

Medium-Term Plan 2009–2011

Medium-Term Plan 2009–2011



PRGA

The CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research
and Gender Analysis for Technological Development and
Institutional Innovation

ICIAT PRGA: PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH AND GENDER ANALYSIS FOR TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL INNOVATION

NARRATIVE

Project Overview and Rationale

Rationale for MTP Project and Changes

Phase III (2008–2012) of the Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation (PRGA Program) builds on and modifies the Program’s revised strategic platform, developed in early 2007 on the basis of lessons from and achievements of the earlier phases (1997–2006), the recommendations of the Program’s first external review in 2006–2007, and detailed annual planning meetings and discussions within the Program’s Advisory Board (now known as the Program Advisory Committee, PAC).

The key factors that underpinned the Program’s work at the beginning of Phase II still apply today:

- A majority of agricultural research systems still lack a critical mass of participatory research (PR) and gender analysis (GA) practitioners, including in the CG System
- There is still little recognition and practice of gender analysis
- There is still an unmet demand for capacity development in GA and PR methods
- Learning and change need to be institutionalized, so that PR and GA can be mainstreamed in agricultural R&D thinking and practice.

The PRGA Program continues to be guided by its programmatic goal “to improve the ability of the CGIAR System and other collaborating institutions to develop technology which alleviates poverty, improves food security, and protects the environment with greater equity” and its programmatic purpose “to assess and develop methodologies and organizational innovations for gender-sensitive participatory research, and operationalize their use in plant breeding, and crop and natural-resources management.” The objective of the Program is to improve the competencies of the CG System and collaborating institutions to mainstream the use of gender-sensitive participatory approaches in plant breeding and natural-resources research.

The strategic platform for Phase III focuses on three thematic areas—New developments in and institutionalization of participatory plant breeding (PPB) and in seed delivery systems, New approaches to measure the effectiveness of research processes that contribute to poverty reduction, and Supporting actions for gender mainstreaming; these constitute the Outputs of the revised logframe.

Summary of changes from previous Outputs and MTP Project

The four Outputs of the 2008–2010 MTP have been consolidated into three. In addition, the Output Targets have been refined (the 2008–2010 MTP was necessarily preliminary as the new strategic platform was only drafted in early 2007). More specifically, the former Output 2 (2008–

2010) on ‘Institutional Innovations in Africa’s Seed and Seedling Revolution’ was merged into Output 1 as ‘New developments ... in seed delivery systems.’

Overall, the 2009–2011 MTP is the result of further strategic thinking on and clarification of the Phase III strategic platform drafted in 2007. The changes have also been influenced by the projected funding situation. In terms of temporal linkages:

- Output 1 (PPB and seed systems) builds on previous Program activities and experience in the Plant Breeding Group (early Phase II)
- Output 2 (measuring research effectiveness) builds on a project started during Phase II, under Output 2 (Impact Assessment) in 2006
- Output 3 (gender mainstreaming) builds directly on Phase II Output 1, with a renewed focus on the CG Centers.

Alignment to CGIAR Priorities

The PRGA Program fits primarily into System Priority area 5 *Improving policies and facilitating institutional innovation to support sustainable reduction of poverty and hunger*, and more specifically Priority 5D *Improving research and development options to reduce rural poverty and vulnerability*. However, the use of gender-sensitive participatory research-for-development by the CG System and its partners, as promoted by the Program, should improve the efficiency of effort in all five Priority areas. For alignment of specific Outputs, see ‘Description [of specific Outputs]’ below.

Alignment to proposed rationale and profile for Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs (SWEPs)

The PRGA Program welcomes the Science Council’s clarification of the history, purpose and preferred characteristics of SWEPs as explicitly stated in the recent SWEPs assessment.¹ The explicitness of the assessment criteria used (current and future SWEPs) has been helpful in assessing how the PRGA Program meets the stated SWEPs criteria. During the 2007–2008 Program Advisory Committee (February 28–29, 2008, CIAT, Cali, Colombia), the staff and PAC members reviewed and evaluated the characteristics of the PRGA Program, as well as its contribution to the success of SWEPs delivery in the light of the Science Council Assessment.² The PRGA Program has demonstrated leadership in building and nurturing communities of practice in the past, and fully meets the generic characteristics for the future Systemwide initiatives.³ The implications of this are as follows:

- i. The ‘international public goods’ (IPGs) catalyzed and nurtured by the PRGA Program are the joint outputs of a larger range of stakeholders and partners than is typical of a SWEP with a scientifically-focused purpose. The PRGA Program has demonstrated that an IPG can originate from within civil society (NGOs and

¹ Science Council of the CGIAR. The Role of Systemwides in Implementing the CGIAR’s Research Agenda. An Assessment of Current Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs (SWEPs). SC Secretariat, February 7, 2008.

