP/Center's monitoring system? Do current Impact Assessment studies respond to targeted indicators? If not, what would need to be included?
1300 to 1400	**LUNCH**
1400 to 1530	**Visualizing indicators and evaluation challenges in a funding scenario** Continuation ... Brainstorming and group work on opportunities to address joint fundraising to support the implementation of monitoring systems and strengthen capacities for impact assessment.
1530 to 1600	BREAK
1600 to 1645	**Conclusion of the workshop** Summing up what has been achieved/agreed. Outlining the plan for completing the action plan in order to achieve the July reporting deadline
1645 to 1700	**Workshop evaluation** Assessment by participants of the extent to which the workshop achieved its objectives Identification of key issues expected to be covered that were not addressed
1700 to 1715	**Closing remarks** Official workshop closure by IITA representative

2. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

N	Participant	Organization	Position	Email	Comments
1	Alessandra Furtado	CIP	Project Development Unit	A.Furtado@cgiar.org	Confirmed
2	Elisabetta Gotor	Bioversity	IA specialist, Cluster leader	e.gotor@cgiar.org	Remote connection, Confirmed
3	Enrico Baccioni	Bioversity	BVI Manager	e.baccioni@cgiar.org	Remote connection, Confirmed
4	Bettina Heider	CIP	RTB - PMO	B.Heider@cgiar.org	Confirmed
5	Nina Jakobi	Bioversity	RTB - PMO	N.Jakobi@cgiar.org	Confirmed
6	Enoch Kikulwe	Bioversity	IA and M&E specialist	e.kikulwe@cgiar.org	Confirmed
7	Benson Kisinga	CIP	M&E and data manager	B.Kisinga@cgiar.org	Confirmed
8	James Legg	IITA	Flagship leader	J.LEGG@CGIAR.ORG	Not confirmed
9	Godfrey Mulongo	CIP	M&E specialist	G.Mulongo@cgiar.org	Remote attendance
10	Oriana Muriel Guzman	CIAT	RTB - PMO	o.muriel@cgiar.org	Confirmed
11	David Obisesan	CIP	M&E specialist	D.Obisesan@cgiar.org	Confirmed
12	Richard Ofei	IITA	RTB - PMO	R.Ofei@cgiar.org	Confirmed
13	Julius Okello	CIP	IA and M&E specialist	J.Okello@cgiar.org	Remote connection, Confirmed
14	Tonny Omwansa	IITA	Director of research support	T.Omwansa@cgiar.org	Not confirmed
15	Monica Parker	CIP	Cluster leader	M.Parker@cgiar.org	Not confirmed
16	Vivian Polar	RTB	RTB - PMU	V.Polar@cgiar.org	Confirmed
17	Claudio Proietti	RTB	RTB - PMU	C.Proietti@cgiar.org	Confirmed
18	Rosern Rwampororo	IITA	Head of M&E unit	R.Rwampororo@cgiar.org	Confirmed
19	Murat Sartas	IITA	Innovation systems scientist	M.Sartas@cgiar.org	Confirmed
20	Kumar Lava	IITA	Cluster leader	l.kumar@cgiar.org	Confirmed
21	Kirimi Sindi	CIP	Senior scientist and country manager	K.Sindi@cgiar.org	Confirmed
22	Ricardo Labarta	CIAT	IA specialist	r.labarta@cgiar.org	Confirmed

N	Participant	Organization	Position	Email	Comments
23	Janelee Waldock	CIAT	M&E specialist	j.waldock@cgiar.org	Confirmed
24	Luka Wanjohi	CIP	Regional Senior Knowledge Management Associate, SSA Research, Kenya	l.wanjohi@cgiar.org	Confirmed
25	Eglantine Fauvelle	CIRAD	RTBfoods Project Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning	eglantine.fauvelle@cirad.fr	Confirmed
26	Yvonne Pinto	Aline	Aline consultant	yvonne@alineimpact.com	Confirmed
27	Andre Ling	Aline	Aline consultant	andre@alineimpact.com	Confirmed
28	Amanda Wyatt	A4NH	Program Manager	A.Wyatt@cgiar.org	Remote connection, Confirmed
29	Enrico Bonaiuti	GLDC	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Specialist, Deputy Director General - Research	E.Bonaiuti@cgiar.org	Confirmed
30	Patrick Adebola	IITA	Project Leader for Africa Yam	p.adebola@cgiar.org	
31	Djana Mignouna	IITA	M & E specialist	D.Mignouna@cgiar.org	Confirmed
32	Peter Kulakow	IITA	Cluster Leader	p.kulakow@cgiar.org	Confirmed
33	Joy Chibueze	IITA	Junior M&E Specialist	J.Chibueze@cgiar.org	Confirmed
34	Ramota Bankole	IITA	Junior M&E Specialist	R.Bankole@cgiar.org	Confirmed
35	Elizabeth Babalola	IITA	Junior M&E Specialist	E.Babalola@cgiar.org	Confirmed
36	Chiekezi Opara	IITA	Junior M&E Specialist	C.Opara@cgiar.org	Confirmed

3. TEMPLATE FOR # OF POLICIES/INVESTMENTS

Policy/Investment Title			
Name of Policy/Investment			
Geographic scope			
Type of organisation Implementing			
Type of policy/investment	Education	Research	
Proposed stage in process (with sub-stages)	Stage 1a: drafted and presented for public and stakeholder consultation	Stage 1b: presented for Legislation/Decree/Funding/curriculum	Stage 2 of Policy/law enacted
Short narrative (max 300)			
CGIAR subIDO			
Gender Focus	Not targeted	significant objective	
Youth Focus			
CRP			
Flagship			

4. TEMPLATE FOR # OF AGRIBUSINESS MODELS

Models	Name	Phase	By Commodity	Value Chain Stage	Agribusiness	Scaling out Stakeholders (Types)	By country	Jobs # (Age/Sex)
1		Pilot	X, Y, Z	Production	A, B, C			
2		Completion of Pilot		Processing				
3		Available for Next User		Distribution				
		Taken up form Next User		* Search for Value Chain literature/ definitions (standards) to include the input supply side				
		OR						
		Research (Developed)						
		Piloted (Validated)						
		Available for Uptake						
		Uptake						

The CGIAR Research Program on Roots, Tubers and Bananas (RTB) is a partnership collaboration led by the International Potato Center implemented jointly with Bioversity International, the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), and the Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (CIRAD), that includes a growing number of research and development partners. RTB brings together research on its mandate crops: bananas and plantains, cassava, potato, sweetpotato, yams, and minor roots and tubers, to improve nutrition and food security and foster greater gender equity especially among some of the world's poorest and most vulnerable populations.

www.rtb.cgiar.org