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# Executive summary

1. The objective of this CCER was to evaluate the progress made since the EPMR of 2006, to assess consistency with the evolving mission of the CGIAR and emerging global challenges in the dry areas and to examine the recommendations and implications of the 2009 CGIAR Stripe Review of Social Sciences for ICARDA’s socioeconomic and policy research agenda. The panel worked jointly in ICARDA office in Amman from 25 - 29 April 2014 and split for the visits to ICARDA’s outreach programs in Morocco and Cairo until May 2. Major sources of information for this review were discussions with ICARDA management and staff, presentations made by members of the SEPRP and ICARDA planning documents including the Strategic Plan 2007 – 2016, the Medium Term Plan 2011 – 2013, the EPMR report of 2006, and the most recent evaluation of ICARDA’s socioeconomic research of 2009.

2. The panel divided the work by different topics based on comparative advantage of expertise and experience which is reflected in the different chapters of the report. The report is composed of seven chapters, namely introduction, assessment of SEPRP’s vision and mission in chapter 2, resources and management in chapter 3, science quality in chapter 4, international cooperation in chapter 5, and research to development continuum in chapter 6 and finally, a summary of recommendations in chapter 7. Statistical material is presented in appendices.

3. Regarding SEPRP’s vision and mission, the panel notes that this needs to be more clearly articulated both in documents and voiced by ICARDA staff. Although ICARDA social science research has the mission of contributing to the Center’s overall mission of research impact, ICARDA social science nevertheless should have its own vision that better facilitates research which is in line with the procedures of the discipline. SEPRP should use its clearly formulated vision to plan and evaluate its activities and define its place both within ICARDA and in the global development research community.

4. Based on the assessment of SEPRP’s human resources (chapter 3 of the report) and in view of the challenges ahead, the review panel recommends the appointment of additional research staff in SEPRP with priority given to expertise in adoption and impact assessment and in natural resource economics. In policy research, capacity should be strengthened in order for ICARDA to be able to capitalize on the ongoing changes in the agricultural sectors in the Arab and other dry land countries to become a Center of Excellence for Agricultural Policy with emphasis on the WANA region. This would not endanger ICARDA’s global mandate but such a move would allow ICARDA to capitalize from the opportunity for unique research emerging from the high demand for new agricultural policy regimes in the Arab world where ICARDA social science is already well recognized. Additional funding outside the CRP should be sought and effective collaboration with IFPRI and/or appropriate ARIs will be crucial to implement such projects.

5. SEPRP has the potential to increase its publication performance both in terms of quality and quantity. Research output rates have fallen below targets due to staff turnover, the disruption caused by the introduction of the CRP system within the CGIAR and the recent relocation of the Center. The panel recommends that ICARDA/SEPRP management establish targets for high-quality publications. Given ICARDA’S mission and the current level of staffing, at least one and, on average, three articles per year in journals such as Journal of Development Studies, Ecological Economics, Agricultural Economics or World Development should be possible. Also, given the high relevance of the global dry land agriculture problem under climate change conditions, there is an excellent opportunity for a high class paper in Nature or Science jointly with biophysical scientists which would give high recognition to ICARDA’s work and give them leadership in this field of development.

6. The recruitment of the senior social analysis/gender specialist should be pursued as a matter of urgency. Recruitment of a further social scientist with gender expertise should be seriously considered if the ICARDA programs have resources to allocate to social and gender research within their portfolios. Support for gender reporting and proposal development could be enhanced without increasing the demands on social scientists, through the production of guidelines (some of which exist elsewhere and just need to be adopted) and notes for mainstreaming gender into the project cycle, starting from the design phase.

7. ICARDA’s decentralization will increase the importance and prominence of national partners, particularly the NARS. Existing research platforms will help consolidate dispersed research activities but linkages to non-platform countries will also grow as more administration and project work is decentralized. Growth of biophysical programs will necessitate increased participation by the socioeconomics group leading to increased expectations which need to be carefully managed. Therefore, SEPRP should clearly identify its comparative advantage and seek an appropriate balance between national interests, research for development and research for the production of IPGs.

8. The review panel recommends that ICARDA/SEPRP should take efforts to increase the strength and breadth of its linkages to ARIs. While recognizing that the CG’s new business model might constrain funding for such activities, the panel believes that ARI linkages will clearly benefit SEPRP. Younger SEPRP scientists will benefit from these research linkages. Research quality will increase further as ARI researchers become more intensively involved in ongoing and new research. Many of the newer techniques in impact assessment, valuation methods, and behavioral economics applied to institutional design have not yet flowed broadly to the CG Centers including ICARDA and stronger linkages with ARIs will facilitate this flow.
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# Chapter 1: Introduction

## 1.1 Background

In 2012 ICARDA requested a Centre Commissioned External Review (CCER) of its social, economic and policy research across the Center. The implementation of the CCER was delayed until early 2014 as a result of ICARDA’s relocation and decentralization activities in connection with the Syrian crisis. Finally, the CCER took place from 24 April to 2 May 2014 with a team of four, namely Adrienne Martin (UK), Hamid Faki - (Sudan), Jeffrey Alwang (USA) and Hermann Waibel (chair, Germany).

The objective of the review is first to evaluate the progress made since the External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of 2006 which recommended that all research activities on socio economics and policy in other mega-projects be integrated in the then existing Mega Project 5 on *Poverty and Livelihood Analysis and Impact Assessment in Dry Areas* (EPMR recommendation 3) and that additional staff are hired to increase the capacity of the socioeconomics Program (recommendation 11). The second objective of the CCER was to assess whether the research is consistent with the evolving mission of the CGIAR and the current and emerging global challenges in the dry areas. Third; the CCER panel was asked to examine the recommendations and implications for ICARDA’s socioeconomic and policy research agenda of the 2009 Stripe Review of Social Sciences in the CGIAR.

Following the common CCER practice in the CGIAR the panel visited ICARDA in Amman as well as Regional and Country Programs in Jordan, Egypt and Morocco in order to assure interactions with other stakeholders and to obtain maximum information within the given time and budget constraints.

## 1.2 Summary of ToRs

Since the Terms of Reference given by ICARDA were originally written in 2012 the panel took the liberty to streamline these in order to reduce redundancy and to bring them up to date. Following this approach, in addition to assessing the progress made since the recommendations of the 5th EPMR, the panel looked at four broad issues in relation to social, economic and policy research at ICARDA:

1. Program vision and mission, in particular:

a) Progress in developing a shared mission and vision for the Center’s social science research and future directions.

b) How SEPRP’s mission, vision and future plans can foster closer integration across ICARDA, i.e. how SEPRP is collaborating with the three other ICARDA Research Programs?

c) Current and future relevance and focus of ICARDA’s socio-economic research with respect to the Center’s Strategic Plan, the CGIAR Program structure, and demands from the Center’s biophysical Research Programs and national partners.

(2) Science quality and productivity of ICARDA’s social science research in terms of:

a) Adequacy of the social, economic and agricultural policy research portfolio across the Center, including especially the social and gender dimension as well as policy research, particularly with regard to NRM and water management.

b) The standard of the research procedures applied, e.g. journal publications in terms of quality and quantity and impact assessment and dissemination studies, including the assessment of private uptake pathways of ICARDA’s research products.

c) Important research areas which are presently not addressed.

f) Composition of SEPRP’s research team and structure as well as knowledge gaps in the team relative to the tasks ahead.

g) Implications of the recommendations provided by the CGIAR Stripe Review of Social Sciences for SEPRP’s agenda.

h) The impact of SEPRP research outputs and outcomes including the production of international public goods in line with ICARDA’s mission and vision.

(3) International cooperation and partnerships in particular the questions:

a) Adequacy and extent of current research partnerships, how these may be strengthened and how they more effectively be called upon for input along the research-for-development impact pathway;

b) Adequacy and quality of current partnerships, including those with other CGIAR centers, particularly partnership with IFPRI, advanced research institutions, NARS, civil society and the private sector, for advancing ICARDA’s social, economic and agricultural policy research across the Center.

c) What is the extent of the Center’s involvement with community approaches and their effectiveness in research-for-development?

(4) The research to development continuum, specifically;

a) Has the internal balance of research-for-development been appropriately struck?

b) Are appropriate uptake pathways (from output to outcome to impact) for the adoption of ICARDA products being adequately explored?

c) What is the extent of the Center’s involvement with community approaches and their effectiveness in research-for-development?

(5) Resources allocated to social, economic and policy research across ICARDA, particularly the questions:

a) Does the Center provide enough human and financial resources for social, economic and agricultural policy research across the Center to play its role under the changing conditions of the CGIAR?

b) Are resource and resource mobilization efforts sufficient to meet the increasing demand for social science research and support?

The panel was asked by ICARDA to provide a list of clear recommendations for action in improving the social science research at ICARDA with the aim of achieving the center’s mission. Recommendations are given for each of the four topics listed above and are summarized in the final chapter of the report.

## 1.3 Concept of the review

The total time available for the panel was 20 working days of which 8 days were spent meeting with ICARDA management and staff in Amman, attending the presentation of social, economic and agricultural policy research across the Center, discussing with staff of the NARS in Jordan, Egypt and Morocco and visiting two outreach programs, namely the ICARDA Regional Office for Nile Valley and Sub Saharan Africa in Cairo and the ICARDA office in Rabat where SEPRP collaborates with the Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), part of the Moroccan NARS.The panel worked jointly in Amman from 25 - 29 April 2014 and split for the visits to ICARDA’s outreach programs. Adrienne Martin and Jeffrey Alwang visited Morocco. They were accompanied by SEPRP Director Aden Aw-Hassan. Hamid Faki and Hermann Waibel visited the ICARDA Cairo office. They were accompanied by SEPRP staff member Dina Najjar.

Sources of information for this review were major ICARDA planning documents including the Strategic Plan 2007 – 2016, the Medium Term Plan 2011 – 2013, the EPMR report of 2006, and the most recent evaluation of ICARDA’s socioeconomic research of 2009 which had been commissioned by the European Commission which was a donor to the then Mega project 8 Poverty and Livelihood Analysis and Impact Assessment in Dry Areas. The panel was also provided with copies of SEPRP’s publications and technical reports. Personal interviews were held with ICARDAmanagement, Research Program Directors and staff. While the visits and meetings took place under considerable time pressure in view of the short time period available for this CCER communication was most effective and fruitful and the panel was able to get a good overview of ICARDA’s economic, policy and social science work.

The panel divided the work by different topics based on comparative advantage of expertise and experience. To a large extent this is reflected in the different chapters of the report. Adrienne Martin focused on gender and social research as well as on the issue of the Research-for- Development- Continuum. Jeff Alwang analyzed the Center’s vision and mission and looked in detail at the program’s International Cooperation activities. Hamid Faki focused on the question of resource allocation and some management issues while Hermann Waibel took on the coordination of the panel report and specifically dealt with science quality complemented by Jeff Alwang’s and Adrienne Martin’s inputs.

## 1.4 Outline of the report

The report comprises seven chapters. In chapter 2 an overview of SEPRP’s activities is provided, and the assessment of SEPRP’s vision is discussed. Chapter 3 deals with resources and management and chapter 4 addresses science quality. In chapter 5 SEPRP’s international cooperation activities are analyzed and in chapter 6 the research to development continuum is described and analyzed. Finally in chapter 7, a summary of recommendations is submitted.

# Chapter 2: Overview of SEPRP’s activities and assessment of its vision

## 2.1 Overview of SEPRP programs

In this section first we give a brief description of SEPRP’s activities and in the second subsection we undertake an assessment of SEPRP’s vision. The evaluation of the activities is carried out in detail in chapter three to six.

The Social, Economic and Policy Research Program (SEPRP) at ICARDA was established in 2007, when the Center restructured its research programs, taking into consideration the recommendations of the 5th EPMR in 2006, and is the driving force and organizational group for all social, economic and agricultural policy research across the Center. In the Medium Term Plan (MTP) 2007 - 2009 the program was called “Poverty and Livelihood Analysis and Impact Assessment in Dry Areas” with six outputs. In the 2011-13 MTP the six outputs with a focus on dry land areas were maintained, namely: (1) causes of poverty and determinants of livelihood strategies; (2) impacts of agricultural research on productivity, income, risk reduction, and rural welfare; (3) impacts of natural resource management (NRM) research on economic, social and environmental sustainability; (4) analysis of local institutions for improved livelihoods; (5) policy and institutional options analyzed and priorities for public investment in agricultural research to improve rural livelihoods in dry areas identified (joint research with IFPRI); and (6) capacity of national research and extension programs in the application of economic tools, livelihood analysis, and impact assessment enhanced.

Under the CGIAR Research Program (CRP) structure of the CGIAR, ICARDA is involved in 10 CRPs - Dryland Systems (DS), Wheat, Grain Legumes (GL), Dryland Cereals (DC), Water Land and Ecosystems (WLE), Livestock &Fish (L&F), Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM), Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH) and Managing and Sustaining Crop Collections (Genebanks)of which SEPRP is involved in 7 CRPs (DS, Wheat, GL, DC, L&F, CCAFS and PIM).

In the dryland systems CRP, led by ICARDA, SEPRP is involved in the following activities:

1. *Baseline study, vulnerability, livelihood systems analysis*

The aims of these activities are: to establish baseline data on the socio-economic and biophysical indicators; to determine the causes of system vulnerability; to evaluate the feasibility of technologies; and monitor technology adoption in the action sites: North Africa and West Asia (NAWA) region.

1. *Bio-economic modeling*

This activity is intended to develop and use bio-economic models connecting field-farm-regional scales for a variety of farm typologies under different market and climate scenarios. It also assesses ex-ante and ex-post impacts of different interventions and policies. Geographical locations of these activities include Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia

1. *Market value chain studies*

These studies explore value chains of cash crops for enhancing market access for small holder farmers. They also analyze actions to improve pre- and post-harvest technologies in Morocco, Tunisia, Jordan, Egypt, Ethiopia and Pakistan. Examples include: Ethiopian sheep and goat meat value chain development and Pakistan small ruminant value chain development.

1. *Social organization and learning for vertical coordination of Value Chains-seeking win-win scenarios*

Project examples under this activity are: Participatory assessments on climate change vulnerability of local agro-ecosystems and development of adaptation options in Tajikistan, Integrated Rangeland Restoration, and Farming with Alternative Pollinators.

1. *Innovation platform for linking research to development*

Innovation platforms are intended to strengthen and scale-up Integrated Natural Resource Management across North Africa and West Asia. The specific platforms are focused around sites in Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia.

1. *Policy*

Research includes groundwater management in Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia. Policy research is also undertaken as a part of four other CRPs repeated in several countries: CRP 1.1 (Integrated Agricultural Production Systems in dry areas), CRP 2 (Policies, Institutions, and Markets), CRP 3.1 (Wheat), and CRP WLI (Water Livelihood Initiative) in Morocco, Jordan, Iraq, Tunisia, Lebanon, Syria, Afghanistan and Egypt.

1. *Gender*

Gender Research as a cross-cutting activity involves several SEPRP members, but mostly falls on a newly appointed gender specialist having ongoing CRP activities in four countries and eight sites. The gender portfolio includes projects such as: gender analysis of sheep and cactus production; identification of means to increase income for women in Jameed production; women’s role in irrigation (including on water use committees); and technology adoption of raised beds in Egypt.