² In the Program’s written response (March 3, 2008), the PRGA Program staff and Program Advisory Committee urged the Science Council to revise its assessment of the PRGA Program in the light of evidence that it may have overlooked or perhaps undervalues.

³ See Appendix I for detail description of PRGA Program’s outputs and SWEPs success factors and Appendix II for how PRGA Program fits the proposed characteristics of the future SWEPs.

- farmers' organizations) when these are effectively supported by NARS and the CG Centers.
- ii. The PRGA Program and its partners explicitly address the way that research is performed and managed to achieve the CG's stated goals. It develops and tests how participatory research and gender analysis allow CGIAR priorities to be advanced or achieved.
 - iii. Robust research has demonstrated that 'institutional failure' underlies the fact that millions of farmers remain poor, marginalized and unsupported by effective technology, after more than 40 years of effort. The gap between what science has to offer and the diverse problems that such farmers face remains very large. The PRGA Program's work seeks ways to help a range of organizational actors 'close the gaps' through development and adoption of appropriate R&D approaches, methods and associated skills and conceptual understanding. The increasing feminization of poverty makes this all the more urgent.
 - iv. None of these concerns fall under the purview of the Challenge Programs. The PRGA Program is thus positioned as a generic facility that complements and adds value to work prosecuted under the CPs.
 - v. The PRGA Program meets the proposed criteria for category 1 SWEPS – coordination.

Outputs Description

Changes from previous MTP:

The four Outputs of the 2008–2010 MTP have been consolidated into three. In addition, the Output Targets have been refined.

Description [of specific Outputs]

Output 1: New developments in and institutionalization of participatory plant breeding (PPB) and in seed delivery systems

- *Activities:*⁴
 - Development and application of new methods within PPB for maximizing the use of agro-biodiversity—SP2
 - PPB to help sustain (and even support the broadening of) the genetic base of poor people's crops—SP2 (1A)
 - PPB as an implementation tool for farmers' rights—SP5D (5A, 5B)
 - Characterization of seed delivery systems effectively targeted to the poor in a marginal area in a specific, defined region (Africa, or the Middle East)—SP5C
 - Developing local seed systems delivery of PPB products within given legal frameworks—SP5C (5A, 5B)
 - Pilot to institutionalize a local seed delivery system for PPB products—SP5C

⁴ The System Priority (SP) addressed by each activity is indicated after the em-dash.

- *Comparative & complementary advantages of the research*

Recent studies show the current agricultural research scene in a very simplistic way: private agricultural research is narrowly focused geographically, on a narrow crop basis (especially soy bean, maize, cotton and rapeseed) and on production and not consumption traits. Some researchers argue that the current trend of amalgamation in global food systems (that is being driven by the process of globalization) is accelerating a two-tiered production system in which small-scale food producers will be neglected in future benefits from agricultural research⁵ Moreover, globally the price of staple food crops is soaring, *inter alia* driven by the trend toward cultivating more cash crops (at the expense of staples) and the rising cost of fuel for transportation. Consequently, targeted research is vitally important to enable small-scale producers to provide food at an affordable price. In order to target their research better to serve the needs of the poor and to reach the Millennium Development Goals, many public agricultural research institutions have now adopted the use of participatory research models as a way of generating and sustaining a rapid rate of innovation, adoption and adaptation, especially in highly uncertain and variable environments and for benefiting the poor or hard-to-reach, and in some cases focusing on crops neglected by private sector research. The fundamental rationale for the PPB Program is to refine our understanding of the situations in which joint efforts of farmers, scientists and others are most critical in effective and cost-effective delivery. Although many CGIAR Centers are applying participatory approaches in breeding, the reviews of the CGIAR PPB programs conducted by the PRGA Program show that PPB work in many Centers is highly fragmented and not ‘institutionalized.’ Hence, the PRGA Program continues to have a clear role in helping to improve the institutionalization of PPB through development and adoption of appropriate PPB approaches, methods and associated skills. Some more advanced farmer-breeding programs in CGIAR Centres exceed the gradual selection in landraces, and include the development and maintenance of major and rather uniform new varieties. Ensuring recognition of the collective innovation and breeding efforts of farmers, and keeping these materials freely available for use and further breeding forms major challenges, as do issues related to seed multiplication and seed policy.
- *Addressing priority goals*

This research addresses Priority area 2: Producing more and better food at lower cost through genetic improvements; and Priority area 5: Improving policies and facilitating institutional innovation to support sustainable reduction of poverty and hunger.
- *Contributing partners*

 - CAZS Natural Resources (South Asia – Bangladesh, India [Assam], Nepal)
 - ICARDA (Africa or Middle East)

⁵ See, for example, Pingali P, 2007. Will the gene revolution reach the poor? – Lessons from the Green Revolution. Mansholt Lecture, Wageningen University, January 26, 2007.

