

# Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)

## DFID's Support to Agricultural Research

### Inception Report

#### Contents

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Background.....	2
3. Purpose of this review.....	2
4. Relationship to other reviews .....	2
5. Methodology .....	2
6. Roles and responsibilities .....	21
7. Management and reporting .....	23
8. Expected outputs and time frame.....	24
9. Risks and mitigation.....	25
10. How this ICAI review will make a difference .....	26

## **1. Introduction**

1.1 The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) is the independent body responsible for scrutinising UK aid. We focus on maximising the effectiveness of the UK aid budget for intended beneficiaries and on delivering value for money for UK taxpayers. We carry out independent reviews of aid programmes and of issues affecting the delivery of UK aid. We publish transparent, impartial and objective reports to provide evidence and clear recommendations to support UK Government decision-making and to strengthen the accountability of the aid programme. Our reports are written to be accessible to a general readership and we use a simple 'traffic light' system to report our judgement on each programme or topic we review.

1.2 We have decided to review the impact and value for money of the Department for International Development's (DFID's) aid programme supporting agricultural research. The programme aims to develop new agricultural products, increase the understanding of agricultural innovation and ensure proven new technologies and products are used to improve the livelihoods, food security and nutrition of the poorest people.

1.3 This Inception Report sets out the evaluation questions, methodology and work plan for the evaluation. It is, however, intended that the methodology and work plan be flexible enough to allow new questions and lines of inquiry to emerge over the course of the evaluation.

## **2. Background**

2.1 The background to this review is described in the Terms of Reference.<sup>1</sup>

## **3. Purpose of this review**

3.1 To assess the value for money and effectiveness of DFID's support to agricultural research and its impact on poor people in developing countries.

## **4. Relationship to other reviews**

4.1 The relationship to other reviews is described in the Terms of Reference.<sup>1</sup>

## **5. Methodology**

### *Analytical approach*

5.1 The aim of this review is to assess the impact of DFID's agricultural research on intended beneficiaries, that is, smallholder farmers and poor and malnourished people in developing countries. We will assess what works and what doesn't work and how poor people benefit from the programme. We will do this by examining:

- the objectives of the current research portfolio and choice of delivery channels, bidding processes, the approach to risk management and the resultant balance of risk;
- how well DFID uses agricultural research findings to encourage uptake and good policies, both internally and by other organisations;

---

<sup>1</sup> *Terms of Reference: Evaluation of DFID's support to agricultural research programmes*, ICAI, 2013, <http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/ICAI-AgResearch-ToRs-FINAL.pdf>.

- the extent to which the agricultural research has led or is likely to lead to improved food and nutrition security for poor people through the scaling up of new technologies and their widespread adoption by smallholders; and
- the extent to which the research agenda targets the priorities of poor farmers in developing countries and is set by them.

## 5.2 We will undertake:

- a portfolio review to assess DFID's overall approach to agricultural research;
- a detailed review of seven projects to assess value for money and trace the impacts that follow from generating new technologies in the laboratory to improved livelihoods and nutrition for poor people in developing countries;
- an assessment of impact, through available evidence and by revisiting two previously completed impact assessments; and
- an analysis of how DFID applies learning from earlier programmes, as the current programme builds on decades of earlier DFID support.

### Portfolio review

5.3 This will be a review of DFID's portfolio of agricultural research projects, to assess how DFID balances the need to research and develop products for use by farmers in the short to medium term (two to five years: putting research into action), with higher level research, which takes longer to generate benefits for farmers (5-15 years) but has potentially high pay-offs. We will consider DFID's use of evidence, its assessment and management of risk and objective setting across the portfolio of projects. We will also assess the rationale for DFID's agricultural research strategy and how it contributes to – and is guided by – the overall strategy of DFID's Research and Evidence Division.

### Detailed review of current projects

5.4 The DFID agricultural research programme comprises 13 on-going projects. Another large project, the £42.4 million Research Into Use project, was recently completed. We will undertake a detailed review of seven of these 14 projects (see Figure 1 on page 7). The selected projects will enable us to trace the impacts that follow from generating new technologies in the laboratory to improved livelihoods and nutrition for poor farmers. For each, we will assess value for money by reviewing the processes of objective setting, bidding and market testing and the efficiency and effectiveness of chosen delivery channels. We will also examine financial management and performance assessment and the ways in which risk is managed. The detailed review projects have been selected to cover:

- different types of research project (**advanced research** on global scientific priorities; **adaptive research** translating known science into technologies for use by researchers and farmers in developing countries; and **near-market research and development (R&D)** to develop new products for use by farmers);
- different delivery channels (**multi-donor trust funds** managed by the World Bank, **memoranda of understanding** with research institutes, **accountable grants** with not-for-profit organisations; and **research contracts** with for-profit companies);

- projects of varying size (from £5 million to £120 million; in the case of the grant to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), a global consortium of 15 research centres); and
- high, medium and low risk projects.

5.5 This ICAI review will look explicitly at how DFID's agricultural research programme supports and influences the CGIAR reform process. Approximately 50% of DFID's agricultural research expenditure is channelled to this organisation. We will examine the ongoing reform programme, examine DFID's management of the grant and assess the impact of CGIAR research on the ground in Africa.