1. *Impact assessment*

This activity includes a systems and livelihood characterization with work underway in the 5 sites of North Africa and West Asia and Central Asia that ICARDA is implementing dry land systems research; and adoption and impact assessment for a variety of technologies under different CRPS. Examples include adoption studies of wheat varieties in Morocco, Uzbekistan and Turkey (planned in 2015) and technology adoption studies in specific projects. Ongoing adoption and impact assessment activities include conservation agriculture to cover 12 studies/projects involving five crops over three countries and five regions with various permutations.

SEPRP is also engaged in other CRPs with adoption and impact assessment studies and natural resource management research. Examples of adoption and impact assessment studies include: improved wheat varieties in Morocco (BIGM, North Africa, CRP/WHEAT); improved wheat technologies in Uzbekistan (BIGM, Central Asia, CRP/WHEAT); improved agricultural technologies through the project “Enhancing food security in Arab countries” (BIGM, WANA, CRP/WHEAT); conservation agriculture (DSIPS, WA, NA, CA regions; CRP/Dryland Systems); and improved barley, faba bean, chickpea, & lentil varieties in Ethiopia (CRP/Dryland Cereals and CRP/Grain Legumes).

1. *Natural Resource Management (NRM)*

In socioeconomic research for NRM, activities are diverse. In addition to work related to CRPs they also include some bilateral projects outside CRPs. NRM covers research on climate change, land degradation, conservation agriculture and especially water productivity and water-use efficiency. Project examples include: Middle East Water and Livelihood Initiative/Integrated Water Livestock Management Program (WLI – IWLMP) in the CRP/Dryland Systems; IFAD-ICARDA Integrated Crop-Livestock Conservation Agriculture for Sustainable Intensification of Cereal-based Systems in North Africa and Central Asia (CRP/Dryland Systems); ACIAR-ICARDA Adapting conservation agriculture for rapid adoption by small holder farmers in North Africa (CRP/Dryland Systems); ERS-USDA-ICARDA Agricultural Productivity with an Emphasis on Water Constraints in the Middle East and North Africa (CRP/Dryland Systems); and an ACIAR-ICARDA Iraq Salinity Project (CRP/Water, Land and Ecosystems). The list of projects reflects the importance of natural research management research for the Center as a whole which generates demand for impact assessment and other socioeconomic analysis. SEPRP is obviously responding to this demand.

To conclude this brief overview of SEPRP’s activities, the panel observes that the socio economic and policy program at ICARDA covers a wide range of activities These will be evaluated in subsequent chapters using the criteria set out in the TORs and against the background of the vision that the Program has expressed. In the next section an assessment of SEPRP’s vision is submitted.

## 2.2 SEPRP’s Vision

### 2.2.1 ToRs

One of the expectations of the CCER is that the panel takes a closer look at SEPRP’s vision especially analyzing the degree of integration and the level of collaboration with other ICARDA programs. The Terms of Reference asked three main questions to the panel:

a) How much progress is there in developing a shared mission and vision for the Center’s social science research and its future?

b) How SEPRP’s mission, vision and future plans can foster closer integration with ICARDA’s other research programs?

c) What are current and future focuses of ICARDA’s socio-economic research with respect to the Center’s Strategic Plan, the CGIAR Program structure, and demands from the Center’s biophysical Research Programs and national partners?

### 2.2.2 Assessment

ICARDA’s vision and mission are articulated in its 2007-2016 Strategic Plan. Its vision is “improved livelihoods of the resource-poor in the dry areas,” while its stated mission is “to contribute to the improvement of livelihoods of the resource-poor in dry areas by enhancing food security and alleviating poverty through research and partnerships….” Embedded within these two key statements is recognition of the concepts and role of social science research. Concepts such as livelihoods, knowledge of the resource poor, food insecurity and poverty spring directly from the social sciences and the mission could not be fulfilled without a leading role for the social sciences.

Despite the development of notable social science-led research activities, the vision and mission of SEPRP are less clearly articulated, either in documents or by ICARDA staff. The panel asked several people about a SEPRP vision statement, and the consensus message was that SEPRP’s role was to facilitate ICARDA’s achievement of its own mission and, as such, SEPRP did not have an independent vision or mission (as is also the case with ICARDA’s other Research Programs). ICARDA social science research has the mission of contributing to the Center’s overall mission of research impact on livelihoods and on sustainable use of natural resources and management, and ICARDA strongly emphasizes integrated analysis and understanding to achieve that. However, most interviewees viewed SEPRP’s main role as a support unit for other ICARDA programs. Despite the development of some social science-led research activities, SEPRP tends not to be seen as a distinct research program in its own right. While the supporting role of social, economic and policy research for ICARDA’s diverse research portfolio is considered to be important, at the same time, ICARDA management places a clear emphasis on high-quality work with the expectation that SEPRP, whether in support of other projects or not, needs to be world-class and a recognized leader in several fields of research in dry areas. These include: impact assessment, particularly impacts of agricultural research in addressing the ill-effects of climate change and water scarcity; policy research, particularly in the areas of water policy, food grain subsidies, and restructuring of national agricultural institutions associated with shifting political realities; and natural resource management. Supporting activities include gender mainstreaming and conducting research on the “downstream” challenges that may inhibit ICARDA’s research from attaining its maximal impact. These challenges include slow adoption of some ICARDA technologies, inadequate attention to value chains and their importance to the impact pathway, and lack of effective extension and other agricultural support services. Each of these areas can be construed as being in support of ongoing ICARDA research themes.

The review panel recommends that there should be some rebalancing of these different perspectives within a more clearly articulated vision for the social science program in ICARDA. This would elaborate on how its supportive and complementary role with other (biophysical research) programs, and the pursuit of distinct social science research driven by disciplinary standards should combine strategically. This will also require a rethinking on project design and strategies for fund raising.

Program leaders outside of SEPRP are explicit about their view that an important part of SEPRP’s role is to provide socioeconomic support for biophysical projects. These project managers express concern that SEPRP is being stretched too thinly, due to multiple activities, and is thus not adequately supporting the biophysical projects. This sentiment was common among interviewees in Amman and was echoed by the biophysical scientists in Morocco. The expression by different project managers on the adequacy of social science input should be evaluated against the resources allocated for social science activity which is often very low.

Some propose that, due to high demands in their own projects for socioeconomic analysis and other inputs, social scientists should be housed in the biophysical units. The argument is that by housing social scientists within their various programs, the biophysical managers can more directly benefit from their activities. In some way, this view demonstrates an opinion that social science is a service and not a research field in its own right.

### 2.2.3 Recommendation

Concluding the observations discussed in the previous section, the panel submits two recommendations. First, regarding the deployment of socioeconomic expertise to other programs outside of SEPRP the panel thinks this would be counterproductive. Social scientists work best in groups and the ICARDA goal of attaining critical mass in key areas would be more difficult to achieve if the social scientists were distributed outside a unit like SEPRP. The panel recommends other options could be employed to meet the demand of biophysical programs for “routine“ socio-economic inputs and analysis. These include, for example, guidelines and training courses to be provided to staff of biophysical projects on how to incorporate gender considerations into projects and which data to collect for quick, indicative, less rigorous impact assessments. Such arrangements would see demand for its routine services reduced and given its limited resources SEPRP could then devote its efforts more efficiently towards advancing social science on topics under ICARDA’s global mandate.

Second, the panel believes that it is important, even if support is its main function, that SEPRP clearly articulate a vision and uses it to plan and evaluate its activities. Stark tradeoffs exist between providing services on demand to myriad projects and the ability to conduct strategic scientific inquiry and produce IPGs. The panel therefore suggests that SEPRP must clearly identify where it sees itself within ICARDA and more generally with the global development research community. SEPRP should formally articulate a vision, which can be used to identify how its support role can complement its desire to produce IPGs—for example, by leveraging responsibilities for impact assessment into state-of-the-art (and strategic) impact assessments. The panel does not see a contradiction to ICARDA’s overall mission if SEPRP has its own clearly formulated vision and mission. To the contrary, a social science group that is merely an add-on service unit to the biophysical programs would have difficulty in being recognized in its profession as a world class research group that can also contribute to the advancement of methodologies in addition to empirical studies. There needs to be a certain degree of freedom for SEPRP to develop its own agenda that is aimed at developing and advancing social science research methods relevant to ICARDA’s mandate and to make use of its comparative advantage of being the only international social science group working on socio-economic and policy issues in agriculture in the WANA region. SEPRP does not have such “cutting edge” in other regions and advancing SEPRP towards an “Arab Economic and Policy Agricultural Research Group” could add tremendous leverage to the whole of ICARDA without jeopardizing the Center’s global mandate.

# Chapter 3: Resources and management

## 3.1 ToRs

The aim of this chapter is to assess the adequacy of social, economic and policy research resources in view of the challenges ahead which emerge from the changing conditions at CGIAR and at Center level. Derived from the ToRs the panel focused its analysis on at least two questions on the issue of resources and management of SEPRP:

1. Does the Center provide enough human and financial resources for SEPRP to play its role under the changing conditions of the CGIAR?
2. Are resource and resource mobilization efforts sufficient to meet the increasing demand for social science research and support?

## 3.2 Assessment of SEPRP staff resources

a) Human and financial resources for SEPRP under the changing conditions of the CGIAR

The research portfolio of SEPRP has seen successive expansions over the years in terms of both widening of the spectrum of researchable topics and expanding geographical coverage following ICARDA's growing, diversified and intensified activities and its increasing spatial spread to the non-tropical developing country dry areas globally. ICARDA's Strategy 2007-2016 has raised the Center's demand for socioeconomic research engagement such that interaction with improved technologies brings the desired benefits to ultimate stakeholders.

Under ICARDA's MTP 2011-2013, socioeconomic research was required to address six system priorities (SPs): promoting integrated land, water and forest management at landscape level; improving water productivity; improving rural institutions and their governance; making international and domestic markets work for the poor; improving science and technology policies and institutions; and improving research and development options to reduce rural poverty and vulnerability. The first three of these SPs are shared with current ICARDA's Programs, namely ILWMP and DSIPSP. Currently, SEPRP has its thematic coverage, structured in five major integrated themes, namely production/livelihood systems analysis, adoption of innovations and impact assessment, natural resource management, environmental governance and climate change impacts, market value chain analysis, and policy research. It is also engaged in two cross-cutting themes: gender- and research-development linkages. Although each of these thematic areas and the cross-cutting themes has a lead scientist, disciplines often cut across these research themes implying a healthy research approach but with a rather thin staff spread. The CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs), which began operations in 2012, brought a new dimension to the research portfolios of ICARDA and SEPRP.

Under the CGIAR's framework ICARDA based its Dryland Systems (DS CRP 1.1, which ICARDA leads) work on four Strategic Research Themes (SRTs): (1) Strengthening innovation systems; (2) Reducing Vulnerability and Managing Risk; (3) Sustainable Intensification and Market Linkages and (4) Impact Assessment and cross-regional synthesis.

In addition, three integrally linked themes comprising (a) youth, (b) biodiversity and (c) nutrition crosscut the four SRTs. The Center works on nine CRPs, out of which SEPRP is directly involved in all of them except three: (1) Water, Land and Ecosystems , (2) Health and (3) Genebanks SEPRP is as well attending to the CGIAR's Strategic Objective 'Policies for People (PfP)' and is superimposing the CRPs on its original thematic areas, adding extra linkages to its research portfolio.

Further, ICARDA's current decentralization process of its research and capacity development incorporates another dimension of SEPRP's staff engagement where four integrated research platforms are set based on identified research priorities and better alignment with the CRPs.

Further to platforms, ICARDA has identified five locations for thematic research areas: (1) Egypt for High Input Irrigated Agriculture, (2) Turkey along with Central Asia and Iran for Winter Wheat and Winter Barley, (3) Izmir, Turkey for Cereal Rusts, (4) Sudan for Heat Tolerance and (5) Jordan for Integrated Crop-Rangeland-Livestock production system.

SEPRP (and ICARDA) are orienting their research to the new decentralization strategy of ICARDA and are assimilating the CRPs and related SRTs in their research activities. Both the decentralization process and thematic research areas arrangements will provide opportunities for SEPRP research to have more focus and be more aligned with locational, regional and national priorities. These will also provide solutions with higher potential to quickly move up the impact pathway. They also furnish closer interactions with national programs and with the priorities they regard as appropriate for their economies. For example, ICARDA collaborators in one of the national-programs (Egypt) expressed aspiration in their meeting with the review panel that ICARDA attend more strongly to the needs of their country and demonstrate impact on peoples' lives.

Despite their benefits, which also include higher availability of financial resources that the CRP furnishes for the research work, the recent arrangements certainly add more demand on the already modest SEPRP staff resources especially in view of the CRPs' "very tight research plans with specific, quantifiable, and time bound targets of activities, outputs, and outcomes". Measured in terms of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE), SEPRP staff development witnessed mostly successive increases since 2006, in response to a recommendation of the 5th External Program and Management Review in 2006, and due to active promotion by senior Center management to strengthen social, economic and policy research capacity.

As shown in table 1 (Appendix), rising from 3.5 FTE scientist years in 2006, the staff reached 5.3 FTEs in 2010, and increased again to 5.5 FTEs in 2012 and 2013. The latest review of the Program in 2009 (then Mega Project 8) alludes to staff constraints pointing that demand for impact studies within ICARDA exceeds the ability of SEPRP to deliver; recommending improving efficiency through integration between studies and prioritization rather than staff increases. The addition to staff since 2009 is only 10% of the current amount as of 2013. In 2014 there was an intake of six new staff: four senior scientists including one at half-time engagement, one associate and one consultant. This represents a substantial improvement, apparently engendered by the CGIAR's CRP arrangements that raised the regular staff number to nine in addition to one consultant. Measured at 220 days’ workload per scientist per year, this brings the senior staff's total FTEs to about 8.75; a rise of about 60% over 2013. Excluding the consultant, the FTE would be 7.9 (44% increase).

While the panel recognizes ICARDA’s efforts to increase human resources at SEPRP it became obvious that demands on staff time have increased more than proportionately. Presentations of research projects to the panel reflect intensive and diverse engagements of principal scientists across major research themes. Staff time distribution over the SEPRP's projects portfolio of 35 research projects excluding training activities is indicative of a rather thinly spread staff. As shown in table 2 (see Appendix), the per staff percentage time allocation across projects and staff out of the total allocated time ranges from 0.1% to 5.5%, but in over 71% of the cases is less than 1%, ranging from 1% to less than 2% in about 11% of the cells, from 2-3% in 13% and only 5.3% of the staff has allotted time of 5% to 5.5%. Lead-staff engagements in ongoing research projects reflect high and diverse workloads where the numbers mostly range between 9 and 20 allotted projects. Activities related to adoption and impact assessment, impact of natural resource management and climate change, and policy and institutional research are exerting high pressure on the scientists' time, while the SERPR Leader, working on 20 projects and activities, is particularly overloaded. In view of the demand for socioeconomic input, four of the Program's broad strategic research themes should be considered for staff increases to reach critical mass. These are Adoption/Impact, NRM, Policy and Gender.