- NGOs: LI-BIRD, FORWARD, SUPPORT (Nepal); PROVA, FoSHoL (Bangladesh); CRS (India)
- Educational establishments: IAAS (Nepal); BAU (Bangladesh); AAU, NLRI (India)
- NARS: NARC/NRRP, DADOs (Nepal); BRRI, BARI, DAE (Bangladesh); IARI, DoA (India)
- Community-based seed producers; private-sector companies; grain millers and merchants; seed merchants (South Asia)
- Policy-makers and members of variety release committees (South Asia)
- Others to be identified (Africa or Middle East)

Output 2: New approaches to measure the effectiveness of research processes that contribute to poverty reduction

- *Activities:*
 - Practical case studies with lessons learned on the role of science and technology and innovation in poverty reduction and social inclusion—SP5A (5C, 5D)
 - Assessing measuring systems that can provide empirical evidence of effectiveness of research process in contribution in poverty reduction—SP5D (5A, 5C)
 - Increased understanding about the institutional gaps in applying measuring systems that provide evidence of effectiveness of research process contributing to poverty reduction—SP5D (5A, 5C)

- *Comparative & complementary advantages of the research*
 There is growing evidence of limited impact of agricultural research impact assessment itself on project identification, approval and implementation management, or on poverty reduction itself.⁶ In the past, impact assessment results have served primarily as a management tool and an accountability measure to evaluate past investments in agricultural research and to set research priorities for future investment. With growing acceptance and mainstreaming of participatory and multi-stakeholder paradigms, however, impact assessment is increasingly seen as a tool for institutional learning and change that has close links to ongoing project monitoring and evaluation processes. The broader field of evaluation research includes many different perspectives, including but not limited to economic assessment. This presents an opportunity for the PRGA Program to support and engage in the emerging collaborative efforts in the development of a set of measuring systems (complementary to existing economic measures) for impact assessment for a broader range of methodologies.

⁶ This was the conclusion of the conference entitled 'Impacts of Agricultural Research and Development: Why Has Impact Assessment Research Not Made More of a Difference?' hosted by the CGIAR Standing Panel on Impact Assessment, San Jose, Costa Rica, February 4–7, 2002.

- *Addressing priority goals*
This research targets Priority area 5: Improving policies and facilitating institutional innovation to support sustainable reduction of poverty and hunger.
- *Contributing partners*
 - University of East Anglia (UK)
 - ILAC Initiative
 - ILRI – Innovation Works program
 - Sustainability Science Program, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
 - Nearly all CGIAR Centers

Output 3: Supporting actions for gender mainstreaming

- *Activities:*
 - Establish an annual Gender Research Prize within the CG—SP5A
 - Policy briefs, covering the main lessons from the PRGA Program and its partners’ work—SP5
 - Short manuals on participatory research and gender research for key research areas within CG Centers’ research portfolios—SP5
 - Taking stock—carrying out a re-inventory of (a) CG gender research and lessons that can be learned from this; (b) exploring the impact on the research agenda of women scientists in the CG Centers—SP5
 - Building advanced capacity for gender analysis in research within selected Centers—SP5D
- *Comparative & complementary advantages of the research*
Gender mainstreaming is a globally accepted strategy for promoting gender equality. Gender mainstreaming in agricultural research and specifically in the CGIAR and partner institutions is not an end in itself, but a strategy (approach, means) to achieve the goal of gender equality in research processes, as well as outcomes, and ultimately impacts. Mainstreaming involves ensuring that gender perspectives and attention to the goal of gender equality are central to all activities—policy development, research, advocacy/dialog, legislation, resource allocation, and planning, implementation and monitoring of programs and projects. PRGA Program assessment has shown that gender research is not mainstreamed in most CGIAR Centers—the major gap identified (which this research will fill) is the supporting activities for mainstreaming efforts.
- *Addressing priority goals*
This research targets Priority area 5: Improving policies and facilitating institutional innovation to support sustainable reduction of poverty and hunger.
- *Contributing partners*
 - CIAT
 - Gender & Diversity Program

- ASARECA/PAAP (Policy Analysis and Advocacy Programme)
- WOCAN (?)

Impact Pathways

Historically, the PRGA Program has sought the input of its stakeholders in identifying researchable problems in the fields of PR and GA. This process should be repeated in the future.

