



# Terms of Reference: Evaluation of CGIAR Contributions to Its 2022 Aspirational System Level Outcome Targets

November 2022

Commissioners of the Evaluation:  
Joined-Up MELIA workstream of the PPU

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms .....	3
1. Background to the evaluation.....	4
2. Brief description and clients .....	5
3. Purpose, general scope and focus of the evaluation.....	6
4. Evaluation criteria and preliminary evaluation questions .....	7
5. Specifications of the evaluation team .....	7
6. Roles and responsibilities of parties involved.....	8
7. Timeline.....	9
8. Key docs list for the 2022 targets .....	9

## Abbreviations and acronyms

AA	Action Areas
CRP	CGIAR Research Programs
EMT	Executive Management Team
IAES	Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service
IDO	Intermediate Development Outcomes
MEL	Monitoring Evaluation and Learning
MELIA	Monitoring Evaluation, Learning and Impact Assessment
PPU	Programs Performance Unit
QA	Quality Assessment
ROI	Return on Investment
SC	System Council
SGD	Science Group Directors
SIMEC	Strategic Impact, Monitoring and Evaluation Committee
SLO	System Level Outcomes
SOAR	Supporters of Agricultural Research
SPIA	Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SRF	Strategy and Results Framework
ToC	Theory of Change

## 1. Background to the evaluation

Between 2017 and 2021, CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) aspired to develop research outputs that aimed to contribute to its Strategy and Results Framework. The framework had an impact pathway, with outputs and Program outcomes first feeding into sub-Intermediate Development Outcomes and Intermediate Development outcomes (sub-IDs and IDs) and eventually to three System Level Outcomes, each with several targets for 2022 and 2030. See Table 1 below for the detailed 2022 targets and the [Strategy and Results Framework](#) for more information.

**Table 1: Aspirational CGIAR and partners' development targets for 2022 and 2030**

Targets: 2022 <sup>5</sup>	Targets: 2030
<b>System level outcome 1: Reduced Poverty</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100 million more farm households have adopted improved varieties, breeds or trees, and/or improved management practices</li> <li>30 million people, of which 50% are women, assisted to exit poverty</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>350 million more farm households have adopted improved varieties, breeds or trees, and/or improved management practice</li> <li>100 million people, of which 50% are women, assisted to exit poverty</li> </ol>
<b>System level outcome 2: Improved food and nutrition security for health</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve the rate of yield increase for major food staples from current &lt;1% to 1.2-1.5%/year</li> <li>30 million more people, of which 50% are women, meeting minimum dietary energy requirements</li> <li>150 million more people, of which 50% are women, without deficiencies of one or more of the following essential micronutrients: iron, zinc, iodine, vitamin A, folate, and vitamin B12</li> <li>10% reduction in women of reproductive age who are consuming less than the adequate number of food groups</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve the rate of yield increase for major food staples from current &lt;2.0 to 2.5%/year</li> <li>150 million more people, of which 50% are women, meeting minimum dietary energy requirements</li> <li>500 million more people, of which 50% are women, without deficiencies of one or more of the following essential micronutrients: iron, zinc, iodine, vitamin A, folate, and vitamin B12</li> <li>33% reduction in women of reproductive age who are consuming less than the adequate number of food groups</li> </ol>
<b>System level outcome 3: Improved natural resources systems and ecosystems services</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5% increase in water and nutrient (inorganic, biological) use efficiency in agro-ecosystems, including through recycling and reuse</li> <li>Reduce agriculturally-related greenhouse gas emissions by 0.2 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>-e yr<sup>-1</sup> (5%) compared with business-as-usual scenario in 2022</li> <li>55 million hectares (ha) degraded land area restored</li> <li>2.5 million ha of forest saved from deforestation</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20% increase in water and nutrient (inorganic, biological) use efficiency in agro-ecosystems, including through recycling and reuse</li> <li>Reduce agriculturally-related greenhouse gas emissions by 0.8 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>-e yr<sup>-1</sup> (15%) compared with a business-as-usual scenario in 2030</li> <li>190 million ha degraded land area restored</li> <li>7.5 million ha of forest saved from deforestation</li> </ol>

CRPs received their funding (windows 1 and 2) but also weaved bilateral and window three funded projects into their programs so that more CGIAR research was mapped to the CRPs (more than 85%). The CRPs were asked to report contributions to the higher-level System Level

Terms of Reference

CGIAR System Organization, Issued: October 20, 2022

Outcome (SLO) targets as part of their annual reporting process. In addition, there were impact assessment studies commissioned by the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) which demonstrated the contribution of CGIAR to one or more key adoption or impact variables.