In table 3 (Appendix) the time allocated to different research programs is presented. Climate change and conservation agriculture are together allocated only 2.3% of the total time allocation for SEPRP staff, corresponding to 4.2% of the total senior researchers' time. The principal NRM researcher used 20% of his allocated time (45 working days) on climate change projects in five countries and to projects on conservation agriculture in four countries. The researcher's spread includes an additional seven project such as market access, agricultural productivity under water constraints (20%), WLI (15%), adoption of crop-livestock systems constraints and trade-offs; among others.

In conclusion, the changing conditions in the CGIAR with the dominance of the CRPs for Centers’ research strategy the demand for socio economic research has definitely increased. This demand poses a tremendous challenge for SEPRP as its director is compelled with an almost constant choice between program coverage and depth of research. The need for additional resources is evident.

b) Resource and resource mobilization efforts to meet the increasing demand for social science research and support

To fulfill the role under the changing research and business models in the CGIAR and the structural change within ICARDA, additional resources mobilization efforts are necessary. Ongoing policy research is more widely spread, involving 14 projects and research activities in eight countries. These are dominated by agenda on water policy and water-related issues, with four others involving wheat economics, climate change and energy. The time allocation within SEPRP portfolio for the principal policy researcher varies, for nine projects, from 0.2% to 1.6% of total staff time. The CRP-Policy, Institutions and Markets has the highest time allocation among different CRP Projects (19.6%), but the policy researcher is allocated only 2.9% therein along with 5.5% to his assistant, while 11% accrue to bio-economic/crop modelers. About 76% of the principal policy researcher's time is allocated to four projects: PIM CRP 2-1 and 2-2 (54%), Livestock/Forage (12%) and Land Management (10%). CRP-Policy receives a mere 0.4% in favor of the principal policy researcher.

Adoption and impact assessment, largely on ICARDA produced technologies, incur gaps in meeting the needs of ICARDA programs on BIGM and ILWMP but close cooperation has always been maintained with the socioeconomic components of national programs. Other themes such as NRM and Policy produce impact results of their own. Some of the demand for impact-related work could be met by more effective collection and management of impact-related data such as results from experimental trials. Technology-related assessments could be conducted more efficiently, and by a well-trained research assistant, if the requisite data were made available. Nevertheless, staff retirement will necessitate replacement of the adoption/impact leader over the coming few years. If efforts were made to reduce the costs of more routine assessments requested by technical programs, the new scientist can focus on application of state-of-the-art approaches addressing complicated impact questions.

Gender research on the other hand, is awaiting the filling of an announced gender position, which when filled will bring the gender staff to two gender analysts (one of them Associate Researcher). Gender is however a highly emphasized ICARDA and CGIAR research area whereby each approved CRP should have a gender strategy.

Both NRM and Policy research need staff reinforcement due to high national, regional and global demand for their outputs. Based on their dryland focus, ICARDA understandably places high demand on NRM where gaps for socioeconomic knowledge and input exist within their BIGM and ILWM Programs, while climate change is an increasing global concern and is especially critical for ICARDA's dryland mandate.

Demand for policy work from ICARDA and the CRP will require wider policy research agenda from SEPRP. In addition to covering more of the demand of other programs, particularly BIGMP and ILWMP, SEPRP is expected to cover more of the policy and institutional dimensions. Cross-cutting issues require special attention. These include youth technology-related employment, dryland ago-biodiversity related to conserving landraces and wild relatives, medicinal, aromatic, herbal and other under-utilized species for enhancing food security, and nutrition policies in the face of changing consumption patterns among the poor (and institutional change in countries). Moreover, a central issue in ICARDA's alignment with the CRP is the drive to move from policy analysis to policy action to realize impact for their technology development outcomes. Further, SEPRP policy research is bound to respond to the CGIAR's flagship projects under PIM (Foresight Modeling): (1) Science Policy and Incentives for Innovation; (2) Adoption of Technology and Sustainable Intensification; (3) Policy and Public Expenditure; (4) Value Chains; (5) Social Protection; (6) Natural Resource Property Regimes).

The Review Panel agrees with SEPRP’s approach to identify and support a national expert in each Ministry of Agriculture of cooperating national programs for devising demand-driven policy research, but which will at the same time form a vehicle for creating an enabling policy environment. Staff choice should however be from the economic units of National Research Centers in order not to jeopardize the strong links and to provide more capacity building to the national economics programs. The existing high needs for policy research require more staff to reach critical-mass of policy analysts. SEPRP's close cooperation with the socioeconomic and policy staff of national research programs, as illustrated to the Review panel via the presentations of NCARE in Jordan, NRC of Egypt and INRA in Morocco, could cover some of the gaps. Yet, many of those programs are overloaded (e.g., NCARE and INRA), lack top expertise, have limited in English language proficiency and are short in research funding.

The panel looked at the socioeconomic staff resources in other comparable CGIAR Centers in order to gain additional insight with respect to the SEPRP's staff adequacy. ICRISAT has been selected for comparison on account of many commonalities in the research agenda of two centers despite their difference in size. The indicator used is the ratio of socioeconomic to total staff of scientists and senior scientists in each of the two centers (see table 4). With ratios of 16.7% for ICARDA and 18.5% for ICRISAT, respectively, the latter has a better socioeconomic/biophysical research staff balance, although it cannot be judged that such a balance is in fact optimal. Surely critical mass is not a matter of staff ratios but rather depends on the Center’s scope of research and development work and the expertise needed for those. From this perspective, adding three researchers to SEPRP would not only bring the ICARDA more in line with other CGIAR Centers but will be more adequate to assure quality of SEPRP’s work.

## 3.3 Recommendations

1. Based on the assessment of SEPRP’s human resources and in view of the challenges ahead the review panel recommends the appointment of additional research staff in SEPR. The panel submits a priority list of expertise to upgrade SEPRP’s capacity. First, and in order to upgrade the methodological excellence of SEPRP in several of its research fields it is recommended that ICARDA hires an applied econometrician who can especially help to improve the work in adoption and impact assessment but also in natural resource economics. Second, in the field of policy research, capacity should be strengthened in order for ICARDA to capitalize on the ongoing changes in agricultural policy in Arab and other dry land countries to become a center of excellence for Agricultural Policy with emphasis on the WANA region although not excluding other economies in transition within ICARDA’s mandate. The panel recognizes ICARDA’s global mandate for dry land agriculture and does not want to say that the Center should be restricted to Arab countries. But the rapid change in the region provides a special opportunity for research and a high demand for new policy regimes. That is, the urgent need in the Arab world should help motivate ICARDA to strengthen its policy analysis unit especially considering that ICARDA social science is well recognized in that region. For strengthening social science capacity in this field two areas seem to be of priority in policy research: a) water policy and b) input and grain subsidies. Third, given the importance of Natural Resource Management and climate change topics within the dry land CRP to hire additional expertise in resource and environmental economics will enhance SERP’s capacity in the environmental policy debate in its partner countries and increase the chance that SEPRP publications can enter the higher echelons of the environment and environmental economics scientific outlets (e.g. *Ecological Economics*, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* (JEEM)).
2. Regarding resource mobilization for socio economic research at ICARDA the panel strongly encourages ICARDA to seek additional funding in order to establish an SEPRP-specific research program on agricultural policy analysis and capacity building in its partner countries. To reduce the risk of SEPRP becoming too much absorbed by service tasks for ICARDA’s technical programs the panel thinks it is important that SEPRP will also have its own additional program which should become part of its mission (see chapter 2). According to the panel’s view this is the only way that SEPRP can develop in to a Social and Policy Science Center of Excellence for countries undergoing rapid institutional change in the Arab region. Effective collaboration with IFPRI and/or appropriate ARIs will be crucial to implement such strategy.
3. The panel recommends strengthening SEPRP’s NRM research in Morocco, e.g. with focus on climate change and NRM activities to support both the Morocco country program and to strengthen the global responsibility of ICARDA’s Research Platform in Morocco.
4. The Review Panel supports ICARDA’s strategy of placing or identifying a national expert in each Ministry of Agriculture of cooperating national programs to be selected from the cooperating socioeconomic units of NRIs.

# Chapter 4: Science quality

## 4.1 ToRs

The purpose of this chapter is to assess the scientific quality of SEPRP’s research. The Terms of Reference (ToR) given to the panel suggested that the following criteria would be suitable to assess the research quality of SEPRP activities:

1. Adequacy of SEPRP’s research portfolio including especially the social and gender dimension as well as policy research, including NRM, water management, production agro-ecosystems, also involving livestock.
2. The standard of the research procedures applied.
3. Journal publication in terms of quality and quantity
4. Impact assessment and dissemination studies, including the assessment of private uptake pathways of ICARDA’s research products.
5. Important research areas which are presently not addressed.
6. Composition of SEPRP’s research team and structure as well as knowledge gaps in the team relative to the tasks ahead?
7. Implications of the recommendations provided by the CGIAR Stripe Review of Social Sciences for SEPRP’s agenda.
8. The impact of SEPRP research outputs and outcomes including the production of international public goods in line with ICARDA’s mission and vision?

The chapter is structured as follows. First an assessment of scientific quality is submitted using the eight criteria listed above. In view of its importance, a special section is devoted to gender and social research as the methods used in this field of research are often of a more qualitative nature in comparison to the quantitative approach of agricultural and development economics research. The chapter concludes with a set of recommendations on how science quality of SEPRP’s research can be improved.

## 4.2 Assessment of agricultural economics research

a) Adequacy of SEPRP’s research portfolio

As described in chapter 2 of the report, SEPRP is currently engaged in a very broad research agenda. Areas of research include livelihoods and vulnerability analysis, bio-economic systems modeling, natural resource (especially water) management, agricultural marketing and value chain analysis, agricultural policy studies (including using IFPRI’s IMPACT model and the Global Trade Analysis Project (GTAP) model). As is the case with other CGIAR Centers, SEPRP is conducting adoption and impact assessments of ICARDA’s technology products and is engaged in the design and implementation of community-based NRM programs, civil society partnerships and works on gender questions.

Judging the adequacy of SEPRP’s research agenda (a) the panel realizes that on the one hand SEPRP’s research reflects the breath of ICARDA’s R&D activities and on the other hand is increasingly is driven by the CRP Dryland Systems led by ICARDA. The CCER team judges SEPRP’s research portfolio to be adequate in terms of ICARDA’s needs. For example, the social and gender dimension are well covered, and natural resources management especially dealing with farm and water management is reflected prominently in SEPRP’s publications. Policy research is carried out in the context of the IFPRI-led CRP “Policy and Institutions” as well as on the Dryland Systems CRP.

The panel notes that in general SEPRP’s research portfolio is rather broad and covers a large number of activities. The research portfolio undoubtedly serves the needs of ICARDA’s technical programs and in most cases also those of the NARS. In any case there seems to be huge potential for ICARDA for regional and national policy research considering profound and ongoing changes in the agricultural sector in general and in agricultural policies specifically in the CWANA region.

In the field of policy research the panel sees potential for SEPRP to engage in policy work under the banner of the “Arab Spring” movement. Political and social restructuring in the region is likely to place pressure on existing agricultural institutions and ICARDA could be well-positioned to inform decision-making. For example, food-grain subsidies, which currently consume a large part of the agricultural budget in many dryland countries, may need to be restructured in the face of the new political realities. ICARDA should be poised to provide high-quality policy advice in such circumstances. Land tenure and land fragmentation is another such area. The panel therefore encourages SEPRP to develop a program that addresses the agricultural policy needs of the Arab countries in order to become a champion in such regional affairs.

Overall the breadth of activities in SEPRP’s program raises the question of achieving critical mass to achieve scientific excellence especially in view of the limited number of SEPRP staff. This point will be revisited in the section on resources and management.

b) Standard of research procedures

To evaluate the standard of research procedures as applied by SEPRP the presentations made by SEPRP staff on April 26 were used as indicators. Including the synopsis presented by SEPRP director a total of 11 presentations were made. Most presenters gave an overview of their respective research activities and outputs, including publications which they authored or co-authored. The presentations were useful for obtaining an understanding of SEPRP research activities and their approach towards implementing research. However, with a few exceptions, most presentations were lacking a standardized and rigorous research outline that consists of a clear problem statement, specification of objectives, a theory guided conceptual framework, research hypotheses derived from the former, a suitable methodology to answer the research questions, major findings, policy implications and major limitations. Most presentations were lacking rigor in defining the relationship between research findings and developmental outcomes including the definition of beneficiary groups. It also became obvious that there was no common template or format used by the presenters and that no rehearsal session was conducted prior to the presentation to the panel on 26 April. Most presentations appeared to be tailored towards a general donor audience rather than to a scientific audience with emphasis on methodological aspects of the studies. From the presentations it was therefore difficult to clearly identify the contribution of social, economic and policy research work to the scientific literature. This however is not to say that the publications on which some of the presentations were based did not make such contribution but the presentations were not conclusive in this regard.

While the panel is convinced that SEPRP’s research procedures follow international standards there is some concern that research procedures are not being documented clearly and could be more effectively communicated to scientific audiences. For example, for its planned research projects, SEPRP does not seem to have a clear publication strategy that would identify the type of expected paper and targeted research outlets.

c) Journal publication in terms of quality and quantity

The panel was provided a list of publications and a sample from the list. The reported quantity of SEPRP published research output is satisfactory; with an overall target average of 1.5 publications in ISI journals per FTE per year. SEPRP staff convey the impression that incentives for publishing are high and expectations are clearly communicated. Management confirms this; publications are valued during the staff evaluation process and the panel commends SEPRP and ICARDA management for effectively communicating these expectations.

SEPRP’s work has been published in a wide range of development oriented and technical journals. Most of the journals are of an interdisciplinary nature (e.g. *Agricultural Systems*; *American-Eurasian Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Science*; *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*; *Experimental Agriculture*; *Journal of International Development*; *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*; *Society and Natural Resources*; etc.) many of which are of a quite high standard. A lesser number of papers are published in highly recognized development economics outlets such as *Food Policy* and *World Development* and, with the exception of the paper of Yigezu, et al (2013) in the E*uropean Review of Agricultural Economics*, no paper was published in recognized agricultural economics outlets such as *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *Agricultural Economics* or *Journal of Agricultural Economics*. Completely absent from SEPRP’s publication list are higher-echelon development journals such as *Journal of Development Economics* (JDE), *Economic Development and Cultural Change* (EDCC) or *Ecological Economics* (EE). Furthermore no publication exists or seems to be planned in top journals such as *Proceedings of National Academy of Science*, *Nature,* or *Science*.