Participatory plant breeding research in a strategic context aims to identify and promote good-practice methods for use by plant breeders in defined contexts. These breeders in turn will develop varieties adapted to a wider range of farming contexts (social, cultural, farming systems, agro-climatic) that will be adopted and promoted by participant farmers, thereby reducing farming risks (through use of adapted varieties, improved systems and increased genetic diversity in the field). With reduced risks, farmers should achieve better yields with consequent improved incomes and livelihoods. Impact will be achieved mostly by use of these methods by NARS and also, in situations not well served by the formal research sector, by NGOs and farmer organizations.

By understanding how formally and informally developed varieties are integrated into the seed system, we should have a clearer overall view of the seed chain. With this knowledge, we will explore ways of influencing variety uptake into commercial seed systems and promoting the establishment of seed enterprise, including in situations where genetic diversity might otherwise become unduly narrowed. Consequently, farmers should benefit from prompt access to appropriate varieties, with consequent positive effects on incomes and livelihoods.

By studying successful development situations (not necessarily interventions), we aim to learn about what made them successful and feed these back to stakeholders. This should improve funding and resource use efficiency within newer programs and projects, thereby achieving positive results in a shorter timeframe and at reduced cost.

In mainstreaming gender issues in their research, partners internalize what they learn, resulting in institutional change; more specifically, partners then routinely utilize appropriate elements of PR and GA whenever appropriate. This leads to improved, better-targeted research, and therefore better outcomes for the ultimate target audience, i.e. the poor.

International Public Goods

The Program is unique within the CG with its focus on PR and GA; it complements the Gender and Diversity Program, which focuses on staffing issues and capacity development among female scientists of many agricultural disciplines. The PRGA Program works alongside partners to develop methodologies that will be applicable over a much wider area. For the specific communities with which it works, there is also the benefit of direct Program input and Outputs (e.g. crop varieties), which themselves may be relevant in similar socio-economic and ecological situations.

Alongside the research, the Program plays an advocacy role in promoting the use of PR and GA techniques throughout the CG Centers and beyond.

Elaboration of Partners' Roles⁷

- CIAT (Convening Center) — building on advantage of hosting PRGA Program
 - Pilot Center for gender mainstreaming – pilot study on gender audit
 - Greater interaction with PRGA Program at senior scientist, management and Board levels
 - ‘Buy-in’ to PRGA Program *raison d’être*
 - ‘Experimental’ case study in establishment of appropriate gender indicators in project review procedures and research evaluations (Output 3)
- CIMMYT, ICARDA, IRRI (Co-Sponsors)
 - As Co-sponsors of the PRGA Program, these Centers are prime targets for research partnerships under Outputs 1 and 2
 - ICARDA PPB expertise in the Middle East and North Africa (Output 1) – currently discussing issues toward preparation of funding proposal
- S. Ceccarelli (formerly of ICARDA)
 - PPB expertise in the Middle East and North Africa (Output 1) – currently discussing issues toward preparation of funding proposal
- CAZS Natural Resources (University of Wales)
 - PPB expertise in South Asia (Output 1) – currently drafting funding proposal
- CGIAR Gender & Diversity Program
 - Expanding the gender audit to other Centers
 - Gender Prize

⁷ Excludes recipient, network and potential future partners (see Appendix II).

PROGRAM LOGFRAME: PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH AND GENDER ANALYSIS (PHASE III) DRAFT 2009–2011⁸

	Outputs	Intended users	Outcome	Impact
OUTPUT 1	<i>New developments in and institutionalization of participatory plant breeding (PPB) and in seed delivery systems</i>	Plant breeders (CGIAR, NARS), farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant breeders adopt and adapt good-practices in PPB, thereby identifying adapted varieties for specific farming contexts • Farmers' rights and gender equality increased • New seed policies in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved livelihoods of poor farming communities • Seed security of poor farmers
Output Target 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective methods for maximizing agro-biodiversity by means of PPB demonstrated, and seed delivery systems targeted to the poor in a marginal area described in a specific, defined region (e.g. Africa, or Middle East) 	Plant breeders (CGIAR, NARS), farmers; seedspeople	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant breeders adopt and adapt good-practices in PPB, thereby identifying adapted varieties for specific farming contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved livelihoods of poor farming communities • Seed security of poor farmers

⁸ Given the ongoing vacancy of the Program Coordinator position (throughout the period of preparation of this MTP), this logframe remains provisional.