5.6 Advanced science projects are generally undertaken in developed countries. Adaptive research and near-market R&D takes places in developing countries. Details of each of the selected projects are given in Figure 1 on page 7.

### Impact Assessment

5.7 We will examine the evidence on the impact of completed agricultural research projects implemented by DFID's partner organisations, including CGIAR. We will also assess current efforts to strengthen the capacity for robust impact assessment of CGIAR and other partners, including the International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) and the African Agricultural Technology Foundation (AATF).

5.8 We will revisit previously completed impact assessments of two projects. The first will be the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) impact evaluation of CGIAR's HarvestPlus programme, a large-scale intervention to improve nutrition through cultivation of nutritionally-improved sweet potato varieties in Uganda.<sup>2</sup> The second impact evaluation to be studied will be a smaller one, of the Farm Inputs Promotion Service, which aims to provide advice and inputs to farmers.<sup>3</sup> We will verify the findings of the two studies and compare the different approaches used.

### Applying learning

5.9 We will assess how well DFID's agricultural research creates policy-relevant evidence and how well DFID and other organisations integrate these findings into their agricultural development programmes. We will also assess whether the lessons learnt through past evaluations have led to improved programming choices over time.

5.10 The evaluation methodology will comprise the following elements:

#### *Phase 1: Pre-site Assessment*

5.11 We will conduct:

- a literature review, focussing on research and evaluations of DFID's agricultural research programmes and similar research programmes supported by other agencies, including CGIAR and the World Bank;
- interviews, either in person or by telephone, with:
  - DFID's agricultural research team members and consultants that worked on the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of DFID-financed agricultural research projects;

<sup>2</sup> *Findings from a HarvestPlus Project in Mozambique and Uganda*, HarvestPlus, 2010, <http://content.yudu.com/Library/A1rzwf/HarvestPlusREUJOFSPBr/resources/4.htm>.

<sup>3</sup> *Bringing New Ideas into Practice, Experiments with agricultural innovation*, P.Gildemacher and R.Mur (Eds.), 2013, KIT Publishers, Amsterdam, Chapter 4, [http://researchintouse.com/resources/Learning-RIU-Africa\\_book2.pdf](http://researchintouse.com/resources/Learning-RIU-Africa_book2.pdf).

- scientists and other staff of implementing organisations, including CGIAR, other international research organisations, UK-based research organisations and national researchers in developing countries;
  - DFID agricultural advisors in different countries, to understand how they incorporate research findings into their regular agricultural development programmes;
  - technical assistance consultants who have been engaged by DFID or its partners in the design, implementation and/or evaluation of DFID-supported projects; and
  - third-party experts in agricultural research and development, who have not been involved directly in DFID’s agricultural research work;
- a desk-based assessment of the use of evidence in the design of DFID’s agricultural research portfolio. Using the literature review, we will assess how well project documentation (especially project planning documents<sup>4</sup>) incorporates knowledge and lessons from earlier evaluations. We will assess whether or not there is an appropriate evidence base to support the current design of DFID’s agricultural research portfolio and whether DFID used all available evidence appropriately; and
  - a desk-based assessment of the previous evaluations and reviews of the DFID agricultural research portfolio. This will give a view on the quality of the evaluative process in each case, the certainty of results and the utility of the reports, including helping to establish baseline data and how this is used to inform subsequent programming and future evaluations. It will consider how the full range of monitoring and evaluation activity that is undertaken and available to DFID’s agricultural research team is used to assess the likely impact of its entire agricultural research portfolio.

*Phase 2: Field Work, including site visits to Kenya and Uganda*

5.12 DFID’s agricultural research programme focusses largely on Africa. Many of its African partners (e.g. AATF), two of CGIAR’s global research centres and other international research organisations (e.g. ICIPE) are based in Kenya, although they have continental or global remits. These organisations also have active field programmes in Kenya and other East African countries. In view of this, we will visit Kenya and Uganda. We will interview selected DFID agricultural research partners and their intended beneficiaries in rural areas.

5.13 We will:

- conduct interviews with:
  - DFID staff in country offices;
  - the scientists and staff of implementing agencies of selected DFID-supported research programmes (see Figure 1 on page 7);
  - senior government officials in Kenya, where DFID has made significant investments in agricultural research;
  - third-party experts in agricultural research and development, who have not been involved directly in DFID’s agricultural research work; and
  - the intended beneficiaries of the programme – smallholder farmers and other poor people;

---

<sup>4</sup> Project plans that track how inputs are expected to lead to desired impacts are often referred to as logical frameworks or logframes.

- assess directly the level of impact on DFID's agricultural research programme on the intended beneficiaries by:
  - conducting a mixture of announced and unannounced visits to interview intended beneficiaries of DFID-supported agricultural research projects and collecting a range of evidence. We expect to interview more than 250 intended beneficiaries in the course of our field visits; and
  - reviewing the findings and conclusions of two completed impact evaluations. We will re-visit the areas involved to assess the sustainability of results and the quality of the impact assessment. The review team will work with local researchers and visit randomly selected villages to conduct focus group discussions and interviews with intended beneficiaries and others at each location. The other stakeholders interviewed will include poor consumers, small agri-business firms and local government farming advisors.