In conclusion on SEPRP’s publication, performance the panel believes that the group has the potential to significantly increase its output, particularly the quality of its output. Output rates have fallen below targets, but staff turnover, the disruption due to the introduction of the CRP system and the relocation of the Center likely explain this. Expectations about quantity of output have been internalized; the panel recommends that management begin to focus on quality and establish targets for high-quality (more than just ISI-listed) publications. Given ICARDA’S mission and the current level of staffing, at least one and, on average, three articles per year in journals such as *Journal of Development Studies*, *Ecological Economics*, *Agricultural Economics* or *World Development* should be possible. Also given the high relevance of the global dryland agriculture problem under climate change conditions provides an excellent opportunity for a high class paper in *Nature* or *Science* which would give high recognition to ICARDA’s work and give them leadership in this field of development.

d) Impact assessment and dissemination studies, including the assessment of private uptake pathways of ICARDA’s research products

One of the SEPRP staff presentations (Ahmed Mazid) was focused on impact assessment. In 2013 five impact studies of ICARDA technologies/products were published namely:

1. Impacts of Crop Improvement Research on Farmers’ Livelihoods: The Case of Winter-Sown Chickpea in Syria. In: *Experimental Agriculture. (2013), volume 49 (3), pp. 336–351.*
2. Assessment of on-farm conservation of dry land agro-biodiversity and its impact on rural livelihoods in the Fertile Crescent. *In: Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems.*
3. The Impacts of an Improved Technology Package on Production Efficiency: The Case of Wheat Farms in the Northern State of Sudan. In: *American-Eurasian J. of Agric. & Environ. Sciences, 13 (8): 1114-1123, 2013*.
4. Assessing the Impacts of the GAFTA Agreement on Selected Members’ bilateral Agricultural Trade. In: *American-Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci., 13 (2): 269-290*.
5. Implications of a shift in irrigation technology on resource use efficiency: A Syrian case. In: *Agricultural Systems* *118 (2013) 14–22, 2013*.

The panel recognizes that SEPRP gives priority to impact assessment studies and undertakes considerable efforts in this area. However there seems to be potential for improvement in terms the use of more advanced methodologies (see SPIA website: http://impact.cgiar.org). The panel emphasizes that in impact assessment quality is especially important particularly given the shifting political and social situation in much of the dry land areas. Thus policy makers and donors place high demand on what works and what does not. This is an area where new techniques are being introduced. These include econometric techniques for identifying causal relationships and randomized trials; ICARDA would be wise to invest in capacity in these; an applied econometrician with expertise in impact assessment could provide this capacity.

A good example of ICARDA’s impact assessment work in the field of policy change is the article “Returns to policy-oriented agricultural research: The case of barley fertilization in Syria”, published in *World Development* (2011). The study provides an example of excellent work understanding how social science research can be used to effect changes in national policy. Lessons from this case study should be incorporated into ICARDA’s policy work.

e) Relevance and thematic balance and important research areas presently not addressed

As ascertained in past reviews, research under SEPRP continues to gain high relevance to ICARDA's mission and research agenda. The Program also continues to align its research activities with ICARDA's changing priorities and research emphasis. This is evident through the Review Panel's rough screening of 62 publications posted on the CCER-MENARID website out of the Program's 132 total publications during 2009-2014 (52%); 61% of which are journal articles. While the disaggregation portrays notable diversity over topics, courtiers, targeted commodities and analytical methods, and every so often with overlapping themes, impact or impact-oriented studies (at about 23%) are SEPRP’s leading and continuing emphasis. This is an aspiration of the Center's top management; expressed as the need for 'strong impact studies' and referred to as 'a top priority research area' in which the Program might take a lead global position. Research activities on poverty and market-related agenda, at 11% and 10%, respectively, also acquire decent continuity momentums. Emerging ICARDA's research emphasis are addressed by SEPRP via an increasing attention to research on climate change (10%), a number of NRM related topics (technical efficiency, resource/water-use efficiency, biodiversity, soil-water management and IPM with a 23% share and, and policy (7%). Research on these topics has predominantly come out over the last two or three years. Emerging in later years, gender research at 3% has been limited, yet with substantial and growing demand.

Despite SEPRP's growing policy research, ICARDA is clearly aware of the crucial need for institutional support and enabling policies that currently fall short of matching the well advanced biophysical solutions on which research is needed 'for outcomes to become impacts' (e.g. see MTP 2011-2013). Also, such research to support the achievement of impacts is a demand from the newly established CRPs where impact pathways must be clearly defined (see discussion under 6.3 below). The Review Panel believes that two policy areas deserve priority attention by SEPRP, namely water and other inputs, e.g. seeds (also addressing subsidies). Water policy research is however receiving more recent attention - since 2010 - via many research projects on surface and groundwater policies in a number of countries. These should be expanded to address water distribution and equity policies including on water harvesting and supplementary irrigation.

“Strengthened seed systems through increased private sector participation and alternative delivery systems including institutional and policy options” is a Center's targeted change in MTP 2011-2013 in response to recommendations from the EPMR in 2006 and a commitment in ICARDA's Strategic Plan 2007-16 under Theme 1.3. The MTP advocates an IPGs generating role of research on national seed policies and regulatory frameworks to assist seed policy making. ICARDA is cognizant of weaknesses in seed delivery systems in partner countries for their vast range of genetic material. Suboptimal seed delivery systems are noted for wheat, more so for barley and most acutely for grain legumes. Notable accomplishments have been made within the Center's BIGMP to advance seed delivery systems including through Village Based Seed Enterprises (VBSE). Given ICARDA's unique position in providing leadership in research on seed delivery systems in partnership with NARS, including for resource poor farmers, research on seed policy should form a priority area in policy research in SEPRP to generate IPGs. With policy research already acknowledged by SEPRP, similar, wider and more in-depth research on seed policy with national and regional dimensions is considered to be opportune by the Review Panel, given the increasing opening of economies and private sector-led investments in the region. This will not only provide support to ICARDA's BIGM, but also to their DSIPS Program and the Eco-regional Program in CAC-P.

In summary at present SEPRP’s current research programs cover important areas which are in line with ICARDA’s vision and mission. While this is consistent with current CGIAR strategies the panel sees the danger that if SEPRP becomes too much of a service unit its potential to become recognized as a center of excellence for the social sciences for the dryland agriculture is constrained. There is an exceptional historical situation which is emerging in several dryland countries particularly in the Arab region where profound changes take place in the role that agriculture plays for development such as deregulation, liberalization, market orientation and modernization. In this process ICARDA has the unique opportunity to play a leading role and become a center of agricultural policy research for dryland agriculture. . The special situation in the Arab region provides SEPRP the opportunity to develop a special program on policy analysis and policy capacity building of NARS partners. This will be best achieved in collaboration with IFPRI which has the global mandate for agricultural and food policy and stronger linkages to respective ARIs. However this will require a reformulation of ICARDA’s funding strategy with additional funding outside the CRPs.

f)Composition of SEPRP’s research team and structure as well as knowledge gaps in the team relative to the tasks ahead?

The panel recognizes that SEPRP has undertaken major efforts to upgrade its staff. This must be also seen against the background of relative attractiveness of an ICARDA social scientist position compared to other CGIAR Centers. Aside from the fact that the low ratio of social scientists to other ICARDA staff there is also a lack of critical mass in the following areas: natural resource and environmental economics, policy, and impact assessment. Critical mass can possibly be obtained across multiple focal areas through a single hire, depending on the person. For example an applied econometrician with interests in natural resource economics could support impact assessment, policy work, and many of the other areas.

g) Implications of the recommendations provided by the CGIAR Stripe Review of Social Sciences for SEPRP’s agenda.

The Stripe Review of Social Science in the CGIAR in 2009 commented that “CGIAR social science has lost much of its research coherence and quality through dilution effects resulting from excessive reliance on short-term, restricted project funding and the associated pursuit of increased immediate development impact”. These conclusions to some extent hold as well for ICARDA’s SEPRP. There have been pressures toward accepting short-term projects (and also longer-term projects) for development impact, without a sufficient research component to generate results. (This observation was also made by the INRA social scientists in Morocco). However, around 70% of SEPRP staff time is associated with specific research outputs for CRPs, with about half of this for the Dryland CRP. The issue is whether the funding allocated is adequate to undertake research of the depth required. The panel definitely sees the danger that if SEPRP defines its role purely as a service unit to facilitate the needs of the technical ICARDA programs the danger of loss of disciplinary depth is real. The moderate publication output in terms of high ranking development/agricultural economics journals is an indicator of this danger.

The Stripe review suggested that CG Centers place special emphasis on identifying their comparative advantage in the production of international public goods. This emphasis requires a clear vision articulating the appropriate balance between service to the institution and pure research outputs. As noted in chapter 2, the panel has not uncovered sufficient evidence of this vision and recommends that efforts be taken to clarify the role of SEPRP in the new funding and operational environment.

h) The impact of SEPRP research outputs and outcomes including the production of international public goods in line with ICARDA’s mission and vision?

Currently there does not seem to be any study that documents the impact of SEPRP’s research output and outcome aside from the “Syria barley fertilizer study” which demonstrates the impact of policy research. The panel submits that due to the focus of SEPRP as being a service unit within ICARDA most of its impact is embedded in the impact of ICARDA’s technology products in as much as socio economics is part of the program design. SEPRP’s impact could be increased if the group engages more strongly in policy research and takes up the opportunities that emerge more in its partner countries where political markets are becoming more open.

## 4.3 Assessment of gender and social research

The importance of conducting high quality gender and social research is clearly recognized in the SEPRP. Since 2009, the publication output in this area has increased, with some earlier reports and presentations published as book chapters or journal articles in 2012. The topics reflect the integration of social and gender analytical frameworks and methods in important areas of ICARDA’s work; for example, in Natural Resource Management, biodiversity conservation and livestock research. They also address some important trends affecting the CWANA region such as migration and the role of remittances (Abdelali-Martini and Hamza 2012), migration, livelihoods and NRM (Abdelali−Martini et al 2012). The edited volume, Gender Research in Natural Resource Management; Building Capacities in the Middle East and North Africa, (Abdelali-Martini and Aw-Hassan eds., 2014), contains case studies generated in the ‘Strengthening Social and Gender analysis in Environment and Natural Resource Management project, (2009-2013) which combined capacity development and research. These studies, conducted by national teams supported by SEPRP, demonstrate an ability to use qualitative and quantitative methods and to analyze and integrate the results.

Demand for gender and social analysis across ICARDA’s programs has increased, particularly in the context of the CRPs. The Drylands System CRP Gender Strategy was approved in March 2014, and articulates a commitment to developing effective interdisciplinary methods to integrate gender throughout the research cycle and to improve knowledge of key cultural, ideological, normative and institutional factors that lead to gender inequalities. Development and policy-oriented participatory action research is seen as important in bringing about transformative change in gender inequality. This brings considerable challenges for SEPRP as such an objective requires going beyond descriptive studies of gender roles and patterns of resource access, to understanding the social norms, attitudes, behaviors and social systems that underlie them. Through this, the program can achieve a greater insight into how innovations (e.g. in NRM and in value chains) can influence and be influenced by gender norms and agency. This agenda is being enthusiastically developed by the recently recruited social and gender specialist in SEPRP. Theoretical advancement in this area should be encouraged, and will require creative thinking and adaptation and integration of approaches from other areas of research, for example, theories of social and transformative learning.

SEPRP’s recent gender related work is examining opportunities and strategies to increase rural women’s incomes and the barriers to their access and control over natural resources. Participatory action research at four action sites in Tunisia, Morocco, Jordan and Egypt has ambitious aims of evaluating technology adaptation and testing gender transformative approaches. SEPRP’s gender research will seek to collaborate with other organizations working with similar challenges. Further opportunities for more in depth empirical research on gender are created by the call for case studies under the cross CRP initiative, “Global study on Innovation and Development through transformation of gender norms in agriculture and NRM”. This is seeking to provide robust empirical evidence on the relationship between gender norms, agency and agricultural and NRM innovation.

There is also increasing demand for gender expertise from ICARDA’s biophysical scientists, partly to address demands of the CRPs for gender analysis in support of proposal development or in reporting research outcomes. There is a risk that if these requirements are for short term advice (outside areas of on-going collaborative research) they can detract from the capacity to conduct high quality gender and social research. It is important that gender and social analysis in agriculture and NRM is regarded as an important research area in its own right, in addition to its supportive role in project design, targeting and reporting.

Following the recommendation made in section 2.2.3 support for gender reporting and proposal development could be enhanced without increasing the demands on social scientists, through the production of guidance notes for mainstreaming gender into the project cycle, starting from the design phase. Several guidelines exist and could be adapted for ICARDA scientists, with examples tailored to ICARDA’s research themes, systems and technologies, and introduced in seminars. This would allow the social and gender specialists to concentrate on research to inform both theory and practice in this field, in addition to contributing to multidisciplinary research at the action sites.

An important function of SEPRP is to support the mainstreaming of gender across ICARDA’s work. There is important overall support in this area from the SEPRP Director, however, with only one SEPRP staff member (a female associate researcher) fully engaged in gender research and another social scientist supporting gender work as part of development linkage, practical capacity is inadequate to meet this demand.

ICARDA’s staff profile shows that female staff constitutes less than 15% of the total, with only one at principal scientist level. The percentage of social scientists in the total staff is only a little higher. This combination of minority status in both discipline and gender, creates difficulties in terms of SERP’s capacity to influence and shape the integration of gender and social issues into biophysical research at the stage of conceptualization and planning. The planned appointment of a senior social and gender scientist is vital in order to support the further advancement of social and gender research, but also to reinforce the status of social and gender analysis and its mainstreaming within ICARDA.

## 4.4 Recommendations

a) To improve science quality and in order to achieve cutting edge socioeconomic research especially in terms of methodological rigor and research strategy the panel recommends re-initiating the in-house seminar program that has disappeared since the move to Jordan. As far as possible SEPRP should invite mentors and reviewers to these seminars (eventually using video link) to act as commentators to provide constructive criticisms to the papers presented. Every SEPRP staff should present each of his/her research projects at least twice, i.e. in the research design phase and during the results phase. The results seminars could be more broadly constituted in order to inform breeders and other ICARDA scientists about socioeconomic research at ICARDA.

b) Engage more specifically with ARIs and SPIA with the aim to especially increase the rigor and science quality of impact assessments. Careful attention is needed to establishing a control and a “treatment” group and identifying the impact of the intervention. Investments in data collection, such as a short panel with measurements at baseline and after the intervention, will increase the ability to do more rigorous impact assessment. This also refers to a good documentation of survey instruments, organization and procedures (sampling frames, enumerator training schedules, enumerator training material, enumerator guidelines, data entry programs including plausibility rules, documentation of non- sampling errors, etc.).

c) Focus research in fewer areas. While there is some division in opinions about the exact focal areas that would be optimal, the review panel believes that efforts should be taken to focus on fewer areas and this focus should reflect staffing levels and information about critical mass requirements in each area. For example, there is a clear lack of critical mass in the following areas: natural resource economics, policy, and impact assessment. Critical mass can possibly be obtained across multiple focal areas through a single hire, depending on the person. For example, an applied econometrician with interests in natural resource economics could support impact assessment, policy work, and many of the other areas.

d) The review panel recommends that ICARDA consider setting up more policy studies particularly in countries where political markets are becoming more open. Such studies will provide a wealth of information on the impact pathway and how it is affected by political change.

e) The recruitment of the senior social analysis/gender specialist should be pursued as a matter of urgency. Recruitment of a further social scientist with gender expertise should be seriously considered if the ICARDA programs have resources to allocate to social and gender research within their portfolios. Support for gender reporting and proposal development could be enhanced without increasing the demands on social scientists, through the production of guidelines (some of which exist elsewhere and just need to be adopted) and notes for mainstreaming gender into the project cycle, starting from the design phase.

f) Focus on sharpening theory in gender related research, in particular to understanding the social constructions of social and gender norms and the conditions for their transformation. The social construction of masculinity and examination of the social norms influencing men’s behavior are important areas for inclusion and link gender research more explicitly to broader application of methods of social analysis. These include the examination of other potential forms of social differentiation which can influence outcomes from poverty oriented agricultural and rural development, for example age, language, culture, religion etc.

h) Complement impact assessment of complex integrated technologies, with baseline assessment of the norms and values which relate to these, or underpin value chain participation. This will help to shape testing and targeting of technologies and can be followed later with an assessment of how they have influenced processes of technology development at intervention sites and been influenced by them.

i) Targeted communication of social and gender research results to ICARDA scientists can be influential in convincing them of the relevance of the research and encouraging the integration of the findings into their decision making. It is important that the practical implications for their specific research and technology development objectives and activities are clearly drawn out in such presentations. Also communication of the results of social and gender-related research to policy makers and wider development partners to inform their policy and development decision making and interventions is important and can be planned in conjunction with SEPRP’s policy research, learning alliance and innovation platform influencing activities.