The 12 CRPs came to a close in December 2021, and a new Results Framework was developed and approved in 2020. In formally retiring the previous Strategy and Results Framework, the System Council agreed on the following:

*“We see a range of benefits in providing data on CGIAR’s contribution to the SRF aspirational 2022 targets, not least because the learning potential it would provide to inform future reporting on CGIAR’s contribution to those Collective Global 2030 Targets (based on the CGIAR 2030 Research and Innovation Strategy and its Results Framework).*

*These data would be provided by mid-2023, building on the contributions from the now ended CRPs, and the first year of implementation of the 2022-2024 Investment Prospectus.” - [CGIAR System Council \(2022\) Retiring 2016-2030 ‘SRF’](#)*

Although the System Council’s request focuses on ‘providing data’, the learning value of such an assessment would benefit from extending beyond the provision of numbers. These critical assessments could include how the SRF targets were met or unmet and if the targets were overly ambitious from the outset. This evaluation builds on [12 CRP reviews](#) conducted in 2020 and [the 2021 Synthesis](#). These reviews and syntheses include a substantial amount of evaluative evidence on setting/achieving targets and provide the needed foundation for this evaluation.

Indeed, better understanding the challenges in meeting the contributions to the aspirational targets or providing rigorous evidence to support those contributions should be key objectives of the assessment.

## 2. Brief description and clients

The overarching objective is **to design and implement an assessment of the CGIAR contribution to its 2022 aspirational “System Level Outcome Targets”** and make recommendations to enhance the portfolio’s use of targeting in the future.

The purpose of the evaluation is to provide essential evaluative information for decision-making by CGIAR governance, management, funders and partners on issues such as targeting setting and CGIAR SLO contribution. Specifically, the evaluation results are expected to provide input learning in the current portfolio.

The main stakeholders of this work are the executive management team and science directors of the CGIAR, CGIAR System Council, CGIAR centers and researchers, notably those participating in the CRPs and now in the initiatives. CGIAR Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service (IAES)

and SPIA – also have a keen interest and can contribute to the study’s design. The stakeholders will be consulted throughout the assessment through various means.

Table 2: Evaluation of stakeholders

Stakeholder	Role	Interest in evaluation
CGIAR Strategic Impact, Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (SIMEC)	Primary client	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accountability for its governance role</li> <li>Learning for improvement of its governance role</li> </ul>
OneCGIAR EMT	Primary client	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accountability for performance</li> <li>Learning improvement of portfolio</li> </ul>
PPU/programs Unit	Primary client Commission and the manage the assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accountability for the performance of CRP</li> <li>Learning for improvement of the current portfolio</li> </ul>
Innovation Finance Management	Informants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accountability for its role</li> <li>Prioritization of investments</li> <li>Learning for improved donor performance within CGIAR</li> </ul>
Former CRP leaders and research managers	Informants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accountability for contribution</li> </ul>
Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service (IAES)	Quality assurance guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accountabilities per mandate documents</li> </ul>
Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)	Guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accountability and learning</li> </ul>
Current research managers (SGDs, initiative leads)	Informants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Learning for the performance of current AAs and initiatives</li> </ul>

### 3. Purpose, general scope and focus of the evaluation

The evaluation will be both summative and formative. Evaluation of the extent to which credible contributions to targets, outcomes (IDOs) and impacts (SLOs) were achieved is the summative portion of the evaluation.

The evaluation will examine target setting and the ability of CRPs to rigorously document progress towards them (see Evaluation Questions in the sections below), building on findings from the CRP reviews and synthesis reports. This part will have formative implications for the new portfolio, which similarly aspires to demonstrate contributions to higher-level impacts.

The methodology will be proposed in the inception phase. The evaluation will build on and, insofar as possible, avoid duplicating the work of other relevant assessments.

The study will draw mainly on annual reports submitted by the CRPs and platforms between 2017 and 2021 and on other impact assessment studies of CGIAR research. It should also include interviews with research leaders, impact assessment specialists in CGIAR, and CGIAR advisory

bodies. Details and introduction of other methods to be worked out as part of the first set of tasks.

#### 4. Evaluation criteria and preliminary evaluation questions

Within the overarching question to ascertain how well the CRPs delivered the system level targets, the evaluation will focus on the questions listed below which were developed by the “Joined-up MELIA” workstream of the PPU. Further refinement is expected during the inception phase of the evaluation.

- From the reported (and quality assessed) data by CRPs between 2017-2021, what are the credible contributions made by CGIAR to the intermediate 2022 SRF Targets (see table 1)?
- What limitations exist on the ability to derive more accurate calculations/estimates around the CGIAR contribution to the intermediate 2022 SRF Targets?
- What should CGIAR do to overcome/avoid those limitations in future portfolio setting and reporting against targets?
- How have the contributions of CGIAR research into impacts (i.e. the SLO outcomes) been documented by CRPs and other researchers:
  - a. How has the CGIAR documented the specific contributions of the different CGIAR research outputs/innovations (technological, policy, social, institutional)? Are there research areas/innovations with evident data gaps?
  - b. How has the CGIAR documented the reach of their innovations, including different target groups that were reached? Did documentation include the where, when, how, and why these research/innovations have been disseminated or scaled? How much credible evidence of impacts at scale of CGIAR research has been documented and what are the gaps across different SLO outcome areas?
  - c. What are the leading indicators of reach and impacts used so far and what have been the main methods and approaches used to provide this evidence?
  - d. Has the evidence provided by impact assessment or adoption studies of CGIAR research/innovations undergone rigorous peer review, backed up by publication in top development journals?