	Outputs	Intended users	Outcome	Impact
Output Target 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods to sustain the diversity of the genetic base of poor people's crops through PPB demonstrated; best practices for developing local seed systems delivery of PPB products identified; strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for local seed systems delivery of PPB products within given legal frameworks analyzed 	Plant breeders (CGIAR, NARS), farmers, private and public sector seedspeople	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers' rights and gender equality increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved livelihoods of poor farming communities • Seed security of poor farmers
Output Target 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic options for seed policy development identified, and an example of an effort to institutionalize a local seed delivery system for PPB products analyzed 	Agricultural policy-makers; seedspeople; CG Centers and NARS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New seed policies in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seed security of poor farmers

	Outputs	Intended users	Outcome	Impact
OUTPUT 2	New approaches to measure the effectiveness of research processes that contribute to poverty reduction	CG Centers, NARS, NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broader base of evidence is generated and used to assess effectiveness of research by CGIAR and partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research of the CGIAR and partners becomes more effective in contributing to poverty alleviation
Output Target 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practical case studies with lessons learned on the role of S&T and innovation in poverty reduction and social inclusion 	CG Centers, NARS, NGOs	Broader base of evidence is generated and used to assess effectiveness of research by CGIAR and partners	The research of the CGIAR and partners becomes more effective in contributing to poverty alleviation
Output Target 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measuring systems assessed that can be used to provide empirical evidence of effectiveness of research process in contribution in poverty reduction 	CG Centers, NARS, NGOs	The CGIAR and its partners have methods for measuring the effectiveness of their research	The research of the CGIAR and partners becomes more effective in contributing to poverty alleviation
Output Target 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased understanding about the institutional gaps in applying measuring systems that provide evidence of effectiveness of research process contributing to poverty reduction 	CG Centers, NARS, NGOs	The CGIAR and its partners have evidence and guidelines for institutionalizing effective measuring systems (that provide evidence of effectiveness of research processes contributing to poverty reductions)	The research of the CGIAR and partners becomes more effective in contributing to poverty alleviation

	Outputs	Intended users	Outcome	Impact
OUTPUT 3	Supporting actions for gender mainstreaming	CG Centers, NARS, NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The practice of gender analysis is mainstreamed in CG Centers and partners • Research products relevant to the needs and priorities of the poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable livelihoods and greater food security among marginalized groups
Output Target 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons from gender audit and gender analysis of CIAT distilled and available to other centers; and gender audit methodology refined 	PRGA Program, CIAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The practice of gender analysis is mainstreamed in CIAT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable livelihoods and greater food security among marginalized groups targeted in CIAT research
Output Target 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender audit methodology applied and critically reviewed in 3 other CG Centers 	PRGA Program, 3 pilot CG Centers, other CG Centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The practice of gender analysis is mainstreamed in 3 other CG Centers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable livelihoods and greater food security among marginalized groups targeted by pilot-Centers' research

	Outputs	Intended users	Outcome	Impact
Output Target 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods and lessons learned disseminated to wide range of partners and other interested parties 	CG Centers, NARS and other partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender mainstreaming methodology available for application in agricultural research institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable livelihoods and greater food security among marginalized groups

Project Funding:

Budgeting 2007–2011

Year	2007 (actual)	2008 (proposal)	2009 (proposal)	2010 (plan)	2011 (plan)
US Dollars (millions)	1.124	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800

Financing Plan

- Fundraising is a major (implicit) component of the Program’s new strategic platform.
 - *See* Annex I: Progress Report on Implementation of (draft) EPMR Recommendations, especially Recommendations 1, 2 and 5.
 - The Program will be recruiting a new Coordinator in 2008. Fundraising will be a major role for that position.
 - Until these process make headway, it is impossible to project the scale of the Program’s budget for 2009 and beyond. Any attempt to do so now would be hypothetical and meaningless (or no more than a ‘wish list’).
- Current Core (unrestricted) donors are Italy and Switzerland.

Appendix I: Science Council SWEP assessment (pp. 5–6): Factors that have contributed to success of SWEPS delivery and PRGA Program’s output

The PRGA has demonstrated leadership in building and nurturing communities of practice in the following fields and processes:

- i. *Building on existing successful initiatives:*
 - (a) *Participatory Plant Breeding:* the sustained support offered by and through the PRGA Program for PPB to other CG Centers (notably ICARDA, but also WARDA, IRRI, Bioversity International, CIMMYT) and NARS (e.g. LiBird, ASARECA partners, EMBRAPA) has progressed from preliminary conceptual development and then state-of-the-art practice, from farmers’ and from breeders’ experience, small competitive grants to allow field teams based in CG Centers and NARS to develop their practice, stakeholder workshops to critically assess experience and further develop technical and conceptual understanding of ‘best practice’ options, costs and benefits. A ‘web-based community’ has been fostered, offering opportunities for web-conferencing on specific technical and management issues. A high standard of publications has been maintained, spanning scientific contributions to high-impact journals (e.g. *Euphytica*), practitioner manuals (e.g. Farnworth & Jiggins, 2006), policy analyses and workshop reports (for details see PRGA Program publications list). The current round of PPB activity and proposals include: ongoing PhD research (WUR & ICARDA) and development of women’s inclusion in PPB; PRGA support to NARS/NGO breeders in South Asia, to develop the diversity and resilience of local cropping systems (with Biodiversity and the University of Wales, in association with a CIMMYT, IFPRI, IRRI proposal to the Gates Foundation); and exploration of the development of a participatory research unit at ICARDA to support regional initiatives to link mature PPB activity with sustaining agro-biodiversity, minor crop development and the registration and commercialization of PPB products.
 - (b) *Impact Assessment:* A recent example of collaboration with other successful initiative is the field of Program’s impact assessment. The PRGA Program, the Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative and the International Livestock Research Institute’s (ILRI) Innovation Works Program have complementary objectives to promote research for poverty reduction and thus co-sponsored a workshop on March 26–28, 2008 in Cali, Colombia, titled ‘Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change,’ to stimulate dialog, build capacity and address issues of institutionalizing new approaches to research and assessment of the impact of these approaches. The workshop was attended by 70 experts from the CGIAR, NARS and universities. A previous workshop co-organized with CIMMYT was highly effective in producing two special issue peer-reviewed journal issues; hence bringing the collective effort in impact assessment of participatory research and gender analysis to the public domain.
- ii. *Adopting partnerships and consultative planning:* All PRGA Program activity is based on partnerships, with a range of stakeholders in the public sector and civil

society. Nearly all activity is built on explicit requests and ideas submitted by its stakeholders and developed jointly with them. Plans were well advanced to hold, in association with CORPOICA, a fifth international ‘stakeholder conference’ in 2006, but these were disrupted as a direct result of the host Center’s difficulties. Draft MTPs are shared with its host Center and CG partner Centers, to harmonize log frames. This stakeholder-based planning and priority-setting process was recognized as one of the Program’s ‘sources of strength’ (EPMR, 2007; p. 4).

- iii. *Involving participatory research approaches within an INRM framework:* NRM as an explicit theme of the PRGA’s work ended at the conclusion of Phase I, except in relation to ongoing partnerships with regional NARS. A strong focus on agro-biodiversity and resilience has always been a concern of the PPB work and has received increasing attention as awareness of likely climate change effects has developed.⁹
- iv. *Engaging private sector and encouraging self-funded partners.* The PRGA works intensively with the largest (but least powerful) actors in the private sector – small farmers struggling to retain *freedom to operate* in the face of adversity, and to *develop capacity to exercise their entrepreneurial rights* in the face of unequal competitive pressures. The contributions of farmers, NGOs and part-funding contributions of NARS have been decisive to the PRGA’s impact.
- v. *Adopting competitive grant funding:* the PRGA pioneered the use of competitive grants in Phase I; funding allocated under Phase II for this support ‘evaporated’ during the host Center’s ‘year of confusion.’

⁹ The PRGA Program places on record that Phase I concluded the NRM program, with numerous academic publications and evidence of effective incorporation of PR and GA in partners’ field activities (see, for example, the book commissioned by the PRGA and edited by Pound *et al*, 2003 *Managing Natural Resources for Sustainable Livelihoods: Uniting Science and Participation*). Following analysis by the PAC (then known as Program Advisory Board) of the comparative advantages of the PRGA program’s work in this area, it was recommended that the NRM theme be dropped as a separate component of the Program and be incorporated under the GA and PPB theme. No separate NRM activity was carried out under Phase II.

Appendix II: Science Council SWEPS assessment (p. 9): Proposed characteristics for the future SWEPS and how the PRGA Program meets these characteristics