# Chapter 5: International cooperation

## 5.1 ToRs

In international cooperation and partnerships the panel looked at two questions:

a) Adequacy and extent of current research partnerships, how these may be strengthened and how they more effectively be called upon for input along the research-for-development impact pathway; and

b) Adequacy and quality of current partnerships, including those with other CGIAR centers, particularly partnership with IFPRI, advanced research institutions, NARS, civil society and the private sector, for advancing ICARDA’s SEPR;

## 5.2 Overview

SEPRP is involved in a wide-ranging portfolio of international partnerships and corresponding activities (see table JA.1 in appendix). These include strong linkages to NARS in the drylands region, maintained through joint participation in ongoing projects, and in CRP activities and designation of NARS partners as focal points for various ICARDA activities. Other international linkages involve non-NARS government agencies such as Ministries of Agriculture, NGOs and other local actors, other CG Centers, regional universities and advanced research institutions (ARIs). Linkages to NGOs are, however, rather limited mainly due to the relative absence of non-governmental partners in many of the countries where ICARDA works. Recent political changes have led to a growing numbers of NGOs and it is anticipated that their profile as development partners will increase.

Several changes have recently affected SEPRP’s international partnerships. The shifting political and social landscapes in drylands areas have created new opportunities for ICARDA to engage national scientists; they also increase the demand for policy advice. Restructuring in the CG and ICARDA also creates opportunities for expanded partnerships. The CRP structure brings new partnership opportunities, particularly with ARIs and national institutions. Some CRP funding is targeted toward facilitating these partnerships. At the same time, the CRP structure creates increased challenges to management of human resources—ICARDA is involved in an astounding 9 CRPs and management must prioritize activities. As resources and time get stretched thin, time to nurture international partnerships must be guarded. ICARDA’s decentralization will also affect demands from partners.

The panel had an opportunity to probe deeply into ICARDA/NARS linkages in three countries (Jordan, Egypt and Morocco, where lengthy discussions with NARS social scientists were held). Evidence of the breadth and quality of linkages with other institutions were inferred by analyzing evidence provided by ICARDA and discussions with SEPRP staff. Additional information could be obtained from the recent CCER report on “Partnerships and Outreach”.

## 5.3 NARS linkages

Linkages between SEPRP and social scientists at the various regional NARS are a clear expectation of management and these linkages are intimately associated with the ICARDA mission. NARS linkages are generally the product of long-term ICARDA involvement in the region and substantive contacts between ICARDA scientists and national researchers. The portfolio of specific linkages varies by country, but they involve, among others, scientific collaboration on projects, proposal elaboration, training and capacity building, and project administration. The relationship between the NARS social sciences groups and SEPRP is best described as a partnership. The exact nature, however, depends on a number of factors; for example, the NCARE (the National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension in Jordan) social science research portfolio was entirely devoted to joint work, while the INRA (Morocco) agenda was partly joint work with ICARDA, partly independent work and partly work with other national and international partners. The differences between the institutions included resource availability and installed capacity. The Institute National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA) receives far more of its funding from the Government of Morocco and bilateral international and other sources; while NCARE’s staff salaries are covered by the government of Jordan, it receives no operating or other resources from government. Research capacity at INRA appears to be much higher quality, although NCARE has made significant recent strides toward capacity building.

The review panel’s visit to Morocco provided a good example of the ICARDA/NARS relationship. Social scientists at INRA described a long history of engagement with ICARDA scientists whom they clearly consider to be their primary research/development partners. This history began in 1978 with joint work on agricultural research; in 1985 ICARDA signed its first formal agreement with the Government and in 1986 an agreement was signed with the Ministry of Agriculture which designated INRA as the focal point for ICARDA in Morocco. Aside from the formal arrangement, INRA social scientists described a robust and close relationship that grew in strength through the 1980s and 1990s. The ICARDA/INRA research collaboration was bolstered by two USAID-funded capacity building projects beginning in the 1980s that trained more than 250 Moroccan PhD students.

INRA social scientists describe a close cooperation with ICARDA on a number of research projects and broad involvement in CRPs. They claim that more than 40% of ICARDA’s socioeconomic research portfolio involved Morocco-related topics. They identify multiple benefits from the partnership with ICARDA for INRA. These include: access to ICARDA scientific expertise and its focus on research quality, resources ICARDA brings to the table, ICARDA’s flexibility in managing project funds, capacity-building, ICARDA’s involvement in region-wide projects and its international connections and networks. Appreciation for ICARDA scientific expertise was reiterated on numerous opportunities during the panel visit. During the visit to NCARE in Jordan, similar sentiments were expressed, and a review of information provided by the Agricultural Research Center (ARC) of Egypt shows that the ARC/ICARDA partnership is a strong one.

INRA scientists note that ICARDA interactions help raise the overall quality of research, help identify new research topics and continually introduce improved/advanced methods, and push research toward end products including publications and development impacts. While most of INRA’s funding for socioeconomic research comes from Moroccan sources, a large share of some socio-economic activities is funded by joint projects. ICARDA efforts at capacity building are highly valued.

ICARDA clearly benefits in multiple ways from NARS linkages. Benefits include ability to leverage research and capacity-building resources, greater ability to collect household data, access to in-country expertise to help identify policy-relevant topics, access to policy makers. SEPRP staff recognizes these benefits and the review panel detected broad agreement that NARS social scientists were viewed as the most important SEPRP research partners.

INRA social scientists express some concern that the linkage with ICARDA is not as strong as it had once been. The scientists perceive that the SEPRP research agenda has become too broad and the scientific interactions are not as intensive as they had been in the past. This sentiment might be a product of new business models endorsed by the CG whereby scientist time is closely accounted for. National partners note that longer-term interactions on bigger-picture themes have historically been the sources of most fruitful interactions and express the view that these longer-term projects are no longer the norm. Long-term training is less available under the new project based funding arrangements than it had been in the past.

INRA social scientists indicated that their collaborative work with ICARDA focuses on agricultural research for development and less on pure science. However, while in the past this brought substantial projects (e.g. the three phases of the IFAD funded Mashreq/Maghreb project since 1995) there has been an increasing trend in SEPRP towards multiple, smaller diagnostic or dissemination projects, which do not provide resources for in-depth, longer term socio-economic research. This is also a constraint to the production of research publications, despite the positive encouragement from ICARDA, and restricts their ability to provide evidence and advice to decision makers. The Drylands CRP has brought further opportunities for embedding research in the wider development context through the Innovation Platforms, although it was felt that this new paradigm will take some time to be fully understood and accepted among biophysical researchers.

In addition, as approximately 90% of the ICARDA-linked projects are managed by biophysical scientists, social scientists are being increasingly viewed as providing services to these other projects and are less able to identify and follow social science-led research themes. In this relationship, the INRA scientists express the opinion that if any project has a substantial socio-economic component, the resources for the socio-economic work should be controlled by a socio-economist. Areas where INRA staff expresses the biggest need for ICARDA expertise are in impact assessments, water economics and policy, and overall policy (water policy and food grain subsidy policy). Additional ICARDA support to the NARS is needed in the area of impact assessment. NARS scientists suggest that they are overburdened by requests for assessments and voice concern that their assessments may not be taking advantage of some of the latest impact assessment techniques. They suggest that ICARDA might take more vigorous steps toward increased rigor in impact assessment and share new techniques with regional partners. Water policy is clearly a high priority of the NARS and they look to ICARDA for state-of-the-art techniques to evaluate water policy options. Interestingly, none of the national partners mentioned gender as a high priority suggesting that more awareness may be needed of the importance of gender.

ICARDA's cooperation with Egypt's ARC offshoots to involve university staff in ICARDA projects who engage their students in field-data collection. ARC socio-economists note that gender research is an interactive work between ICARDA and national gender programs. They express need from ICARDA for training in economic and value chain analyses and writing and editing skills. Demand is also expressed for more cooperation on youth issues such as organizing functional forums that assist to bring together views of various stakeholders on how to involve youth and attract their contribution in development. NARS partners in Egypt emphasized the growing role of the horticultural sector and a corresponding need for socioeconomic and gender studies related to post harvest systems and value chains.

Particularly referring to visit in Egypt the Review Panel noticed a substantial knowledge gap among ARC socio-economists on the CGIAR's new move toward the CRP structure and its implication for ICARDA’s work. Sometimes the ICARDA-NARS work is seen in the light of consultancy contracts. This may be one reason why some ARC socio-economists perceive ICARDA’s programs to have little effect on decision making of agricultural administrators and policy makers in the country. They argue that projects often serve the interest of ICARDA and less the country’s interest. In principle, this could jeopardize the sustainability of ICARDA projects (and those of other organizations too) and especially calls for proper “exit strategies” when ICARDA projects end. From the CGIAR and the Center’s point of view this of course raises the point on the balance between researches specific to a country versus research for generating international public goods. Clearly, specific country contributions are less in the interest of an international Center while the NARS understandably are interested in that.

Another issue is the apparently low priority given to adequately checking the quality of national-level data uses in analyses of the NARS partners. This seems to be an implication of the lack of priority given to database management (e.g. documentation data access) and data quality issues by SEPRP-HQ on NARS collaborators’ perception on the role and importance of data quality. There is therefore a need to sensitize NARS scientists on these topics, which however requires that SEPRP-HQ invests in database management and documentation (and perhaps training) in order to be able to demonstrate the importance of this to the NARS. The socioeconomics' group also expressed concern about a weak role of the economic and extension components in ARC research, stating that technical institutions tend to align together. This despite the fact that such a role has increased over the last two years, apparently following a ministerial directive to involve economists in every research project. It is not clear to the Review Panel whether the low involvement is attributed to weak initiatives of the socio-economists, which could be due to inadequate capabilities, or to insufficient comprehension of biophysical scientists of the importance of socioeconomics in their research agenda. It is however observed by the Review Panel that there is high dependence of ARC economists on ICARDA Staff for direction and guidance. Yet, the gender specialists are very active and seem to be effective partners for good research. In either case, ICARDA, whose work is interdisciplinary, will have a role to play to build awareness and intensify training to ensure research synergies since otherwise work will be affected.

## 5.4 Other national partnerships

Other national partnerships, described in table JA.1 (Annex), include a wide variety of activities with various ministries of agriculture, water and others throughout the region. A total of 10 such partnerships were identified by SEPRP staff since 2009; while this does not seem like an excessive number, many have multiple activities. Four partnerships involve translating research findings into fact sheets for local consumption. In this regard, ICARDA is potentially increasing its development impacts by inserting its findings directly into the national policy debate. Some of the fact sheets examined by the review panel were geared toward an extension audience and could have direct impacts on farmer decisions. Other joint activities include direct research projects (five) and participation in proposal writing. Areas of SEPRP/national cooperation correspond to SEPRP strengths: water valuation and policy, impact assessment, and gender activities.

These other national partnerships can provide important benefits to ICARDA as it seeks to fulfill its mission. As Ministries of Agriculture frequently fulfill prominent roles in agricultural policy, direct linkages to these ministries can facilitate uptake of research recommendations and increase ICARDAs impact. These partnerships should be recognized by ICARDA management as important and should be rewarded during staff evaluations.

## 5.5 ARIs

SEPRP identified a modest (9 since 2009) number of collaborations with ARIs, but the self-reported strength of the collaboration is quite high (all were rated 5 on a 1-5 scale of intensity). Subjects of these collaborations include impact assessment, bio-economic modeling, climate change, and economic analysis of conservation agriculture and land degradation. These are subjects where SEPRP wishes to build its own capacity, so the partnerships are appropriate. The genesis of linkages between ICARDA and the ARIs vary; some represent longer-term connections through SEPRP staff (e.g. Purdue University), some are linked to bilateral projects, and some emerge through personal connections between SEPRP staff and researchers at the ARIs. A clear advantage to ICARDA of these collaborations is the ability to enhance science quality and improve the international visibility of Center research. Historically, partnerships with ARIs have led to some of the higher-profile publications of the Center and ARI partnerships help the Center maintain its scientific strength. Under the current SEPRP staffing profile, the review panel recommends that these partnerships be encouraged—ARI participation in Center research can help build capacity and younger staff can gain experience through these interactions.

An important mechanism for ICARDA/ARI linkages is through graduate student research being conducted under ICARDA projects. Such linkages generally lead to cutting-edge research as young scientists seek to contribute international public goods. Student advisors at the ARIs might seek to extend their relationship to SEPRP beyond completion of the student’s research. ICARDA can leverage its resources; when an appropriate topic can be identified, a graduate student or ARI scientist can provide intellectual inputs far beyond what would be expected from a short-term consultant hired to do similar work. When graduate students reside in an ICARDA office, ICARDA gains a better read on the student’s ability and the opportunity to hire may present itself in the future. As noted in the Stripe review and other sources, one of the solid programs for attracting high-quality researchers was the Rocky-doc program (Rockefeller Social Science Fellowship Program); SEPRP could build a pre-doc program that provides similar benefits to the institution.

While SEPRP research is clearly benefiting from linkages to ARIs, particularly in the area of bio-economic modeling, stronger linkages could strengthen socioeconomic research in a number of areas. These include impact assessment, policy analysis, and natural resource economics. For impact assessments, ARIs could contribute state-of-the-art methodologies for ex-post assessments. An example is the recent SPIA call for strengthening impact assessment in the CG. Under this project, funding is being provided for 2-year professional interactions between ARI impact assessment specialists and CG centers and focused cutting-edge assessments of key project or programs. The idea is to move the CG centers beyond cookie-cutter approaches to impact assessment and engage them in new partnerships to improve the scientific credibility of the assessments.

SEPRP can expand its impact assessment program by considering how to conduct impact assessments when ex-ante baseline surveys are not available. Modern statistical techniques may be used to overcome the absence of baseline data, but for projects where impact assessment is deemed to be important, the impact assessment methods need to be considered during project conception.

In the area of policy analysis, SEPRP researchers are entering an exciting arena. In the region, two policy issues stand out for their importance: water policy under increasing scarcity and agricultural policies that subsidize both grain production and consumption. It appears that SEPRP has appropriately decided that the modeling platform for their policy work will be the IFPRI IMPACT model. This model, which itself was the product of substantial interactions between IFPRI scientists and ARIs, is appropriate because it contains a specific water module and can be adapted to many policy environments. As SEPRP calibrates the model for use in the drylands area, it should seek inputs from ARI scientists to ensure that region-specific conditions are adequately represented and properly modeled. Partnerships with NARS can be exploited to identify policy scenarios; eventually capacity will have to be built at the country level to understand the model’s strengths and weaknesses. During this process, SEPRP needs to carefully identify its own comparative advantage and ensure that it is using the model as a platform to produce IPGs as well as substantive advice to the region’s governments.

