



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

EuropeAid Cooperation Office

Horizontal operations and Innovation

**Food security**

**Final2**

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **FOR MONITORING OF THE CGIAR<sup>1</sup> PROJECTS**

#### **CO-FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION IN 2004**

#### **IN A.C.P., ASIA, LATIN AMERICA AND THE MEDITERRANEAN REGIONS**

#### **Through the “Food Security and Food Aid” Budget line**

### **1) BACKGROUND**

Investments in agricultural research are needed in order to develop the most appropriate agricultural technologies, management strategies and policies for sustainable development. Environmentally and socially responsible increases in agricultural productivity and diversification of agriculturally based livelihood options will enable developing countries to take advantage of new opportunities offered by national, regional and world markets. The **CGIAR** established in the early Seventies, aims at contributing to food security and poverty eradication in developing countries through strategic research, research partnerships, capacity building and policy advice.

Europe has been involved in the CGIAR since its beginning in 1971 and it represents now the most important share of the overall funding (about 45% of the annual CGIAR budget of roughly 400 M€). The EC, as one of the largest EU contributor (about 22 M€ in 2004), has a vital interest to participate in the strategy formulation and agenda setting of the CGIAR, including current discussions for policy and institutional reform. In order to provide a solid basis for continued support, the elements of a strategy for EU's investments in the CGIAR have been formulated ([Annex 1](#)).

EC resources are allocated to a defined number of CGIAR projects that are generally co-funded by several donors. Budgets and work-plans are proposed by Centres, reviewed by the CGIAR Science Council, and examined / endorsed by the CGIAR Members for funding each year for the following year. Pledges are then made at the end of the calendar year at the latest with advance payments due at the beginning of the following year.

Annual donor commitments are made against a budget on a project basis, in principle without any breakdown for each individual donor. At the end of each budget period, Centres provide detailed

<sup>1</sup> Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

financial reports for each donor. The annual allocations of EC funds to specific projects may vary from one year to another, as a consequence of changing priorities in the wake of the CGIAR restructuring and reform process. However, a lot of attention is given to ensure continuity in the EC support provided to selected projects. The methodology for selecting the projects to be supported by the EC annually and the resource allocation mechanism is described in [Annex 2](#).

The detailed list of programmes / projects targeted by EC funding through the “Food Security and Food Aid” budget line in 2004 is given in [Annex 3](#). A "sample" will be subject to the present monitoring exercise.

## 2) **OBJECTIVES**

The monitoring exercise is clearly foreseen in the Financing Proposal endorsed by the EU Member States in May 2002. Its main purpose is to review the progress made by the selected projects according to their milestones (as described in the medium-term plan of the respective Centres) and to evaluate accordingly the possible need of reorienting the EC funding to these projects in the coming years.

More specifically, the experts will assess mainly, as defined below, the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of each of the EC supported projects selected for monitoring and particularly with regard to the EC support strategy for the CGIAR and to the needs of targeted partners. The expertise has to be regarded as a monitoring exercise rather than a full project evaluation per-se. The consultants need to take a broader look than a single year time frame. In addition, since not all outputs from a particular project are necessary dependent on EC funding, it might be necessary to examine components of projects that were not directly linked to EC-funding.

For that purpose, it will be necessary to examine, among others, the following issues:

### At the level of the projects:

- ⇒ Is the project designed with the participation of intended beneficiaries and in response to their specific and defined needs?
- ⇒ Does the project effectively focus on small-scale farmers’ needs?
- ⇒ Is it likely to contribute to food security and rural poverty alleviation (MDG-1), other relevant MDGs (for example MDG-7) and sustainable development?
- ⇒ Will the project contribute to improving knowledge and techniques, as well as ensuring their adaptation and adoption by the NARS and target groups?
- ⇒ Are dimensions such as social, economic, local and personal producer strategies for food security and the environment taken into account?
- ⇒ Are the project objectives relevant to current ARD state of the art and does the project not replicate known research?
- ⇒ Is the team best placed to conduct research on the proposed issues?
- ⇒ Do the individual scientists or teams involved have the necessary capabilities to carry out the project?
- ⇒ Are adequate scientific, technical and social partnerships implemented?
- ⇒ Does the project promote inter-institutional co-operation with other stakeholders?
- ⇒ Can the equipment and methods to be employed in the project lead to the expected results?
- ⇒ Are the work programme, budget, human resources and timetable, as well as management procedures, adequate to achieve the expected results of the project?
- ⇒ Are proper monitoring and evaluation systems incorporated, including farmers' perspectives?