**Figure 1: Selected agricultural research projects**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Allocation<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Funding channel, location and specific target</b>
<b>Multi-donor trust funds (MDTF)</b>			
<b>Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)</b>	£120 million <sup>6</sup> (Unrestricted 'core' funding)	2012-15	<p>The CGIAR Fund, managed by the World Bank, is a consortium of 15 agricultural research centres around the globe, with an annual budget of \$900 million in 2013.</p> <p>CGIAR undertakes advanced, adaptive and near-market R&amp;D. Through its research, it aims to contribute to sustainable improvements in the productivity of agriculture, forestry and fisheries in developing countries and enhance nutrition and well-being, especially of low-income people.</p> <p>We will review the CGIAR programme as a whole. We will read programme documents and reports and interview representatives of the CGIAR Fund, the CGIAR Consortium and the CGIAR Independent Science and Partnerships Council.</p> <p>We will focus on the two CGIAR centres with headquarters in Kenya – the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF).</p>
<b>HarvestPlus</b>	£30 million (Ear-marked funding)	2012-15	<p>The CGIAR Fund, managed by the World Bank and channelled to the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) for the HarvestPlus programme.</p> <p>HarvestPlus seeks to reduce hunger by providing micronutrients to billions of people directly through the staple foods that they eat. These foods include: wheat, rice, maize and sweet potato.</p> <p>HarvestPlus focusses mainly on adaptive research and near-market R&amp;D.</p> <p>We will focus on the HarvestPlus Vitamin-A enhanced sweet potato programme in Uganda and revisit communities covered by IFPRI's impact evaluations. We will also review project documents and reports and interview the senior managers of HarvestPlus, based in Washington DC, United States.</p>
<b>Memoranda of Understanding (MoU)</b>			
<b>Biotechnology and Biochemical Research Council</b>	£5.4 million	2006-13	<p>MoU with the UK Biotechnology and Biochemical Research Council for the Sustainable Agricultural Research for International Development (SARID) project.</p> <p>SARID undertakes advanced and early adaptive research through UK universities, working in partnership with developing country scientists.</p> <p>We will review project documents and reports and interview BBSRC staff managing the programme and five UK researchers and their Kenyan and Uganda partners.</p>

<sup>5</sup> Data provided to ICAI by DFID.

<sup>6</sup> DFID has provided core funding to CGIAR since 2002.

Title	Allocation <sup>5</sup>	Dates	Funding channel, location and specific target
<b>International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE)</b>	£12.8 million	2011-15	<p>MoU with the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) to manage DFID support to the ICIPE, with headquarters in Kenya.</p> <p>ICIPE undertakes adaptive and near-market R&amp;D. It aims to improve food security and human health by developing and disseminating tools and strategies to farmers to enable them to manage both harmful and useful insects.</p> <p>We will review project documents and reports and interview ICIPE staff and selected staff of its partners in Kenya.</p> <p>The ICIPE grant is part of DFID's £40 million Support to its International Agricultural Research Centres that Benefit Poor People project.</p>
<b>Global Alliance for Livestock Vaccines (GALVmed)</b>	£19.5 million	2005-17	<p>MoU with GALVmed.<sup>7</sup></p> <p>GALVmed undertakes adaptive and near-market R&amp;D. It aims to improve the livelihoods of resource-poor livestock keepers by providing animal health tools, including vaccines.</p> <p>We will review project documents and reports and interview the CEO and staff at GALVmed's Edinburgh headquarters. We will also visit its partners in Kenya, which are distributing the East Coast Fever vaccine. We will also interview intended beneficiaries of the programme. GALVmed is co-financed by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF).</p>
<b>Accountable Grant</b>			
<b>African Agricultural Technology Foundation (AATF)</b>	£7.5 million	2010-14	<p>Accountable Grant with AATF, with headquarters in Kenya. We will review project documents and reports and interview AATF staff and selected staff of its partners.</p> <p>AATF undertakes adaptive and near-market R&amp;D. It helps small farmers to access innovative agricultural technologies, such as drought and pest-resistant seeds.</p>
<b>Direct Contract</b>			
<b>Research Into Use Consortium (RIU)</b>	£42.4 million	2006-12	<p>Direct contract with RIU, a company of the University of Edinburgh.</p> <p>The RIU consortium undertook near-market R&amp;D with an aim to gather and evaluate evidence and disseminate lessons on how best to enable innovation in the agricultural sector in developing countries.</p> <p>We will review project documents and reports and interview the former Director and Deputy Director of RIU. We will also interview RIU's impact evaluation consultants at the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) in Amsterdam. In Kenya we will resurvey communities covered by the KIT impact evaluation of Farm Input Promotion Services Ltd (FIPS), an RIU implementing partner.</p>

5.14 In addition to the focus projects outlined in Figure 1, the review team will examine documentation for those projects listed in Figure 2 on page 9. Although not chosen for detailed review, these will provide contrast to the core projects and will support our assessment of DFID's strategy and overall agricultural research portfolio.