In the realm of natural resource management, SEPRP scientists should engage international scientists to continue to ensure that their research methods are cutting edge and contributing to the creation of IPGs.

## 5.6 Summary of findings and recommendations

International research partnerships lead to benefits flows to partner institutions and ICARDA in different ways. ICARDA benefits by leveraging its scientific expertise, gaining access to country-level data, and building its legitimacy among policy makers. Local capacity building is enhanced by long-standing linkages to domestic partners and development projects could not function properly without their participation.

ICARDA’s decentralization will clearly increase the importance and prominence of national partners, particularly the NARS. The main research platforms, located in Morocco, Ethiopia and India, will help consolidate disperse research activities in these countries, but linkages to non-platform countries will also grow as more administration and project work is decentralized. The projected growth of the plant breeding program in Morocco will necessitate increased participation by the socioeconomics group and contacts between SEPRP and the national partners will become more routine and regular. These increased contacts will likely be appreciated by country partners. They also will likely raise expectations about the role of SEPRP in providing analytical “services” to the country. These expectations need to be carefully managed. SEPRP should clearly identify its comparative advantage and seek an appropriate balance between national interests, research for development and research for the production of IPGs.

National SEPRP partners express concern that the role socioeconomics is considered by many bio-physical scientists as providing services to biophysical research projects and would appreciate efforts to strengthen their autonomy in designing a larger part of their research program. Much of the “service” demanded by biophysical projects involves fairly mundane tasks such as collecting data for impact assessment, ensuring gender is adequately accounted for, and ensuring that outreach efforts such as innovation platforms function well. These routine tasks compete for staff time and it is important to recognize that time spent in such tasks means less time for scientific research. SEPRP can take a lead role in identifying the more “routine” tasks and instituting processes whereby these are completed while minimizing scientist time spent on the task. Templates for data collection, training on gender sensitivity and inclusion, and training on what is known to work and not work in innovation platforms are examples of steps that SEPRP could take to gain efficiencies (see also chapter 4).

ICARDA should take increased leadership in leveraging its provision of “services” for bio-physical projects into more cutting-edge research topics. For example, requests for routine impact assessment work might be used to negotiate inclusion in the broader research program of an innovative approach using randomization or another technique to identify the effect of interest. Work on innovation platforms might be exploited to examine platform effectiveness under different conditions or different institutional arrangements. By moving beyond the routine, SEPRP can help NARS scientists engage in innovative approaches.

The review panel strongly feels that ICARDA should take efforts to increase the strength and breadth of its linkages to ARIs. While recognizing that the CG’s new business model might constraint funding for such activities, the panel still believes that ARI linkages will clearly benefit SEPRP. Younger SEPRP scientists will benefit from these research linkages. Research quality, while already high, will increase as ARI researchers become more intensively involved in ongoing and new research. Many of the newer techniques in impact assessment, valuation methods, and behavioral economics applied to institutional design have not yet flowed broadly to the CG and stronger linkages with ARIs will facilitate this flow. Suggested steps to build ARI linkages include:

1. Identify ARI mentoring partners for junior research staff. Due to the seniority imbalance in SEPRP staff the panel recommends a planned mentoring program for junior staff. Mentors could include senior ARI researchers who could be offered annual travel to HQ and access to state-of-the-art research projects as part of an incentive package.
2. Provide access to ICARDA data sets to stimulate research partnerships. ICARDA conducts its research in a developing area that is of extreme interest to policy makers worldwide. ARI researchers are likely to be interested in the area due to its geopolitical importance and its sensitivity to climate change. Enhanced access to the numerous household data sets will strengthen linkages. For example, students in econometric or data analysis courses at international universities often engage in a search for “interesting” data to analyze for class projects. By making these data sets available, ICARDA can broaden its linkages and, in cases where the analysis goes well, leverage its research portfolio.
3. Enable and promote sabbatical leave programs with ARIs. Many universities support faculty on sabbatical leave, with typical programs paying 100% of the salary (for 6 months) or 50% of the salary (for 12 months). Social science faculty members at ARIs are looking for interesting research topics and might be interested in a drylands area sabbatical. ICARDA could seek funding advertise its opportunities to this potential audience. Extended leaves are likely to bear fruit by promoting high-quality research and creating the opportunity for longer-term research collaborations. Similarly, sabbatical leaves for SEPRP at ARIs might be supported by ICARDA. Such opportunities would enable longer-term and more substantive research interactions.
4. Increased advertising for opportunities at ICARDA. It is the sense of the review panel that ICARDA could broaden participation of ARIs through wider advertisement of research opportunities, including sabbaticals, positions and post-doc positions. By engaging international researchers in searches for candidates, familiarity with and visibility of the institution are enhanced. Part of the sense that SEPRP staff is “stretched too thin” is evident in the breadth of its partnerships. The established and growing partnerships with NARS and ARIs dovetail nicely with an important recommendation of the review panel—that ICARDA/SEPRP establish and continue collection of regular panel data sets in action sites.
5. Given the interest in the region on household vulnerability and adaptation to climate-related shocks, it is important that data for vulnerability assessment be collected. Researchers recognize that to properly identify responses to vulnerability in a quantitative sense, panel data are necessary. As noted in the STRIPE review, historically CG centers have invested in long-term panels and these investments have paid substantial premiums. National partnerships will be strengthened by such a long-term effort and ARIs linkages can be strengthened through it. ARIs can contribute international expertise in designing data collection instruments and ensuring an excellent research design.

# Chapter 6: The research to development continuum

## 6.1 ToRs

This section deals with ICARDA’s strategic vision on Research for Development and how it is being realized in practice. The relevant questions from the TORs are:

a) Has the internal balance of research-for-development been appropriately struck?

b) Are appropriate uptake pathways (from output to outcome to impact) for the adoption of ICARDA products being adequately explored?

c) What is the extent of the Center’s involvement with community approaches and their effectiveness in research-for-development?

## 6.2 Overview

The ICARDA strategic plan 2007-2016 provides an indication of its position on the relationship between research and development. The developmental vision is for improved livelihoods of the resource poor in the dry areas, to which ICARDA’s mission is to contribute by enhancing food security and alleviating poverty through research and partnerships.

Globally, over the last decade, there has been increasing emphasis on the contribution of agricultural research to development goals. Agricultural Research for development (AR4D), value chains, and innovation systems approaches are examples of efforts to situate agricultural research within a broader context of national policies, agricultural service provision, both public and private, and the needs of the farming, rural and urban populations for income and food security. Research for Development has been variously interpreted, ranging from a requirement that research designs specify the pathway through which the knowledge and innovation generated by their research will contribute to improving farmers’ livelihoods and ultimately have an impact on poverty reduction, food security and sustainable management of natural resources, to an approach requiring more accountability for development outcomes and a more fundamental change in how agricultural research is conducted (GCARD 2012). The latter interpretation emphasizes effective partnership mechanisms, a collective focus on priorities shaped by science and society, inclusion of the specific needs of women producers, broader participation and investment, generation and sharing of knowledge and creating close linkages to the wider development context. The expectation is that research will be evaluated on its outcomes, and ultimately the extent to which it has led to positive impacts on poverty, food security and the environment.

The review team considered how ICARDA and its social, economic and policy research in particular, orientates its work along the research for development continuum and whether the positioning is appropriate. It considered how uptake pathways are defined and used by the program and the extent and effectiveness of SEPRP’s approaches for scaling-up and scaling-out of research outputs for developmental outcomes and impact, including community based approaches.

## 6.3 Assessment

*a) Orientation on the research for development continuum*

One concern relating to the positioning of CGIAR Centers in the Research for Development Continuum is that their research functions can be overshadowed by their catalytic and advocacy roles and that preoccupation with horizontal and vertical partnerships and interactions at multiple scales may emphasize processes and activities with high transactions costs, at the expense of value-added action and impacts (CGIAR 2006:15).

SEPRP staff are engaged both in research to understand the contribution of technologies to development, and research on processes such as innovation platforms and policy processes in order to better understand the conditions for promoting development. SEPRP position themselves as generally not engaged in direct development implementation, which they consider to be the responsibility of partners in national organizations and development bodies. SEPRP’s research includes working directly with users in community-based action research and higher level engagement with stakeholders and policy makers, however, the research and learning objectives are at the forefront. The review team supports this position and encourages the pursuit of research which contributes to a *more rigorous understanding* of the conditions for agricultural and NRM technologies and policies to contribute to developmental impact.

The observation of the Stripe Review of Social Science in the CGIAR, 2009 on the effects of short term funding and emphasis on immediate development impact on research coherence and quality is discussed in chapter 4 above. However, these realities of international funding are unlikely to change. There is a risk that donor pressure for ICARDA involvement as a major player in the region will encourage more engagement by SEPRP as a dissemination and development partner. It is important that SEPRP ensures that there is a strong research and learning component in bilaterally funded projects.

There is no hard and fast dividing line between where research ends and development begins. The level of engagement in ‘development’ depends crucially on the extent to which development partners are active at national, local levels, whether these are government extension staff, private sector companies, farmers’ organizations, other civil society bodies and NGOs or internationally funded development projects. To date, the range of partners that SEPRP has worked with has been relatively restricted – primarily government agricultural research organizations and ministries of agriculture. Among their partner organizations, SEPRP listed only one organization as ‘other’ than a government ministry, NARS, ARI or university and cited this and two additional organizations as ’development’ partners’. All three were in Morocco. SEPRP collaborated with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) working with the Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forets et à la Lutte contre le desertification (HCEFLCD), a government structure. This was categorized as a relatively low level of collaboration, involving the production of knowledge fact sheets. The other two development organizations were also government agencies; the Agence de Développement de l'Agriculture and the Agence Nationale pour le Développement des Zones Oasiennes et de l'Arganier (ANDZOA). The latter is active in the Moroccan learning alliance.

There has been little visibility of SEPRP collaboration with NGOs, farmer organizations and the private sector, whether because these have been slow in developing or because of lack of visibility of small local organisations with which projects interact. One effective partnership between SEPRP, NCARE and the private sector has been established in Jordan, working with a dairy processing unit to increase the capacity of smallholder and cooperative processors and solve problems along the dairy value chain.

However, the emerging area of work around innovation platforms provides a more focused opportunity to engage with new actors. Furthermore there is increasing potential for expanding the range of partnerships with the impetus given to civil society organizations since the ‘Arab spring’.

*b) Uptake pathways*

The concept of the ‘impact pathway’ has contributed to developing awareness of the research for development continuum among CGIAR scientists. A description of the impact pathway was required for each major project under the previous MTP process. At their most simple, they outlined a linear path of adoption, but the more complex defined a sequence of stages and relationships necessary to secure end users access to technologies and other conditions necessary for there to be positive outcomes.

For example, findings from the previous output 1 (MTP 2011-2013) on causes of poverty and livelihood strategies were to be communicated through direct interaction in workshops with policy makers, development project managers and international development agencies; through written materials (policy briefs, ICARDA research news and other ICARDA publications); and through engaging in projects with development agencies. For output 4, research on strengthening local institutions for improved livelihoods and methodologies for community-based and participatory methods, the target groups are researchers, national planners and decision makers. A key step is the institutionalization of participatory and community based approaches in NARS which would enhance technology adoption by end users and empower rural communities and enhance household social capital on a wider scale.

This perspective on impact pathways is further emphasized within the CRPs which include a theory of change which shows how innovation in different parts of the system will interact in order to lead to changes and deliver the development outcomes. Impact pathways and partnership development is clearly articulated in the DS CRP, however, it is less apparent in other projects. It is unclear the extent to which the articulation of a clear impact pathway is embedded as part of research proposal design outside the CRP. Furthermore, it is not necessarily under SEPRP influence.

The Drylands CRP has defined its anticipated intermediate development outcomes and the mechanisms through which these will be reached. In addition to outcomes relating to livelihoods resilience, income, food security and equitable and sustainable natural resource management, there are outcomes which help to create the enabling environment for these to be scaled up and out; e.g. better functioning markets, more integrated and connected service delivery institutions, policy reform removing constraints and creating incentives and better access to and control of productive assets by women and youth.

For SEPRP these outcomes constitute important subjects for research, for example, factors promoting value chain development, the effectiveness of partnerships among different types of organizations, the degree to which multi stakeholder platforms actually promote scaling and the processes of policy influence. However, available documentation did not elaborate these questions in any detail nor the research methods to investigate them.

The requirement of CRPs to deliver outcomes has increased the importance of connections to development partners. One newly appointed SEPRP staff member is working specifically on development partnerships and linkages.

In cases where the research partners already have a mandate to promote uptake and pursue development goals, there is continuity between research and promoting change for development. In other cases, to reach the desired outcomes there needs to be effective partnerships with a range of stakeholders and development organizations, government and non-government, who are considered best situated to engage in further scaling out and up.

The number of partners identified by SEPRP outside government ministries, national and international research organizations and Universities is very small. Yet there has been increasing recognition of the need to go beyond engaging national partners in the research process, to exploring other mechanisms for promoting and understanding the developmental impact of research. In addition, mechanisms are needed for sharing the policy implications of research and identifying new policy research questions and priorities. For example, two mechanisms utilized by SEPRP are innovation platforms and learning alliances.

SEPRP defines Learning Alliances (LA) as a joint process of learning undertaken by a group of different stakeholders including non-government actors such as civil society representatives and producer organizations, in order to share knowledge, experience on good practice, identify challenges and generate ideas on how activities can further development outcomes. An IDRC-funded project working with learning alliances in Morocco and Egypt focused on agricultural production, marketing and value chain development, with a strong gender focus. The opportunities and challenges identified provided an agenda for action research, e.g. options for organizing local tomato processing, date marketing, upgrading of artichoke collection and processing. Additionally the LAs identified system level constraints such as input supply systems, and policy constraints. Four learning alliance workshops were held in 2013, two in Morocco and two in Egypt and the first phase of a learning alliance completed in Jordan in April 2014. In Egypt, the LA included farmers, community based organizations, international development agencies, and the NARS and directorate of agricultural extension, while in Morocco additional participants were stakeholders from within the value chain and national universities. ANDZOA has offered to house the alliance administratively. In Jordan, the civil society participants included a women’s agricultural cooperative, a water users association, and a locally registered development agency. The need for private sector, university and health institution participation was identified.

The outcomes are in terms of 1) partners’ development of practical approaches, tools and methodology for addressing a common challenge and 2) through proof of concept, government and collaborators are encouraged to invest in long term programs that mainstream principles espoused by the learning alliance framework in the MENA region.

There is an important research contribution in examining the conditions under which multi stakeholder learning processes and interaction can promote gender aware, technology development and adoption and innovation, market access, and influence policy. More specific research areas associated with the learning alliances and innovation platforms include the role of agricultural extension and advisory services; how to combine reactive and proactive approaches within the learning alliance; how to reconcile the different mandates and priorities of scientific agricultural research and civil society organizations, and how these processes can be resourced and sustained.