- ⇒ In which way does the research project contribute to an (intended or ongoing) innovation process that is carried forward by private sector firms, by collective organisations in agriculture and by development agencies?
- ⇒ The monitoring exercise requires an examination of project outputs in terms of reports and technical papers. Therefore the monitoring teams should also examine the quality of such reports, along with the usefulness of the project logical framework and how well it has been used as a planning tool.

#### At the level of the Centres

- ⇒ How does the Centre support the project and ensure the quality control of their activities?
- ⇒ Is the support process enforced by the Centre's headquarters and/or local offices to the project, efficient and adapted to its needs?
- ⇒ How does the project contribute to the overall objectives of the Centres and to the CGIAR as a whole? How does it fit the general policy of the Centre and of the CGIAR?

During the missions in countries, a visit to some EC rural development projects or projects (co-) funded by Member States or FAO and to the local NARS will be included in order to assess the synergies among the results of the research carried out by the Centres and their adoption by the beneficiaries.

### **3) SELECTED PROJECTS**

A sample of projects among those co-funded in 2004 by the EC through the “Food Security and Food Aid” budget line has been selected for monitoring:

- **WORLFISH (ICLARM):**  
Project No 1: Conservation of Aquatic Biodiversity
- **ICRISAT:**  
Project GT1: Harnessing Biotechnology for the Poor
- **IRRI:**  
Project 1: Germplasm conservation, characterization, documentation, and exchange
- **CIFOR**  
Project 5: biodiversity and managed forests
- **SSA Challenge programme**
- **WARDA:**  
project 3.2: policy environment and rice market development

**Annex 4** provides the main features of these projects.

#### 4) METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

a) **Main reference documents** to be made available by the Centres:

- ⇒ CGIAR Centres Medium Term Plans 2002-2004 / 2005-2007
- ⇒ CGIAR Centres external reviews and relevant Cross-Centre and Programme Reviews
- ⇒ CGIAR Centres reports (technical, financial, audit reports, etc.) relating to the projects.

b) **Monitoring criteria to be utilised for each selected project**

- i) **Relevance:** the relevance of a project relates primarily to its design and concerns the extent to which its stated objectives correctly address the identified problems and real needs at two points in time: when the project was designed and at the time of monitoring.
- ⇒ Identification of real (as distinct from perceived) problems or needs and of the correct beneficiaries, and how well the project's initial design addressed them,
  - ⇒ Complementarity and coherence with related activities undertaken elsewhere,
  - ⇒ The quality of the entries in the assumptions, risks and conditions column of the of Log Frame at the appropriate levels,
  - ⇒ overall design strengths and weaknesses including :
    - quality of the Log Frame ,
    - clarity and internal consistency of the stated overall objectives, purpose and results,
    - whether the objectively-verifiable indicators of achievement (OVIs) were well-chosen and widely agreed,
    - realism in choice and quantity of inputs,
    - overall degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances.
- ii) **Efficiency:** The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (sometimes referred to as outputs), in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. A key question it asks is "were things done right?" and thereby also addresses value-for-money, that is whether similar results could have been achieved more by other means at lower cost in the same time. The analysis of the efficiency will therefore focus on:
- ⇒ The quality of the research from various points of view :
    - scientific,
    - technical,
    - social,
    - environmental,
    - ethical,
    - financial, including possible IPR issues,
    - policy, etc
  - ⇒ The quality of day-to-day management, for example in :
    - management of the budget (including whether resources allocated were utilised as planned in the project descriptions, e.g. geographical areas) ;
    - management of personnel, information, property, etc