#### 5. Evaluator(s) qualifications and skills

Given that this evaluation is on a relatively narrow topic requiring some degree of specialization of skills, a single consultant or team of two should be sufficient for this inquiry phase of the task. For the inception phase, we would like to hire one consultant to deliver a design. That design would then inform whether an additional consultant would be hired for the inquiry phase and what the qualifications for the additional team member would be. Essential qualifications for the selected individual are:

- Strong academic background and experience in domains relevant to retired CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016-2030
- Significant experience in leading or conducting evaluations
- Experience in conducting impact assessments is desired
- Ability to distinguish rigorous evidence in support of impact contribution claims
- Ability to synthesize quantitative data that is generated independently
- PhD or Msc in relevant disciplines (Economics, Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Security, Social sciences) with at least 12 years of relevant experience.
- Good knowledge of CGIAR MEL system
- Excellent writing skills in English and good verbal communication skills

## 6. Roles and responsibilities of parties involved

Table 3: Tentative schedule

Phase	Period	Level of effort	Main output	Responsibility
Inception phase	November 2022  December 2022	15 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evaluation team recruited</li> <li>○ Inception meeting and consultations</li> <li>○ Inception report with a draft study design (First review by PPU and final review by OneCGIAR SDGs, EMT, SPIA, IAES and SC)</li> <li>○ Final inception report taking into account all feedback</li> </ul>	PPU and Evaluation team
Inquiry phase	January to March 2023	30 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Various analysis products as indicated in the inception report</li> </ul>	Evaluation team
Presentation of preliminary findings	April 2023	5 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentation of preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations</li> <li>○ Feedback from main stakeholders</li> </ul>	Evaluation team
Report drafting	May 2023	5 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Draft evaluation report</li> <li>○ Feedback on the report</li> </ul>	Evaluation team
Final evaluation report	June 2023	5 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Final evaluation report</li> </ul>	Evaluation team
SC Response		NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ System Council presentation and response</li> </ul>	PPU



## 7. Project Timeline

The evaluation is expected to begin November 10, 2022, and end in June 2023. A tentative schedule is provided in Table 3 above.

## 8. How to apply

Please submit the following as separate documents:

- 1) A brief statement of no more than two (2) pages of text identifying the type of service proposed and highlighting three (3) examples of the publications /reports (for functional/image examples please provide links.)
- 2) A CV including two (2) references (no more than two pages)
- 3) Daily rate in USD. These rates will be applied for the full period the consultant is on contract

**Please submit documents to [smo-bidding@cgiar.org](mailto:smo-bidding@cgiar.org).**

All applications must be received no later than 31 October, 2022. Only electronically submitted applications will be considered. Late applications will not be considered.

Applications will be reviewed on a rolling basis through the stated deadline. Only short-listed candidates will be contacted. Please note: these consultancies are not designed for work of a continuing nature, or to lead to a staff position and as such, there should be no expectation of continued employment at the end of the contract.

## 9. Key document list for the 2022 SLO target study

- CGIAR (2016). [CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016-2030](#). Annex 3 target justification
- [CGIAR \(2021\) SLO Annual reporting guidance](#)
- [CGIAR \(2021\) Quality Assurance Assessor guidance: A document for assessment](#)
- CGIAR (2018). [Annual Performance Report 2017](#)
- CGIAR (2019). Annual Performance Report [2018](#)
- CGIAR (2020). Annual Performance Report [2019](#)
- CGIAR (2021) Annual Performance Report [2020](#)
- CGIAR (2022) Annual Performance Report [2021](#)
- [Standing Panel on Impact Assessment \(SPIA\) reports and publications](#)
- Alston et al (2020) [The Payoff to investing in CGIAR research](#).
- CAS Secretariat (CGIAR Advisory Services Shared Secretariat) (2020) [CRP Evaluative Reviews 2020](#)
- [CGIAR Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service \(IAES\) \(2021\). Synthesis of Learning from a Decade of CGIAR Research Programs. Rome: IAES Evaluation Function.](#)

- [CGIAR \(2020\) Performance and Results Management Framework 2022-2030. A companion document to the CGIAR 2030 Research & Innovation Strategy](#)
- [CGIAR \(2022\) Technical Reporting Arrangement](#)
- CGIAR Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service (2022). [CGIAR Evaluation Policy](#). Rome: CGIAR Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service
- CGIAR Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service (2022). [CGIAR Evaluation Framework](#). Rome: CGIAR Independent Advisory and Evaluation Service
- [Other SLO resources](#)
- Donor exchanges (as appropriate, e.g. mask the donor/staff names)