<sup>7</sup> The current £6.2 million project with GALVmed (2012-17) is through an MoU. The earlier two grants were through accountable grants.



**Figure 2: Other projects considered part of the assessment**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Allocation<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Funding channel, location and specific target</b>
<b>African Enterprise Challenge Fund (AECF)</b>	£5.2 million	2010-15	MoU with the AECF, headquartered in Kenya. AECF also implements agribusiness development programmes for DFID country programmes in Africa.
<b>AgResults</b>	£25.0 million	2012-18	Multi-donor trust fund with the World Bank. AgResults will stimulate the private sector to invest in the development and delivery of agricultural technologies (adaptive research and near-market R&D).
<b>Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA)</b>	£11.3 million	2011-14	MDTF with ASARECA, an African-led umbrella organisation supporting national agricultural research systems in ten Eastern and Central African countries. It operates a regional competitive research grant scheme and focusses mainly on adaptive research.
<b>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</b>	£30.0 million	2006-12	MoU with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to co-finance advanced and adaptive research, focussing on problems experienced by African smallholder farmers.

5.15 We will examine a range of documentation, as set out in the evaluation framework from page 10. Our assessment will include a review of documentation in-country and a detailed examination of DFID’s operational files and evaluations related to its agricultural research programme.

5.16 We will assess the agricultural research programme’s financial information, focussing on the last five years. This will include analysis of the financial reports of selected partner organisations to try to identify costs and the proportion of allocated funds reaching intended beneficiaries.<sup>9</sup> It will consider the flow of funds, accounting and reporting systems, audit and the costs at each stage of the delivery chain. By comparing the different delivery channels and partners used in the DFID agricultural research portfolio, we will seek to draw lessons on effective programme delivery.

5.17 The full list of interviewees will be drawn up by the review team based on discussions with DFID’s agricultural research team and other key informants. We will conduct face-to-face interviews with DFID staff who worked on the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the agricultural research programmes in the portfolio, to inform analysis of the use of data, impact and performance management. We will review, in particular, how these evaluations have used the lessons identified to inform future programmes. We will also conduct face-to-face and telephone interviews with partner organisation staff who deliver DFID’s agricultural research programmes.

### *Evaluation framework*

5.18 The evaluation framework for this review is set out below. It is based on the standard ICAI guiding criteria and evaluation framework, which cover four areas: objectives, delivery, impact and learning.

<sup>8</sup> Data provided to ICAI by DFID.

<sup>9</sup> This review is dependent on receiving sufficient and appropriate financial reports from partner organisations.