The distinctions between Learning Alliances and Innovation Platforms appear to be rather blurred. In the CRP1.1 High Value Chain cluster the learning alliance appears to have a focused learning function, involving all stakeholders along the value chain. It is envisaged that lessons from value chain joint learning exercises in Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia would inform members of Innovation Platforms on the take-up pathways identified for addressing constraints. CRP 1.1, under “Innovation platforms and scenarios”, indicates that innovation platforms will ‘foster collaboration among a wide range of public and private stakeholders and partners for more effective development and adoption of technologies and best practices within mutually identified pathways’. Exchange of knowledge will enhance adaptation and adoption of technologies and best practices and lessons from research will influence policy reform. This term Innovation Platform is distinct from a notion of research platform as the location for integrated research approaches, as for example, ICARDA’s work on irrigation in Egypt or grain legumes in India.

SEPRP is commended for advancing their thinking in this area, not easy given the history and institutional architecture of CWANA region. However, some further refinement is needed. A clear definition of how SEPRP is using these concepts and how they relate to each other is important both for internal coherence, but also for external communication, as they are terms widely used within the International research for development community. Further discussion is needed on the convening principles (e.g. a broad policy interest in the agricultural sector, or a specific interest in a value chain or problem), the stakeholder composition and the levels at which the alliances or platforms operate (national, local). Research on the conditions necessary for effective joint learning or for multi-stakeholder innovation should go alongside the facilitation of these processes.

*c) Community approaches*

SEPRP has a long involvement in community-based participatory approaches. MTP outputs relating to participatory approaches have been specified at least since 2005 and the application of participatory and community-based approaches for research on rural livelihoods was strengthened through collaboration with the System-wide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) and the System-wide Program on Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRi). There has been increasing emphasis on getting knowledge on these approaches out to researchers. Output 4 in the 2007-2009 MTP was ‘Framework for community-based and participatory research approaches adapted or developed and made available to stakeholders’. The article in *Development in Practice*, Strategies for out-scaling participatory research approaches for sustaining agricultural research impacts (Aw-Hassan 2008) addresses the important question of how to ensure the application of participatory approaches in research practice and research organisations, or to ‘institutionalise’ participatory approaches. The paper makes recommendations for research managers and identifies specific strategies to create dynamic learning processes and institutional change. These include working with farmers’ groups and in partnership with development projects; organizational support for mainstreaming participatory research and gender analysis; the effective involvement of agricultural extension services and the strengthening of stakeholder capacity. This paper consolidated previous learning and set the agenda for continuing SEPRP research in this area.

In recognition of the need to institutionalise participatory and community based approaches, The MTP 2009-2011 modified the title and focus of Output 4 to ‘Local institutions for improved livelihoods analysed and recommendations for their strengthening in dry areas developed’. Specific research areas covered the effectiveness of small scale farmer associations on securing market access and promoting good agricultural practice, and guidelines for supporting such organisations (research in Egypt and Morocco).

The effectiveness of the institutionalization of participatory and community based approaches was evident in the discussions with NARS visited in Jordan and Morocco. INRA reported starting with community based approaches in 2000, working with farmers, extension services and with ICARDA and including decision makers. In particular, they cited the different phases of the Mashreq Maghreb project. They noted the development of Innovation platforms supported by SEPRP which has widened stakeholder participation beyond communities and research and extension agencies. However, staff capacity in this area, both in the NARS and in SEPRP has been limited. INRA in Morocco reported a significant decrease in their sociological capacity due to staff retirements. Encouragement to maintain and build NARS expertise in innovation and organizational development is important.

## 6.4 Recommendations

1. The review panel considered the internal balance of research for development and the level of resources devoted to these areas as appropriate, and that engagement at the developmental end of the continuum is important to maximize the relevance of ICARDA’s economic, social and policy research. The review panel advises against SEPRP directly implementing development programs, despite encouragement from donors because of ICARDA’s regional presence and administrative capacity.
2. It is important for SEPRP to clarify its roles, particularly in initiatives such as Learning Alliances and Innovation Platforms. It is advised that they clarify the distinction between the role of a catalyst in facilitation and brokering new alliances and partnerships, and their role in pursuit of the research and learning questions associated with the introduction of these initiatives and processes.
3. The panel recommends that SEPRP clarify its use of the terms ‘Learning Alliance’ and ‘Innovation Platforms’ to avoid confusion as to their purpose, targeted stakeholders and scale of interaction and influence. This will enable SEPRP to clearly formulate research questions and ensure that outputs in this area contribute to the growing body of knowledge and experience, while bringing the particular perspectives of introducing such approaches into formerly highly centralized government controlled systems.

# Chapter 7: Recommendations

The objective of this CCER was threefold: (1) to evaluate the progress made since the EPMR of 2006 which recommended to change the organizational set up and to increase the capacity of the socioeconomics Program, (2) to assess whether the research is consistent with the evolving mission of the CGIAR and the current and emerging global challenges in the dry areas and (3) to examine the recommendations and implications for ICARDA’s socioeconomic and policy research agenda of the 2009 Stripe Review of Social Sciences in the CGIAR.

Although the time for the CCER was short the conduct of the review was highly efficient and smooth. ICARDA management and staff provided excellent support and facilitation of the visits and meetings and supplied full access to necessary documentation. The panel is convinced that the ICARDA’s socio economics program is well in line with the Center’s vision and mission. Furthermore the SEPRP activities are carried out by highly qualified and dedicated staff under the supervision of a very experienced and able leader who is well respected among ICARDA management and staff and recognized in the profession. The challenges which SEPRP is confronted with however require adjustments and changes which are summarized in the following sections. The major messages and recommendations that have emerged from the analysis of the four broad issues addressed in this review, namely program vision, science quality, international cooperation, resources and the research and development continuum are presented in the following:

## 7.1 Program vision and mission

1. The panel thinks that it will be to ICARDA’s benefit if SEPRP articulate a vision and uses it to plan and evaluate its activities, along with vision of the center’s CRPs. SEPRP must clearly identify where it sees itself within ICARDA and with the global development research community**.** This would strengthen SEPRP’s service function with the Center and help make it a high level policy research group especially for the Arab region recognized by NARS ARIs and international organizations in development assistance without jeopardizing ICARDA’s global mandate.

## 7.2 Science quality

1. The panel recommends re-initiating the in-house seminar program in order to achieve cutting edge socioeconomic research especially in terms of methodological rigor and research strategy. SEPRP should invite mentors and reviewers to these seminars to act as commentator and provide constructive criticisms to the papers presented.
2. SEPRP should engage more completely with ARIs and SPIA with the aim to especially increase the rigor and science quality of impact assessments. Particular issues to be addressed are establishment of control and treatment group and investments in data collection and data management. Complement impact assessment of complex integrated technologies, with baseline assessment of the norms and values. Communicate the results of impact assessment especially social and gender-related research more effectively to policy makers and wider development partners
3. In order to obtain critical mass of socioeconomics research staff the panel recommends that SEPRP focus its research in fewer areas along with an adequate staff hiring policy. For example an applied econometrician with interests in natural resource economics could support impact assessment, policy work, and many of the other areas.
4. The review panel recommends that ICARDA consider setting up more policy studies particularly in countries where political markets are becoming more open. Such studies will provide a wealth of information on the impact pathway and how it is affected by political change.
5. The recruitment of the senior social analysis/gender specialist should be pursued as a matter of urgency. Recruitment of a further social scientist with gender expertise should be seriously considered if the ICARDA programs have resources to allocate to social and gender research within their portfolios.

## 7.3 International cooperation

a) The review panel strongly feels that ICARDA should take efforts to increase the strength and breadth of its linkages on social, economic and policy issues to ARIs, including identifying ARI mentoring partners especially for junior research staff.

b) The panel urges SEPRP to provide access to ICARDA data sets to stimulate research partnerships. ICARDA conducts its research in a developing area that is of high interest to policy makers worldwide; more widespread use of its data would benefit the institution by raising its profile and could stimulate production of global public goods.

c) ICARDA/SEPRP should also enable and promote sabbatical leave programs with ARIs. Similarly, sabbatical leaves for SEPRP staff at ARIs should be supported by ICARDA in order to achieve longer-term and more substantive research interactions.

d) Increased advertising for opportunities at ICARDA and engage international researchers in searches for candidates, familiarity with and visibility of the institution are enhanced. Part of the sense that SEPRP staff is “stretched too thin” is evident in the breadth of its partnerships.

e) The panel recommends that long-term panel data be collected for household vulnerability assessment given the interest in the region on household vulnerability and adaptation to climate-related shocks.

## 7.4 Resources

1. In view of the challenges ahead and based on the assessment of SEPRP’s human resources the panel strongly recommends the appointment of additional research staff in SEPR with the following priorities: (1) Econometrician who can especially help to improve the work in adoption and impact assessment but also in natural resource economics; (2) Policy research, in order for ICARDA to capitalize on the ongoing changes in agricultural policy especially in the Arab countries to become a Center of Excellence for Agricultural Policy in the region; (3) resource and environmental economics to enhance SERP’s capacity in environmental policy.
2. The panel strongly encourages ICARDA to seek additional funding outside the CRP in order to establish an SEPRP-specific research program on agricultural policy analysis and capacity building in its partner countries. Effective collaboration with IFPRI and/or appropriate ARIs will be crucial to implement such strategy.

## 7.5 Research development continuum

1. Engagement at the developmental end of the continuum is important to maximize the relevance and impact of SEPRP’s research, but the review panel advises against SEPRP directly implementing development programs, despite encouragement from donors because of ICARDA’s regional presence and administrative capacity.
2. The panel recommends SERRP to clarify its use of the terms ‘Learning Alliance’ and ‘Innovation Platforms’ to avoid confusion as to their purpose, targeted stakeholders and scale of interaction and influence. This will enable SERPS output in this area to contribute to the growing body of knowledge and experience in these areas, bringing the particular perspectives of introducing such approaches into formerly highly centralized government controlled systems
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# Appendices

Table A1: Staff scientist’s years (FTEs)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of scientist-years (FTE) corrected for directors research time of 50%** | | | | | | | |
| 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Average 2009-2013 |
| 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 4.7 |

Source: SEPRP Program Synthesis prepared for the CCER by SEPRP

Table A2: Percentage shares of staff time in different projects out of total time allocation   
(excluding training) (contin.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total Days | A.  Aw-Hassan | B.  Dhehibi | S.  Kassam | G.  Kassie | A  Mazid | R.  Telleria | Y.  Yigezu | Ayman  Frija | Prakesh | S.  Christman | D.  Najjar |
| **DS-CRP Activities** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-vulnerability | 126 |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-Bioeconomic | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-Policy | 35 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-Cereal Agg. App. | 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-Inn. Platform | 226 | 0.6 |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-high VC clusters | 185 | 0.4 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-Market access & Post-harvest | 117 | 0.1 | 0.5 |  | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-South Asia | 47 | 0.1 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-Gender | 630 | 0.5 |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |
| **Other CRPs** | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wheat | 372 |  |  |  |  | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.6 |  |  |  | 1.1 |
| GL 3.5 | 37 | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| DC3.6 | 5 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L&F3.7 | 110 |  |  |  | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L&F3.7 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CCAFS7 | 45 | 0.5 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CCAFS -Coordination | 60 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PIMCRP2-1 | 52 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PIMCRP2-2 | 786 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  | 1.6 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |  |
| **SEPRP Bilateral Projects** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MENARID | 5 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERS-USDA-ICARDA | 184 | 0.5 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELD -ZEF UZBK | 115 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GIZ-Foot Hill restoration UZBK | 120 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.7 |  |
| EU/IFAD-Legume-cereal | 20 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WLI | 44 |  | 0.8 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AFESD-Palestine | 10 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food security | 20 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ACIAR-Iraq | 376 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |
| ACIAR-Conservation Agric NA | 22 |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IFAD NA & Tajikistan | 33 |  | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AfDB | 10 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IFAD/Barley Livestock Jordan & Iraq | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| IFAD-CACILM II | 25 | 0.2 |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADA-land management; Ethiopia | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| ADA-IPM-Ethiopia | 22 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date Palm | 10 |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HASAD | 63.2 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 0.7 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ACIAR-Afghanistan | 33.4 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A2a: Percentage shares of staff time in different projects out of total time allocation   
(excluding training) (contin.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Gender specialist** | Ampai | Tamer | Nariman | Maria Marzouk | Lejla | Hala | Linda | Chandra | Sum | Total |
| **DS-CRP Activities** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DS-CRP-vulnerability |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |  | 103.1 | 3.1 |
| DS-CRP-Bioeconomic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| DS-CRP-Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |  | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| DS-CRP-Cereal Agg. App. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| DS-CRP-Inn. Platform |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| DS-CRP-high VC clusters | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |  | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| DS-CRP-Market access & Post-harvest |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |  | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| DS-CRP-South Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |  | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| DS-CRP-Gender | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  | 15.7 | 15.7 |
| **Other CRPs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wheat |  |  | 2.7 |  | 2.5 |  |  |  |  | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| GL 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| DC3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| L&F3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| L&F3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| CCAFS7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| CCAFS -Coordination | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| PIMCRP2-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| PIMCRP2-2 |  | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 19.6 | 19.6 |
| **SEPRP Bilateral Projects** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MENARID |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ERS-USDA-ICARDA |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 1.5 |  | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| ELD -ZEF UZBK |  |  |  | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| GIZ-Foot Hill restoration UZBK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| EU/IFAD-Legume-cereal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| WLI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| AFESD-Palestine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Food security |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| ACIAR-Iraq |  |  | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| ACIAR-Conservation Agric NA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| IFAD NA & Tajikistan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| AfDB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| IFAD/Barley Livestock Jordan & Iraq |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| IFAD-CACILM II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| ADA-land management; Ethiopia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| ADA-IPM-Ethiopia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Date Palm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| HASAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| ACIAR-Afghanistan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0.8 |

Table A3: Distribution of research topics in SEPRSP publications 2009-2014

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Total** | **Percent** |
| Impact | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 | 1 | 14 | 22.6 |
| Poverty | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 1 |  | 7 | 11.3 |
| ClimChange |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9.7 |
| Marketing |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 6.5 |
| Demand |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| Consumption |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| Technical Efficieny |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 6 | 9.7 |
| Resource Use Efficiency |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| Biodiversity |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| IPM | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 3.2 |
| Soil and Water Management |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| Waste Water |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| WUE |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 3.2 |
| Policy |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6.5 |
| Gender |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 3.2 |
| Adoption |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| AgricProductivity |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| Output Growth |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| PopProdCons |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| ProdCosts |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| Socioecon |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| Trade |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 3.2 |
| Unrecognized | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1.6 |
| **Total** | **8** | **8** | **4** | **16** | **17** | **9** | **62** | **100** |

Table A4: Ratios of socioeconomic to total staff\* at ICARDA and ICRISAT

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ICARDA | | | ICRISAT | | |
|  | Total Staff | Socioeconomics |  | Total Staff | Socioeconomics |
| BIGMP | 21 |  | Resilient Dryland Systems | 12 |  |
| DSIPSP | 9 |  | Markets, Institutions & Policy | 13 | 13 |
| IWLMP | 10 |  | Grain Legumes | 35 |  |
| SEPRP | 8 | 8 | Dryland Cereals | 14 |  |
|  |  |  | ESA - Nairobi | 10 | 3 |
|  |  |  | Lilongwe, Malawi | 3 | 1 |
|  |  |  | Bulawayo, Zimbabwe | 4 | 1 |
|  |  |  | Addis Ababa, Ethiopia | 5 |  |
|  |  |  | Bamako, Mali (WCA) | 10 | 2 |
|  |  |  | Niamey, Niger | 10 | 2 |
|  |  |  | Kano, Nigeria | 3 |  |
| Total | 48 | 8 | Total | 119 | 22 |
| **Ratio** |  | **16.7** | **Ratio** |  | **18.5** |

\* Staff comprised only Scientists and Senior Scientists, excluding Post-docs, Research Associates, Visiting Scientists and Admin staff.