- whether management of risk was adequate, i.e. whether flexibility was demonstrated
  - in response to changes in circumstances ;
  - relations/co-ordination with local and national authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors ;
  - respect for deadlines ;
- ⇒ costs and value-for-money : how far the costs of the project were justified by the benefits - whether or not expressed in monetary terms - that they generated , in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences ;
- ⇒ Contributions from donors: were they provided as planned, were communications good?
- ⇒ quality of internal CGIAR Centre monitoring : its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it,
- ⇒ whether the chosen indicators of efficiency were suitable and, if not, whether management amended them ;
- ⇒ did any unplanned results arise from the activities ?
- iii) **Effectiveness:** the effectiveness criterion concerns how far the project's results were used or their potential benefits were realised - in other words, whether they achieved the project purpose. The key question is what difference the project made in practice, as measured by how far the intended beneficiaries really benefited from the products or services it made available. The analysis of the effectiveness will therefore focus on :
- ⇒ whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived mainly by the key beneficiaries,
  - ⇒ the appropriateness of the indicators of benefit used in the above assessment to measure achievement of the project purpose; this should include a judgement on how promptly and effectively the Centre management reacted to any changes that occurred following the initial design by amending indicators found no longer to be appropriate ;
  - ⇒ whether behavioural patterns have changed in the beneficiary organisations or groups at various levels; and how far the changed characteristics have produced the planned improvements (e.g. in productivity or ability to generate actions which lead to economic and social development) ;
  - ⇒ whether any shortcomings at this level were due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or overarching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation ;
  - ⇒ whether the research outputs represent added value to existing / new (sub-) regional / national initiatives and are supported by related policies / measures at these levels.
- iv) **Impact and sustainability:** these two important issues relate to the longer-term effect of the project on beneficiaries. Though difficult to fully appraise through a short-term mission, some indication should be stated on these issues.
- v) **Performance rating:** monitoring teams should include in their assessments an overall performance rating for each of the above three monitoring criteria, on the basis of the following scale :
- ⇒ highly satisfactory : fully according to plan or better ;
  - ⇒ satisfactory : on balance according to plan, positive aspects outweighing negative aspects ;

- ⇒ less than satisfactory : not sufficiently according to plan, taking account of the evolving context; a few positive aspects, but outweighed by negative aspects;
- ⇒ highly unsatisfactory : seriously deficient, very few or no positive aspects).

Each rating should be stated as part of the conclusions for each of the three criteria.

### **Special point regarding the monitoring of the CP SSA:**

Since the Challenge Programme (CP) was formally approved by the CGIAR AGM04 in October 2004, it is at a very preliminary stage of implementation and therefore the mission will apply the above mentioned TOR as appropriate and may wish to focus on the way the CP was designed, the involvement of the stakeholders and the approach and strategy of the preliminary pilot learning sites and teams.

## **5) REPORTING**

- c) **Reports, presentations required for each selected project** : briefing at the EC, draft report, debriefing / presentations to the EC, final report
- d) **Language** : English
- e) **Date of delivery** : draft report within 15 days after the mission, final report within 10 days after reception of the comments from the EC (due 30 days after reception of the draft report)
- f) **Number of copies required** : 5 copies of the draft reports and 10 copies of the final reports
- g) **The main text** of a monitoring report should not exceed 20 pages, plus Annexes, plus an Executive Summary of no more than 2 pages with fully cross-referenced findings and recommendations.
- h) **The main sections** of the monitoring report for each selected project will be as follows :

**1- Executive Summary:** a tightly drafted, to the point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should be short, no more than two pages. It should focus mainly on the key purpose or issues of the monitoring, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text that follows. See format in [annex 5](#)

**2- Main text:** the main text should start with an introduction describing, first, the project to be monitored and, second, the monitoring objectives. The body or core of the report should follow the three monitoring criteria mentioned above, describing the facts and interpreting or analysing them in accordance with the key questions pertinent to each criterion.

**3- Conclusions and recommendations:** these should be the subject of a separate final chapter. Wherever possible, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation. The key points of the conclusions will vary in nature but will often cover aspects of the key monitoring criteria (including performance ratings - see above), that is :

- ⇒ *Relevance* : whether the design of the project was originally, and still is, sound as regards targeting the real needs and problems of the right beneficiaries;

- ⇒ *Efficiency* : whether the same results could have been achieved at lower costs; or whether there might have been different, more appropriate ways of achieving the same results;
- ⇒ *Effectiveness* : whether the planned benefits were in fact received, whether the beneficiaries' behavioural patterns changed, whether neglect of cross-cutting issues affected the achievement of the project purpose;

Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the project, and of the resources available to implement them. They could concern policy, organisational and operational aspects.

**4- Annexes:** the report should include the following annexes:

- ⇒ The Terms of Reference of the monitoring
- ⇒ The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- ⇒ Map of project area implementation,
- ⇒ Calendar of visit and list of persons/organisations consulted
- ⇒ Literature and documentation consulted
- ⇒ Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses)
- ⇒ 1-page DAC summary, following the format incorporated in the contract and annexed to this document (see [Annex 6](#) attached).