Characteristics of the PRGA Program

- vi. *Topics related to host Center's mainstream research.* CIAT has historically been a champion of the added value that participatory research can secure, as well as a lead Center with respect to gender research. CIAT's current and future strategic focus is under development, in the light of emerging global agendas, priorities and opportunities, and following a prolonged hiatus in its commodity work that made it difficult for the PRGA Program to develop synergy with CIAT's commodity programs. Following the initial recovery period at CIAT, the PRGA Program has received a number of requests to assist in new CIAT proposals and these are under joint consideration. The interim DG has assured the PRGA Program that participatory research and gender analysis will remain core items in the mainstream program at CIAT as this is developed. The Program responded toward the end of 2007 to a request from CIAT's BoT to pilot a Gender Audit of gender research at CIAT. This builds on the previous exercise of gender-related data-gathering and interviews and analysis at ILRI and CIP, further generating interest that is likely to lead to invitations to conduct similar Gender Audits in at least two other Centers. The current phase of the work will conclude April 2008, when the recommendations resulting from the Audit will be considered by CIAT's senior management and BoT.
- vii. *Partnerships involve several centers that are engaged in the research of activity,* quoting the Program EPMR (2007) directly (p. 4): "The inclusive nature of the Program, resulting in a multiplicity of partners, is one of the hallmarks of the PRGA. Carefully documented inventories described 48 partnership projects in Phase I and 30 in Phase II. Many partnerships in Phase I were funded via a small grants program that operated from 1999–2001. This proved to be an effective way of engaging colleagues from the CGIAR: 15 different Centers, Eco-regional Programs, and Systemwide Programs from the CGIAR participated in the small grant program. More than 20 NARS and NGO partners also took part. Since the first workshop in September 1996, periodic stakeholder workshops have figured prominently in priority setting. This seems efficient and is one of the sources of strength of the PRGA."
- viii. *Synergy from Center collaboration is clear:* The PRGA Program has demonstrated clear added value in its collaboration with other Centers with respect especially to PPB, NRM and impact assessment. The synergies developed through the PRGA Program with respect to gender research are most clearly developed in its collaboration with regional NARS (e.g. ASERECA) and multi-country programs (e.g. WOCAN), where the collaboration has led to continuing efforts to strengthen capacity, legal changes, and policy adjustments by science management. The synergy catalyzed with and through other CG Centers has had sporadic effect; sustaining the gains and building on them has been and will remain largely the responsibility of the CG Centers concerned.

- ix. *Serve a capacity-building role and foster effective communication to enhance NARS, CGIAR and public-awareness program content:* Quoting the EPMR (2007) here again: “Capacity building was carried out in Phase I primarily through the small grants programs and in Phase II through intensive work with NARS, aimed at organizational change. Concurrently with the small grants program, the PRGA organized a number of ‘learning workshops’ aimed at promoting participatory research and gender and stakeholder analysis. The Program also organized 14 international meetings and workshops between 1996 and 2005, involving almost 900 participants.”

Annex III: Progress Report on Implementation of External Review Recommendations

Name of Center or CP: **Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation (PRGA Program)**

Dates of External Evaluation Report Presentation and Discussion: **February 2007**

Science Council: **March–June 2007**

Executive Council: **March–June 2007**

CGIAR Annual General Meeting: **December 2007**

Recommendation as listed in the External Review report	Response Accepted or Not accepted	Implementation		
		Milestones	Progress Achieved	Target Date of Completion
1. The PRGA's past performance and its present and future relevance to the Science Council's priorities for the CGIAR warrant its continuation.	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop strategy for Phase III (2007–2011) • Develop revised Program description and logframe • Funding secured for Phase III activities • Recruitment of new Program Coordinator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First draft Strategy developed by AB (March 2007) • <i>New Strategic Platform</i> flyer published (April 2007) • Revised logframe drafted for MTP 2008–2010 (May 2007) • Draft 2 of Phase III logframe (herein) • Coordinator vacancy announcement released (April 2008) 	December 2008 for securing funding

Recommendation as listed in the External Review report	Response Accepted or Not accepted	Implementation		
		Milestones	Progress Achieved	Target Date of Completion
2. The PRGA should stay the course and maintain its investment in participatory plant breeding [PPB].	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include PPB as a major theme in Phase III • Develop working relationships and funding proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theme/Output 1 of new logframe is PPB (May 2007) • Proposal prepared with CAZS-NR rejected by DFID; being redrafted for Gates Foundation • Ongoing discussion with former facilitator of PPB Working Group and ICARDA re institutionalization of PPB into NARS 	December 2008 for securing funding
3. The PRGA should strategically reconsider its role and program in Participatory Natural Resource Management [PNRM].	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PNRM dropped from PRGA portfolio • “<i>Research on PNRM be integrated into the Inter-Center INRM Working Group</i>” (Science Council, May 2007) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PNRM not included in first draft of Phase III logframe (May 2007) • <i>IC-INRM-WG ‘adoption’ of PNRM out of Program’s hands</i> 	<i>Completed</i>