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
(1) Objectives: what is the programme trying to achieve?			
<p>Does the programme have clear, relevant, realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (1.1)</p>	<p><b>Does DFID’s agricultural research work (including DFID’s engagement with CGIAR, with other international research organisations and with academic and not-for-profit bodies) have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on defined short, medium and long-term impacts? (ToR 6.2.1)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of clear and relevant objectives being set at programme, portfolio and project levels</li> <li>• Evidence of objectives being specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound</li> <li>• Evidence of a strategic vision for the programme that was appropriately reviewed in line with change of circumstances</li> <li>• Evidence of assessment by DFID’s agricultural research team of partners’ capacity to monitor the delivery of the programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID and partners’ programme planning, implementation and monitoring documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with partners and other donors financing the same organisations</li> <li>• Interviews with senior officials in the Government of Kenya</li> </ul>
<p>Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)</p>	<p><b>Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence, theories of change and assumptions, to show how individual projects will achieve impact for the smallholder farmers and poor people and minimise the risk that benefits become monopolised by others (e.g. private seed companies or large-scale farmers)? (ToR 6.2.2)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a sound theory of change for the portfolio (analysis of problem, options, solution generation, implementation model and outcomes)</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate design detail and relevant theory of change for each project</li> <li>• Evidence of comprehensive approaches for each intervention</li> <li>• Evidence that the risks of other interest groups monopolising benefits are explicitly considered and risk management strategies included in project designs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID, CGIAR and other partner organisations’ programme planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews and evaluations</li> <li>• Interviews with staff of DFID, CGIAR and other delivery partners</li> <li>• Interviews with other donors</li> <li>• Interviews with third-party experts</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)	<b>Do DFID and other donors take a holistic approach? (ToR 6.2.1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of appropriate design detail for each programme</li> <li>• Evidence of sound approaches that include other partners in design for each programme</li> <li>• Evidence of effective dialogue taking place with government and other aid providers</li> <li>• Evidence of a lack of duplication with government and other aid providers</li> <li>• Evidence of effective planning and co-ordination with other donors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID, CGIAR and other partner organisations' programme planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews and evaluations</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID and CGIAR staff</li> <li>• Interviews with other donors</li> <li>• Interviews with senior officials in the Government of Kenya</li> <li>• Third party reporting</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<p>Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)</p>	<p>Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the social, economic, political and environmental context?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of appropriate contextual analysis being undertaken</li> <li>• Evidence of comprehensive needs assessments (e.g. social and environmental impact assessments)</li> <li>• Evidence of suitable planning and implementation, using contextual analysis and needs assessments to inform decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID's agricultural research strategy and programme documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews and evaluations</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with CGIAR and other of DFID's partners' staff</li> <li>• Interviews with technical assistance consultants undertaking studies</li> <li>• Other donor interviews and documentation</li> <li>• Third party reporting and interviews</li> <li>• DFID's and partners' risk assessments</li> <li>• Interviews with senior officials in the Government of Kenya</li> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
(2) Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?			
Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)	<b>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? Does DFID consider a wide enough range of potential delivery partners in its bidding processes? (ToR 6.3.1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of appropriate appraisal of funding and delivery options</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate capacity and quality assessments of partners</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate value for money analysis in selecting partners and improving efficiency</li> <li>• Evidence of sufficient, realistic, risk analyses of individual agricultural research projects and the programme as a whole</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID's options appraisals and business cases</li> <li>• CGIAR and other partners' project documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with CGIAR and other partner organisations' staff</li> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• DFID's detailed project plans</li> </ul>
Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)	<b>Were the needs and priorities of intended beneficiaries taken into account in programme design and roll out and were they involved in the roll out?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of meaningful consultation with intended beneficiaries in design, governance, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and their satisfaction with these processes</li> <li>• Evidence of involvement of intended beneficiaries in the programme design and roll-out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Third party reporting</li> <li>• Programme documentation and analysis</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with CGIAR and other partners' staff</li> <li>• Interviews with impact evaluation and review teams, including technical assistance consultants</li> <li>• DFID's detailed project plans</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)	Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of sound financial management</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate anti-corruption policies and procedures</li> <li>• Evidence that best practice and recommendations in ICAI's anti-corruption report are being acted upon</li> <li>• Evidence of effective challenge and accountability around programme design and resource allocation</li> <li>• Evidence of robust partner selection criteria and capacity assessment</li> <li>• Evidence of strong oversight of implementing partners, including reporting requirements</li> <li>• Evidence that DFID's agricultural research team has adequate capacity to assess governance arrangements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID, CGIAR and other partners' staff</li> <li>• Technical review of systems</li> <li>• Review of CGIAR and other partner organisations' policies</li> <li>• Audit and other financial management reports</li> <li>• Financial management best practice guidance material</li> <li>• Review of programme documents</li> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> </ul>
Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)	Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of appropriate options appraisal</li> <li>• Evidence of other finance sources being used effectively</li> <li>• Evidence of all funds being managed holistically</li> <li>• Evidence of DFID actively engaging with other donors and, where applicable, sharing costs and review requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with other donors</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID and partners' staff</li> <li>• Interviews with senior officials in the Government of Kenya</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Do managers ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery chain? (2.5)	<b>How efficient and effective are the different delivery channels? (ToR 6.3.2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of detailed cost review and management</li> <li>• Evidence of relevant changes to budgets, design and delivery to improve cost-effectiveness</li> <li>• Evidence of an effective assessment of the quality of technical assistance provided</li> <li>• Evidence that DFID's agricultural research team has sufficient capacity to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of delivery chain arrangements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial reporting</li> <li>• Programme evaluations</li> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Third party assessments</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with partners and other donors</li> </ul>
Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)	<b>How efficient and effective are the different delivery channels? (ToR 6.3.2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of appropriate cost appraisal assessments and financial reporting</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate assessments being provided by all partners</li> <li>• Evidence that DFID's agricultural research team has sufficient capacity to assess costs throughout the delivery chain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial reporting</li> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> </ul>
Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)	<b>Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? Is the balance of low, medium and high risk research projects appropriate? (ToR 6.3.4)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that DFID explicitly considers the balance of high, medium and low risk projects in the portfolio, prior to individual project design.</li> <li>• Evidence of each element of delivery having an adequate risk appraisal</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate risk registers throughout the delivery chain</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate management of identified risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk appraisals</li> <li>• Risk registers</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with partners and other donors</li> <li>• Interviews with officials in the Government of Kenya</li> <li>• Programme review documentation</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)	Are activities delivering on their agreed objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of effective delivery against key targets</li> <li>• Evidence of an appropriate link between DFID funding and its key targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme evaluation reports</li> <li>• Third party reporting</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with partners</li> <li>• Interviews with other parties, including intended beneficiaries</li> </ul>
Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)	Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of analysis of changing circumstances</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate decision-making, including changes to delivery method, based on analysis</li> <li>• Evidence of agility by decision-makers to facilitate efficient changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management minutes</li> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Evaluation reviews</li> <li>• Third party assessments</li> </ul>
<b>(3) Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?</b>			
Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)	<p><b>Is the current research likely to deliver clear, significant and timely research outputs, with the potential to be taken to scale and with positive development outcomes for the intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.4.1)</b></p> <p><b>Did earlier DFID investments in agriculture research deliver significant and timely benefits for intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.4.2)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of effective delivery of outputs to intended beneficiaries and of plans to take delivery approaches to scale</li> <li>• Evidence of sufficient short-term benefits</li> <li>• Evidence of sufficient long-term benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID project reporting documentation, including programme reviews, evaluation and monitoring reports</li> <li>• Interviews with project reviewers and evaluators</li> <li>• Interviews with other organisations, including public organisations and the private sector</li> <li>• Interviews and focus group discussions with intended beneficiaries</li> </ul>



ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)	Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of effective integration with DFID's other development programmes</li> <li>• Evidence of effective joint management with other multilateral and bilateral donors</li> <li>• Evidence of coherent outcomes being achieved and avoidance of negative unintended effects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Partners' assessments and interviews</li> <li>• Third party assessments and interviews</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with other donors</li> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> </ul>
Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)	<b>Have there been long-term and sustainable impacts from the earlier DFID investments in agriculture research? Are similar impacts likely to be provided by the current programme? (ToR 6.4.3)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of beneficial systemic change achieved through the programmes and activities</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate improvement in both quality and coverage of partners' programmes</li> <li>• Evidence of sufficient food security and nutrition impact achieved through the programmes and activities</li> <li>• Evidence of meaningful impact from technical assistance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Evaluations</li> <li>• Partner assessments</li> <li>• Third party assessments</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with other donors</li> <li>• Interviews and focus group discussions with intended beneficiaries</li> </ul>
Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)	Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of appropriate targets to build sustainable capacity</li> <li>• Evidence of an increase in sustainable capacity of partner organisations</li> <li>• Evidence of an appropriate exit strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with other donors and partners</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)	Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of details of assistance being publicly available in formats that are accessible to stakeholders in the UK, internationally and in-country</li> <li>• Evidence of meaningful engagement with local community and civil society organisations in seeking feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publicly available reports (online, media, other)</li> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Interviews with donors</li> <li>• Programme evaluations and reports</li> </ul>
(4) Learning: what works best and what needs improvement?			
Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (4.1)	<b>Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (ToR 6.5.1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of activities designed with clear intended results, to support ease of evaluation and learning</li> <li>• Evidence of sufficient project reporting and monitoring</li> <li>• Evidence of the appropriate use of independent evaluation</li> <li>• Evidence of DFID's agricultural research team measuring the sustainable impact of programmes on intended beneficiaries and using this to inform decisions</li> <li>• Evidence of intended beneficiaries being sufficiently involved in the monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Programme reviews and evaluations</li> <li>• DFID monitoring and evaluation reports</li> <li>• Interviews with partners</li> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)	<b>Is there evidence of innovation in carrying out good research, in encouraging research uptake and in the use of global best practice? (ToR 6.5.3)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of lesson-learning being effectively incorporated into the design and implementation of the programme and its constituent projects</li> <li>• Evidence of appropriate innovation and use of global best practice and global learning</li> <li>• Evidence of DFID's agricultural research team identifying innovation from other DFID programmes and effectively incorporating it into the agricultural research programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Programme reviews</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with partners and other donors</li> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Interviews with experts</li> </ul>
Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)	Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of effective comparison with best practice</li> <li>• Evidence of effective comparison with recommendations from evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme planning and implementation documentation</li> <li>• Programme evaluations and monitoring reports</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with partners and other donors</li> <li>• Interviews with intended beneficiaries</li> <li>• Literature review</li> </ul>

ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Evaluation Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<p>Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)</p>	<p><b>Have lessons been learned from both the successes and the challenges of earlier investments? If so, were they used to refocus the research programme? (ToR 6.5.2)</b></p> <p><b>How well does DFID share research findings and encourage take-up within the organisation and with external partners? How well are research results disseminated at the country level? (ToR 6.5.4)</b></p> <p><b>Are the farmers themselves given the benefit of what has been learned and/or is there a plan to do this?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of lesson-learning being effectively incorporated into the design and implementation of the programme and its constituent projects</li> <li>• Evidence of recommendations from annual monitoring being used appropriately to inform operational decisions</li> <li>• Evidence of lesson-learning being shared effectively with other similar programmes of different organisations</li> <li>• Evidence of lesson-learning being shared with and benefitting farmers or plans for this in future</li> <li>• Evidence of DFID staff visiting the field at appropriate and sufficiently frequent times</li> <li>• Evidence of effective knowledge capture</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate dissemination of knowledge captured to inform DFID's and other donors' programmes at the country level.</li> <li>• Evidence of lessons learned having positively informed DFID's strategy, corporate guidance and future programming decisions</li> <li>• Evidence of lessons learnt having influenced the strategies and programmes of national governments and other donors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of monitoring and evaluation reports</li> <li>• Review of programme documentation</li> <li>• Interviews with DFID staff</li> <li>• Interviews with farmers</li> <li>• Interviews with private and public sector agricultural advisors serving farmers</li> <li>• Interviews with partners and other donors</li> </ul>

## **6. Roles and responsibilities**

6.1 The Team Leader will be the primary point of contact with DFID. KPMG will provide oversight of this review under the overall leadership of the ICAI Project Director. Supplementary analysis and peer review will be provided by KPMG staff.