Source: ICARDA staff list provided by SEPRP; staff list in ICRISAT website

Table A5: List of ICARDA International Partnerships on Social, Economic and Policy Research

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Partnership Institutions** | **Nature of Partnerships** | **Duration** | **Depth of Cooperation (1 = low, 5 = high)** |
| ***Ministry of Developing Countries*** | | | | |
| ***1*** | ***Ministry of Agriculture***  ***Location: Jordan*** | Collaborated on 2 knowledge factsheets: income generating activities for women and irrigation canal rehabilitation; gender study; cost benefit analysis on livestock production | 2013 | 4 |
| ***2*** | ***Ministry of Water and Irrigation of Jordan – MWI  Location: Jordan*** | Collaborated on research activities: economics of groundwater (Jordan and other countries); groundwater valuation (Mafraq, Jordan); farmers’ perceptions of water policies (Jordanian Badia) | 2013 | 3 |
| ***3*** | ***Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Higher Education***  ***Location: Iraq*** | Collaborated on research activities : the general equilibrium effects of catching up with international productivity of wheat (Iraq) | 2013 | 1 |
| ***4*** | ***Ministry of Water and Environment***  ***Location: Yemen*** | Collaborated on knowledge factsheet: rehabilitation efforts by local communities | 2012 | 1 |
| ***5*** | ***Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries in Oman – General Directorate of Agricultural Planning***  ***Location: Oman*** | Collaborated research activities : assessing returns from investments in two agricultural development projects (protected agriculture and modern irrigation systems) | 2011 | 4 |
| ***6*** | ***Ministry of Agriculture***  ***Location: Tunisia*** | Collaborated on 4 knowledge factsheets: income generating activities for women, Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands, no-tillage, recharge wells (in cooperation with National de Recherche Agronomique de Tunis, under FAO LADA project) | 2009 | 3 |
| ***7*** | ***Ministry of Equipment and Environment***  ***Location: Tunisia*** | Collaborated on knowledge factsheets: natural resources conservation by local communities | 2012 | 2 |
| ***8*** | ***Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI)***  ***Location: Egypt*** | Collaborated on project proposal: groundwater management | 2012 | 2 |
| ***9*** | ***Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Fisheries***  ***Location: Morocco*** | Collaborated on research activities: water policies for efficient water use technologies - solar energy versus liquefied petroleum gas for pumping irrigation ground water (Morocco) | 2012 | 3 |
| ***10*** | ***Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock***  ***Location: Afghanistan*** | Collaborated research activities : forage options for smallholder livestock in water–scarce environments (Afghanistan) | Before 2010 | 1 |
| ***NARS*** | | | | |
| ***11*** | ***The National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE) of Jordan  Location: Jordan*** | Collaborated research activities : barley-livestock and climate change project (IFAD-funded project); the dairy value chain (Jordan); bio-economic modeling and modeling framework under CRP1.1 (Jordan) ; agriculture productivity under ERS-ICARDA project (Jordan); national agriculture performances and policies (Jordan); value chain of olives and olive oil under CRP11-DS-WANA (Jordan) | Before 2009 | 5 |
| ***12*** | ***State Board of Agricultural Research (SBAR) and Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) of Iraq  Location : Iraq*** | Collaborated research activities: survey under CA project (Iraq); household and manufacturing survey (HASAD project) | 2013 | 1 |
| ***13*** | ***Agriculture Research Center – Agriculture Economics Research Institute (AERI-ARC)***  ***Location: Egypt*** | Collaborated research activities: the value chain of citrus, tomatoes and buffalo milk under (CRP11-DS-WANA); faba bean and wheat production (Egypt) | 2013 | 3 |
| ***14*** | ***Uzbek Institute of Market Reform (UIMR)***  ***Location : Uzbekistan*** | Collaborated research activities on data collection, entry (Uzbekistan) | 2010 | 1 |
| ***15*** | ***Institut National de Recherche Agronomique de Tunis (INRAT)***  ***Location : Tunisia*** | Collaborated research activities: bio-economic modeling under CRP1.1; survey under CLCA project (Tunisia) | 2013 | 4 |
| ***16*** | ***INRA Tunisie*** | Collaborated research activities: bio-economic modeling under CRP1.1; survey under CLCA project (Tunisia) | 2013 | 4 |
| ***17*** | ***Sahel and Sahara Observatory***  ***Location: Tunisia*** | Collaborated on knowledge factsheets : exploitation of geo thermal water and water desalinization units | 2012 | 2 |
| ***18*** | ***Agence de Développement de l'Agriculture & Agence Nationale pour le Développement des Zones Oasiennes et de l'Arganier***  ***Location : Morocco*** | Collaborated on baseline survey : a circular economy approach to agro-biodiversity conservation in the Soussa Massa Draa (Morocco) | 2013 | 3 |
| ***19*** | ***Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA)***  ***Location : Morocco*** | Collaborated research activities: bio-economic modeling under CRP1.1; understanding gender and poverty dimensions of high value agricultural commodity chains under CRP-PIM funded (Morocco); MENARID knowledge factsheet. | Before 2009 | 5 |
| ***20*** | ***The Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR)***  ***Location: Ethiopia*** | Collaborated research activities : national, regional and zonal adoption (barley, faba-beans, lentils and chickpeas); determinants of the adoption of individual and multiple technologies; adoption of improved varieties; assessment of the situation, outlook , investment opportunities and constraints for malt barley production (Ethiopia); the gender implications of the dynamics in the legume (Ethiopia) | Before 2009 | 5 |
| ***21*** | ***Agricultural Research Corporation (ARC) of Sudan***  ***Location: Sudan*** | Collaborated research activities : baseline survey under the African Development Bank funded SARD-SC project (Sudan, Nigeria, and Ethiopia) | Before 2009 | 5 |
| ***22*** | ***Tajik Academy of Agricultural Science: Institute of Agricultural Economics Republic of Tajikistan  Location: Tajikistan*** | Collaborated research activities: survey under CLCA-IFAD project (Tajikistan) | 2010 | 3 |
| ***23*** | ***Institut Technique des Grandes Cultures (ITGC)***  ***Location : Algeria*** | Collaborated research activities: survey under CLCA-IFAD Project (Algeria) | 2013 | 3 |
| ***24*** | ***Bahri Dagas International Agricultural Research Institute (BDIARI)***  ***Location: Turkey*** | Collaborated on literature review on past adoption and impact studies (Turkey) | 2013 | 3 |
| ***Universities in Developing Countries*** | | | | |
| ***25*** | ***Zagazig University***  ***Location: Egypt*** | Collaborated research activities: Total Factor Productivity Growth; agriculture productivity accounts (Egypt) under ERS-ICARDA project; research methodology guideline (Approaches to Total Factor Productivity Measurements in the Agriculture Economy); national agriculture performances and policies (Egypt) | 2013 | 5 |
| ***26*** | ***American University of Cairo***  ***Location: Egypt*** | Sharing knowledge, participating events and workshops | 2013 | 2 |
| ***27*** | ***Aleppo University***  ***Location: Syria*** | Joint students and training | Before 2009 | 2 |
| ***28*** | ***Damascus University***  ***Location: Syria*** | Joint students | Before 2009 | 1 |
| ***29*** | ***Hassan-II University***  ***Location: Morocco*** | Joint supervision of students | 2009-2013 | 3 |
| ***30*** | ***Alemaya University***  ***Location: Ethiopia*** | Joint supervision of students | 2010 | 4 |
| ***31*** | ***Ecole Supérieure d’Agriculture de Moghrane – ESAM***  ***Location : Tunisia*** | Collaborated research activities: Total Factor Productivity Growth; agriculture productivity accounts (Tunisia) under ERS-ICARDA project; national agriculture performances and policies (Tunisia) | 2013 | 5 |
| ***32*** | ***Bahirdar University***  ***Location: Ethiopia*** | Collaboration on research projects | 2010 | 3 |
| ***Advanced Research Institutions*** | | | | |
| ***33*** | ***Purdue University***  ***Location: USA*** | Collaborated on research activities: bio-economic model for CRP-DS (Jordan) | 2013 | 5 |
| ***34*** | ***UC Davis***  ***Location: USA*** | Collaboration on impact research and saffron marketing | 2009 | 5 |
| ***35*** | ***University of Florida***  ***Location: USA*** | Joint student on gender and climate change | 2011 | 5 |
| ***36*** | ***University of Natural Sciences and Life Sciences- BOKU***  ***Location: Austria*** | Collaborated research activities: economics of watershed management; impacts of perceptions on adaptation strategies; impacts of different watershed management strategies in the face of climate change | 2011 | 5 |
| ***37*** | ***CHEAM – IAMM  Location: France*** | Collaborated research activities: bio-economic model for CRP-DS (Morocco) | 2014 | 5 |
| ***38*** | ***Western Australian University***  ***Location: Australia*** | Joint analysis of the economics of conservative agriculture | 2013 | 5 |
| ***39*** | ***Royal Tropical Institute (KIT)***  ***Location: Netherlands*** | Just started discussion on collaboration of extension and innovation platform | 2014 | Expected to be 5 |
| ***40*** | ***IAMO***  ***Location: Germany*** | Assessing the impact of Climate Change | 2011 | 5 |
| ***41*** | ***ZEF***  ***Location: Germany*** | Research on economics of land degradation | 2014 | 5 |
| ***42*** | ***Yale University***  ***Location: USA*** | Joint research | Before 2009  (not active now) | 5 |
| ***Others*** | | | | |
| ***43*** | ***UNIDO Morocco & Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forets et à la Lutte contre le changement climatique***  ***Location : Morocco*** | Collaborated on 3 knowledge MENARID factsheets: rangelands restoration, pastoral cooperatives, water harvesting system/Vallerani plough | 2012 | 2 |

Table A6: Timeline of CCER on Social Economic and Policy Research Program of ICARDA

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24April 2014** | **Arrivals of the Panel members** | |
| **25 April 2014** | Morning: Meetings of the Panel members  Afternoon: Meetings with Dr. Aden Aw-Hassan, Program Director | |
| **26 April 2014 Program Staff Presentations** | | |
| 08:30-09:00 | Pick up from Hotel to ICARDA Office in Amman | |
| 09:00-10:00 | Meet with Dr. Dr. Maarten van Ginkel- DDG/Research and Aden Aw-Hassan- Program Director | |
| 10:00-10:30 | Program over view | Aden Aw-Hassan |
| **10:30-11:00** | **Coffee break** |  |
| 11:00-11:30 | Adoption impact studies | Ahmed Mazid |
| 11:30-12:00 | Bio-economic Modeling | Yigezu Atnafe Yigezu |
| 12:00-12:30 | Partnership with development | Shinan Kassam |
| 12:30-13:00 | Economics of NRM | Boubaker Dhehibi |
| **13:00-14:00** | **Lunch break** |  |
| 14:00-14:30 | Meeting with Dr. Kamel Shideed | ADG-International Cooperation and Communication |
| 14:30-15:00 | Meeting with Dr. Theib Oweis | Director IWLM Program |
| **15:00-15:30** | **Coffee break** |  |
| 15:30-16:00 | Market research | Girma Tesfahun Kassie |
| 16:00-16:30 | Environmental Governance | Stefanie Christmann |
| 16:30-17:00 | Economic research activities in CA | Nariman Nishanov |
| 17:00-17:30 | OPEN for discussions |  |
| 17:30- | Pick up from ICARDA Office back to Hotel |  |
|  | | |
| **27 April 2014 Presentation and Meetings continued** | | |
| 08:30-09:00 | Pick up from Hotel to ICARDA Office in Amman | |
| 09:00-09:30 | Meeting with Dr. Hichem Ben Salem | Director DISPS Program |
| 09:30-10:00 | Policy Analysis | Roberto Telleria |
| 10:00-10:15 | Linkage to development | Hugo Remaury |
| **10:15-10:45** | **Coffee break** |  |
| 11:00-11:30 | Gender Research | Dina Najjar |
| 11:30-12:30 | Individual meetings with SEPRP staff |  |
| **12:30-13:30** | **Lunch break** |  |
| 13:30-15:00 | Individual meetings with SEPRP staff | |
| 15:00-17:00 | OPEN | |
| 17:00- | Pick up from ICARDA Office back to Hotel | |
|  | | |
| **28April 2014** | **Meetings with National Programs-NCARE- Jordan** | |
| 08:30-09:30 | Pick up from Hotel to NCARE, Jordan | |
| 09:30-12:30 | NCARE social Sciences presentation of ICARDA collaboration | |
| 12:30-13:00 | Return to ICARDA office | |
| **13:00-14:00** | **Lunch break** | |
| 14:00-17:00 | OPEN | |
| 17:00- | Pick up from ICARDA Office back to Hotel | |
|  | | |
| **29 April 2014** | **Visit to national programs (two panel teams):**  Team A (Hermann Waibel and Hamid Faki)- Travel to Egypt  Team B (Jeff Alwang and Adrienne Martin)- travel to Morocco; | |
| **30April 2014** | Visits of national programs and presentations from national programs | |
| **1May 2014** | OPEN: Panel members meetings, analysis, writing, and additional virtual meetings with Skype | |
| **2 May 2014** | Return flights Panel Members  Final Meeting Panel Chair with. Maarten van Ginkel- DDG/Research and Aden Aw-Hassan- Program Director | |
| **3 May 2014** | Return Flight Panel Chair | |

Table A7: List of persons met in Morocco

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Name of Person met | Affiliation |
| 30-04-2014 | Dr. Rachid Mrabet | Director of Research and Head of the Scientific Division INRA |
|  | Mr. Abdelali Laamari | Agricultural Economist, INRA |
|  | Mustapha el Bouhssini | Entomologist, ICARDA |
|  | Ramish Verma | Barley Breeder, ICARDA |
|  | Filippo Bassi -. | Wheat Breeder, ICARDA |
|  | Mohamed Karoo | Integrated water and land management program, ICARDA |
| 01-05-2014 | Mohamed Badraoui | Director of INRA |
|  | Abdelatif Katabi | Gender Specialist, ENFI |

Table A8: List of persons met in Egypt

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Name of Person met | Affiliation |
| 01-05-2014 | Dr. Marwan Owaygen | ICARDA Coordinator Regional Office for Nile Valley and Sub Saharan Africa. |
|  | Dr. Hisham Alam | Former Director of Horticulture Program, Agriculture Research Center (ARC) |
|  | Dr. Ragab Hassan Ahmed | Economist/Researcher, ARC |
|  | Dr. Ali Ahmad Ibrahim | Director Social and Economic Program, ARC |
|  | Dr. Aman Algarhi, | Chief Researcher, ARC |
|  | Dr. Gihan Al Monoufi, | Researcher, ARC |
|  | Dr. Ali Ahmad Ibrahim | Professor of Economics, Zagazig University |