Recommendation as listed in the External Review report	Response Accepted or Not accepted	Implementation		
		Milestones	Progress Achieved	Target Date of Completion
4. The PRGA should accelerate its efforts to introduce gender analysis into the wider GCIAR system.	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain gender-mainstreaming activities, with renewed focus on CG Centers • Initiate gender-mainstreaming pilot in one CG Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 2 of Phase III is all about gender mainstreaming (herein) • GM project at CIAT initiated (October 2007)—final report due in May 2008 • Gender Prize drafted (March 2008) 	Ongoing
5. The PRGA should renew its search for the funding of a competitive grants' initiative to elicit greater cooperation from its partners particularly those in the CGIAR.	Not accepted			—
6. The Convening Center [CIAT] should take steps to promote greater interaction with the PRGA in the areas of financial management, the PRGA Advisory Board [<i>now</i> Committee, PAC], and interdisciplinary research especially with biological scientists.	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2007, the CIAT BoT representative position was included in the PAC. • The PAC chair was also welcomed to participate in CIAT's BoT meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louise Fortmann has been appointed as the CIAT BoT rep. • PAC reps have sat in on CIAT BoT meetings in 2006 & 2007, so this is making the process formal 	December 2008

Recommendation as listed in the External Review report	Response Accepted or Not accepted	Implementation		
		Milestones	Progress Achieved	Target Date of Completion
7. The PRGA should continue to invest in impact assessment with greater emphasis on quantifying the benefits of PPB to different groups in society.	Not accepted fully (continue investment in impact assessment work in general not limited to PPB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social inclusion study • Collaborative impact workshop organized to produce case studies, analysis of impact assessment and evaluation methods, and institutionalization of these learning-oriented approaches • Peer-reviewed publications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social inclusion study (January 2008) • Workshop (March 2008) • Updated versions of 7 (earlier) workshop papers published in <i>Experimental Agriculture</i> 44(1) Special issue (January 2008) • Updated versions of a further 6 workshop papers to be published in <i>Development in Practice</i> Special issue (mid-2008). At the request of the editor, a call for practical notes was organized: 18 submissions were received, of which eight were able to be included in this special issue. 	Completed/ongoing

Recommendation as listed in the External Review report	Response Accepted or Not accepted	Implementation		
		Milestones	Progress Achieved	Target Date of Completion
8. We endorse recent PRGA efforts to publish more in peer-reviewed journals, to solicit more graduate student participation in the program, and to allocate more time to research.	Accepted		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 titles in 2007 • Several in press and in prep. in 2008 	ongoing
9. We encourage the PRGA to publish good practice manuals for biological and social scientists in specialized areas of the programmatic expertise in PR and GA.	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender manuals (see Output 3 in the current logframe: supporting actions for gender mainstreaming) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output of ASARECA project in prep. 	June 2009
10. Management of the Program should become less hands-on and more strategic.	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment of new Program Coordinator with revised, more strategic TORs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds secured (April 2008) • Vacancy advertised 	August 2008
11. The Program should design an effective communications strategy.	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft communications strategy presented to PAC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No progress to date 	Next PAC meeting (January 2009)

Appendix IV: Secondary partners¹⁰

‘Recipients’ and ‘objects’ of Program research

- Poor farmers, both men and women

Partners within established networks

- PRGA Program listservs
 - CG: Africa Rice Center; CIAT; CIFOR; CIP; ICARDA; ICLARM; ICRISAT; IFPRI; IITA; ILRI; IPGRI; IRRRI; IWMI; World Agroforestry Centre, WorldFish Center (i.e. all the Centers); ILAC Initiative; Gender & Diversity Program
 - ARI: ACIAR; Centre for Development Research (Denmark); CIRAD; CSIRO; Department of Rural Development Studies (Sweden); FAO; FDS; GTZ; IDRC; ILEIA; JIRCAS; KIT; Louis Bolk Instituut; NRI; ORSTOM; Swiss Agency for Environment, Forests and Landscape; USDA
 - Donors: EC/EU; IFAD; UNDP; World Bank; WorldVision Canada
 - Governmental/NARS: numerous
 - NGO: numerous
 - University: numerous
 - SRO: ASARECA
 - Private: companies; individuals.

Potential future partners

- ‘Learning from the positive’ project:
 - CIP, ICARDA (PPB), ICRAF, ILRI, ILAC Initiative
- Output 1 – PPB and seed systems:
 - INRA, CSOs (MENA)
 - IPGRI, NARS, CSO (Asia)
 - FARA, ASERECA, CORAF, SADDCC, CIAT, ICRISAT, WARDA, CIMMYT
 - The Clinton Foundation, the Volkswagen Foundation and the African Women’s Development Fund
- Output 2 – Measuring research effectiveness:
 - IFAD and ASARECA
- Output 3 – Gender-mainstreaming
 - Regional Development Banks (AfDB, ADB, etc.)
 - CG Gender & Diversity Program
 - CGIAR Systemwide Program on Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI)
- *This list will grow as new staff take post and work-plans are built around the new strategy.*

¹⁰ For major R&D partners, see Project Narrative.