6.2 The team will comprise the following members:

### **Team leader (Independent)**

He is a rural livelihoods expert with over 30 years' experience in research and consultancy on agricultural and rural development. He led the design of a number of DFID's and the World Bank's flagship rural poverty programmes and has also worked on more than a dozen impact evaluations of rural livelihoods programmes in Asia and Africa. He has a good knowledge of agricultural research. He was a member of DFID's Plant Sciences Research Programme's advisory committee from 1995 to 2005. He also led the evaluation of the International Rice Research Institute's poverty-focussed rice research programme in 2001. He was an expert on the ICAI evaluation of the Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project, in 2012.

### **Team member 1 (Independent)**

He has over 40 years' experience in agricultural research and development in Africa and Asia. From 1990 to 2005, while employed by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), he served on the CGIAR independent Technical Advisory Committee, which FAO manages on behalf of CGIAR donors. While there, he co-ordinated the external programme and management reviews of CGIAR Centres. He also led reviews of CGIAR research priorities and strategies. He earlier developed FAO's approach to planning agricultural land use. He is currently a visiting professor at Reading University and has also done research at Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria. He is an adviser on agricultural and rural development with Aga Khan Foundation programmes in Asia and Africa.

He will be the agricultural research expert on the mission. He will assess the quality of DFID's agricultural research and its relevance to the needs of smallholder farmers. He will also contribute to the review team's assessment of the reform process in the CGIAR and other research partners.

### **Team member 2 (KPMG)**

She is a Chartered Accountant with a Masters in Development Studies and has over six years' experience with KPMG working across public sector audit. She has also worked at the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office and at the Institute of Development Studies. Within KPMG, she has worked for two years as part of the internal audit team at King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and has experience of auditing charitable funds at a range of healthcare organisations. She will assess DFID's financial and programme management capacity in the context of its Agricultural Research programme. She will assess the capacity of implementing partners and examine the delivery chain of DFID's programmes.

### **Team member 3 (Independent)**

She is an applied development economist. She is engaged in research projects for Durham University, the World Bank and the United Nations University – World Institute for Development Economics Research. She is also an external associate at the University of

Manchester Brooks World Poverty Institute (BWPI). Her research interests include agricultural markets, trade and institutions, foreign aid and public expenditure allocation. Her research primarily relies on quantitative methods and data analysis, mainly applied to countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and East Asia and the Pacific. She has conducted empirical investigation on the labour markets in Ethiopia.

She will be the economist and impact assessment specialist on the team. She will review completed impact evaluations by DFID, CGIAR and others. She will also review current DFID and CGIAR agricultural research impact evaluation policies and approaches. Additionally, she will contribute to the design and supervision of field research for the mission by local consultants.

#### **Peer reviewer 1 (Independent)**

He is a development economist, with over 20 years of experience in agricultural research, impact evaluation and research on poverty in Africa and Asia. In 2005, he authored a report for DFID on the rates of return to agricultural research. In 2010, he authored a report for DFID on evaluation methods for research programmes, which is now part of the standard operating procedures for DFID research programmes. In 2002 and 2009, he was a member of evaluation teams to evaluate the effectiveness of IDRC funded multi-country research programmes. He has published extensively on agriculture and on poverty. He will oversee and provide quality assurance of the impact evaluation workstream for this review.

#### **Peer reviewer 2 (Independent)**

He has 20 years' experience as a statistician specialising in poverty and food security analysis, the design and implementation of complex household surveys and sampling strategies, monitoring and impact evaluation. He has an MSc in Tropical Agricultural Development and a PhD in Applied Statistics. He will provide a peer review and challenge function for this review, he will also provide a secondary data integrity role, interrogating DFID's data and programme designs.

#### **Impact evaluation team leader (TNS Global)**

He has over 15 years of experience in managing research projects in Africa, including extensive experience in the agricultural sector. He has expertise in research design, quality control and delivery. He has worked in over 30 African countries. He was the Director of the Farmer First farmer segmentation study for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. This was an attitudinal study of small-scale farmers to identify those likely to adopt new products and services. He has undertaken other assignments for governments, not-for-profit organisations, private firms and international donors. These have included an evaluation of mFARM, a project designed to improve the prices farmers receive, through increased transparency down the value chain. He has led social impact studies of coffee and fruit farmers in East African countries and evaluated radio programmes designed to provide information to microenterprises. He led an evaluation of milk fortification for improved nutrition in Kenya.

He will be the Project Director of the impact evaluation verification studies. He will be responsible for designing the studies, overseeing implementation, data analysis and report writing.

### **Impact evaluation team member 1 (TNS Global)**

She has over 30 years of experience in managing agricultural and rural development programmes. She started her career as a government official in Uganda and later worked for NGOs and on international donor-funded projects. She has undertaken research assignments for a range of clients, including government agencies and NGOs. A number of her recent assignments have involved nutritional studies, using quantitative and qualitative methods, related to crop improvement programmes and horticulture projects.

She will be Team Leader of the impact evaluation verification study in Uganda. She will manage the overall study and be responsible for quality control and data analysis. She will also lead one of two field research teams working in six villages, interviewing 50 farmers and leading focus group discussions.