The draft report will be proposed for comments to the relevant Centre by each team of monitors before the debriefing in Brussels. The possible comments will be included in the draft report if appropriate under the responsibility of the monitors. The responses of the Centres should be attached to the reports as an annex.

The final reports will be published and posted as appropriate on the Web.

If necessary, an additional confidential report may be submitted to the EC for its consideration.

## **6) EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND CONTRACTOR'S REQUIREMENTS**

### 6.1. for all Centres

The contractor will have to provide, for each selected project, two high level experts:

- One specialised on the scientific area of the project
- One specialised on the assessment of economic and social impact of agricultural research projects

Ideally, one of the two experts will have knowledge on environmental issues.

Criteria for selecting experts are:

- Strong experience in monitoring and evaluation of ARD projects
- Strong background in the socio-economic approaches for assessing the impacts of ARD projects
- Significant background in management of scientific projects
- Good knowledge of the CGIAR system, without any current commitment in Centres management (e.g. Board member) or projects
- Background in environment will be an advantage

For each project to be monitored, a short-term mission is foreseen, combining:

- a visit to the CGIAR Centre in charge of its implementation and
- a field visit to a characteristic component of the project on the following basis (location to be proposed by the Contractor):
  - Outside the country of location of the Centre’s headquarters,
  - Preferably in one of the priority countries of intervention of the “Food Security / Food aid” budget line, or
  - Possibly in a country where significant EC funded rural development projects, or projects (co-) funded by Member States or FAO, related to the CGIAR visited project theme, are implemented.

In each country, a visit to the EC Delegations, to the local NARS and when relevant to the above mentioned development projects will be included during the missions.

## 6.2. other considerations

The contractor will submit up to four Curriculum Vitae for each required expert, ranked by order of preference, for a final choice by the European Commission.

Experts will have debriefing meetings at the European Commission in Brussels, before and after their mission.

The contractor is invited to send to the European Commission a technical and a financial offer. The total amount for the monitoring of the selected projects should not exceed € 300,000.

The contractor will have to complete the work, i.e. to send the final reports to the EC, within a six-month period after signature of the contract.

---

Annex 1:	European Commission and the CGIAR: Strategy pointers
Annex 2:	Implementing the Commission's strategy for the CGIAR
Annex 3:	Listing of EU supported CGIAR projects through the “Food Security” Budget line in 2004
Annex 4:	Main features of projects selected for monitoring
Annex 5:	Executive Summary format
Annex 6:	DAC Summary format.

---

## Annex 1

# European Commission and the CGIAR: Strategy pointers

**PLEASE PRINT THE FOLLOWING FILE**  
**BY DOUBLE-CLIKING ON THE ICON**



I:\Philippe Vialatte\  
CGIAR ALL FILES\Cgi

## Annex 2

# Implementing the Commission's strategy for the CGIAR

**PLEASE PRINT THE FOLLOWING FILE**  
**BY DOUBLE-CLIKING ON THE ICON**



I:\Philippe Vialatte\  
CGIAR ALL FILES\Cgi

## Annex 3

Listing of EU supported CGIAR  
projects through the “Food  
Security” Budget  
Line in 2004

**PLEASE PRINT THE FOLLOWING FILE**  
**BY DOUBLE-CLIKING ON THE ICON**



\\s-apollo\envrur\  
Dev\_co-op\_pol&sect\_

## Annex 4

# Main features of projects selected for monitoring

**PLEASE PRINT THE FOLLOWING FILES**  
**BY DOUBLE-CLIKING ON THE ICONS**

- **WORLFISH (ICLARM):**  
Project No 1: Conservation of Aquatic Biodiversity

[ICLARM1.doc](#)

- **ICRISAT:**  
Project GT1: Harnessing Biotechnology for the Poor



\\s-apollo\envrur\  
Dev\_co-op\_pol&sect\_

- **IRRI:**  
Project 1: Germplasm conservation, characterization, documentation, and exchange



\\s-apollo\envrur\  
Dev\_co-op\_pol&sect\_

- **CIFOR**  
**Project 5: biodiversity and managed forests**



\\s-apollo\envrur\  
Dev\_co-op\_pol&sect\_

- **SSA Challenge programme**



\\s-apollo\envrur\  
Dev\_co-op\_pol&sect\_

- **WARDA:**  
Project 3.2: policy environment and rice market development



\\s-apollo\envrur\  
Dev\_co-op\_pol&sect\_

## Annex 5

# Executive Summary format

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. **THE CG CENTRE**: Location and mandate
2. **PROJECT**: Number, Title, Overview
3. **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**:

### 3.1 Project Design and Implementation<sup>2</sup>

Performance <sup>3</sup>	HS	S	LS	HUS	Comments
<b>RELEVANCE</b>					
Output 1					
Output 2					
Output 3					
<b>EFFICIENCY</b>					
Output 1					
Output 2					
Output 3					
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
Output 1					
Output 2					
Output 3					
Output 4					
<b>IMPACT &amp; SUSTAINABILITY</b>					
Output 1					
Output 2					
Output 3					

<sup>2</sup> **References:** project description included in the EC/CGIAR-World Bank contract 2003, EC-CGIAR strategy document

<sup>3</sup> *HS: Highly Satisfactory, S: Satisfactory, LS: Less than Satisfactory, HUS Highly Unsatisfactory*

**Disclaimer:** the authors accept sole responsibility for the contents of this report, drawn up on behalf of the Commission of the European Communities. The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission

<b>TECHNICAL MATTERS</b>					
Quality of the science					
Quality of the project management					
<b>INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS</b>					
Co-ordination with the Centre's other activities					
Co-ordination with other CGIAR Centres					
Co-ordination with NARS					
Diffusion of the findings / results / outcomes (including training activities)					
Involvement of stakeholders					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the project design / reorientation</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the research activities</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the results dissemination</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the project evaluation</li> </ul>					
<b>OTHER RELEVANT ISSUES TO BE MENTIONED</b>					

**Disclaimer:** the authors accept sole responsibility for the contents of this report, drawn up on behalf of the Commission of the European Communities.  
The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission

### **3.2 Recommendations**

*3.2.1 Recommendations linked to project design and implementation*

*3.2.2 Recommendations linked to Institutional Matters*

### **3.3 Overall recommendation on future support by the European Commission**

	Yes / no	Comment
<b>Suspension</b>		
<b>Continuation</b>		

**Disclaimer:** the authors accept sole responsibility for the contents of this report, drawn up on behalf of the Commission of the European Communities.  
The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission

## Annex 6

# DAC Summary format.

**Disclaimer:** the authors accept sole responsibility for the contents of this report, drawn up on behalf of the Commission of the European Communities. The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission

## THE STANDARD DAC FORMAT FOR EVALUATION REPORT SUMMARIES <sup>1</sup>

**Evaluation title** (+ evaluation reference)

Abstract (central, 4 lines maximum)

**Subject of the evaluation**

5 lines maximum on the project, organisation / issue being evaluated

**Evaluation description**

Purpose (3 lines max)

Methodology (3 lines max)

**Main findings**

Clearly distinguishing possible successes/obstacles and the like where possible  
(25 lines max)

**Recommendations**

(25 lines max)

**Feedback**

To be completed by AIDCO/H/6

(5 lines max)

<b>Donor:</b> European Commission	<b>Region<sup>2</sup>:</b>	<b>DAC sector<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Evaluation type<sup>4</sup>:</b> Monitoring	<b>Date of report:</b> ../../.. <sup>5</sup>	<b>Subject of evaluation<sup>6</sup>:</b>
<b>Language:</b> English	<b>N° volume / pages<sup>7</sup>:</b>	<b>Authors:</b>

<b>Programme and budget line concerned<sup>8</sup>:</b>		
<b>Type of evaluation:</b> intermediate		
<b>Timing</b>	<b>Start:</b>	<b>Completion:</b>
<b>Contact person<sup>9</sup>:</b>		<b>Authors:</b>
<b>Cost<sup>10</sup>:</b>		<b>Steering group</b>

**Disclaimer:** the authors accept sole responsibility for the contents of this report, drawn up on behalf of the Commission of the European Communities. The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission

- 1 Text font should be Times New Roman 10 or equivalent
- 2 If more than 3 countries but not continent-wide, choose a geographical region
- 3 Choose from standard list
- 4 Choose between : relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact.
- 5 Date as on cover page of report.
- 6 Choose one of : programme/project/sector/country or region / synthesis / thematic / NGO.
- 7 Indicate number of pages per volume (e.g. 72 pp; 80 pp; 102 pp in case of 3 volumes)
- 8 Budget line (EDF, Tacis, Phare, etc.).
- 9 Name of the responsible person in AIDCO.
- 10 Cost of the evaluation