### **Impact evaluation team member 2 (TNS Global)**

He has extensive experience of research on African agriculture, especially with smallholders in East Africa. He specialises in socio-economic research, agricultural trade and marketing, agribusiness and monitoring and evaluation. He is proficient in the design of quantitative and qualitative data collection tools and data analysis. He also has extensive experience in field research. He is skilled in the use of Access, Excel, SPSS and STATA for quantitative work and EpiData for qualitative work. His clients include government agencies, NGOs, private sector firms and donors, including the African Development Bank, the Japan International Cooperation Agency and the United States Agricultural Development Fund.

He will be the Team Leader of the impact evaluation verification study in Kenya. He will manage and participate in the research in six villages, involving interviews with 50 farmers and focus group discussions. He will be responsible for ensuring quality control and data analysis.

### **Impact evaluation team member 3 (TNS Global)**

She has five years of experience in conducting and managing qualitative research in East and West Africa. She led a qualitative study of small-scale dairy farmers in the Rift Valley, Kenya to develop insurance products for farmers. She worked with the Impact Evaluation Team Leader on the Farmer First farmer segmentation study for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, leading qualitative research. She has also undertaken a number of studies for NGOs on women smallholder farmers, to understand their needs and priorities. She is experienced in focus group discussions, in-depth interviewing, participant observation and other ethnographic methods. She is also experienced in managing small field research teams.

She will lead one of two field research teams in Uganda working in six villages, interviewing 50 farmers and leading focus group discussions.

## **7. Management and reporting**

7.1 We will produce a first draft report for review by the ICAI Secretariat and Commissioners by w/c 5 August 2013, with time for subsequent revision and review prior to completion and sign off in w/c 21 October 2013.

## 8. Expected outputs and time frame

8.1 The main deliverables will be:

Phase	Timetable
<b>Planning</b> Finalising methodology Drafting Inception Report	March 2013 – May 2013
<b>Field Work</b> UK field work Kenya and Uganda Field Work	May 2013 – June 2013 June 3-16 2013
<b>Analysis and write-up</b> Roundtable with Commissioners First draft report Report quality assurance and review by Secretariat and Commissioners Report to DFID for fact checking Final report sign-off	10 July 2013 w/c 5 August w/c 12 August – w/c 23 September w/c 30 September w/c 21 October



## 9. Risks and mitigation

9.1 The following sets out the key risks and mitigating actions for this evaluation.

Risk	Level of risk	Specific Issues	Mitigation
Inability to access key information	Low	<p>Unable to see all relevant DFID files</p> <p>Unable to obtain information from DFID project partners</p>	<p>Ensure clear authorisation is given at start up</p> <p>Collect and review as much information as possible before the mission</p> <p>Ensure that DFID partners, including CGIAR centres, are informed of our key information requirements at least two weeks before we visit. Liaise with them directly to ensure they fully understand what is required prior to our visit</p> <p>Allow sufficient time to work with partners, during our visits, to clarify any further information requests</p>
Lack of impact data makes impact assessment impossible	Medium	Impact data absent, incomplete or unreliable	<p>Undertake review of completed impact assessments. We have been promised full access to the data sets of the researchers who undertook the impact evaluations of HarvestPlus and FIPS Ltd.</p> <p>Undertake a detailed desk review of available evaluation evidence on other DFID-financed projects, including CGIAR impact evaluations</p>
Intended beneficiary voices not heard	Low	Access to intended beneficiaries proves difficult	<p>Our locally engaged team of field researchers will undertake focus group and household interviews in a random sample of the HarvestPlus and FIPS impact evaluation villages. We will also organise impromptu focus groups during unannounced visits to local communities where GALVmed's partners are working with livestock keepers. We will ensure sufficient time in field and aim for an appropriate range of intended beneficiary consultations to enable concerns to emerge. We will engage local interpreters as required</p>

## **10. How this ICAI review will make a difference**

10.1 This review will examine the impact of DFID's agricultural research programme on smallholder farmers and poor and malnourished people in developing countries. Findings will support direct improvements in the ability of the portfolio of agricultural research projects to deliver impact for these people. We will undertake a portfolio review and examine the effectiveness of programme management, including objective-setting, the balance of risk and the use of monitoring and evaluation to feed back into future programme design. Our review will assess this cycle in detail.

10.2 Our review will scrutinise the extent to which DFID's research agenda targets the priorities of poor farmers in developing countries and is set by them. It will focus on DFID's investment allocation processes, including bidding and market testing and the choice of delivery channels. We will consider how these options are evaluated by DFID's agricultural research team and how lessons learned feed into the future design of agricultural research projects. We will examine financial management and performance assessment as part of our overall assessment of the ways in which risk is managed

10.3 We will focus in detail on seven research projects, including advanced science, adaptive research and near-market R&D. The selected projects will enable us to trace the impacts that follow from generating new technologies in the laboratory to improved livelihoods and nutrition for poor people in developing countries.

10.4 The current agricultural research programme builds on decades of earlier DFID support to agricultural research. This review will assess how learning from past evaluations has been used to inform future agricultural research choices.

10.5 This ICAI review will look explicitly at how DFID's agricultural research programme supports and influences the CGIAR reform process. Lessons learned will be of wider interest to DFID programmes implemented through World Bank-managed multi-donor trust funds.