

Consolidated Feedback The Challenge Dialogue System™



Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change A Pre-Workshop Dialogue



Workshop – March 26-28, 2008
Cali, Colombia

Sponsor —

Emile Frison, Chair, Alliance Executive, CGIAR

Prepared by Collaborative Workshop Planning Team —

**Patti Kristjanson, Innovation Works: Linking Knowledge with Action,
International Livestock Research Institute**

**Nina Lilja, CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and
Gender Analysis Program for Technology Development and Institutional
Innovation**

**Jamie Watts, Institutional Learning and Change Initiative of the CGIAR,
Bioversity International**

With additional collaborative support from —

**Stephen Biggs, Research Fellow, School of Development Studies, University of
East Anglia, Norwich, UK**

**Nancy Dickson, Sustainability Science Program, Center for International
Development, Harvard University**

Douglas Horton, Consultant, Sarasota, Florida, USA

Process and facilitation support by —

**Keith Jones, R. Keith Jones & Associates and Innovation Expedition Inc. Affiliate,
Victoria, Canada**

February 28, 2008

Thank you! — Introduction & Continuing to Set Context

February 28, 2008

Greetings RIM Challenge Dialogue Participant:

This is just a quick note to say — *many thanks!* — to those of you that were able to take some time from your busy schedules to respond to the *Challenge Paper*¹ — *Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change; A Pre-Workshop Dialogue*. You have provided valuable and insightful perspectives on the challenges we aim to address at the workshop in Cali.

Reactions and responses to the Challenge Paper are included in this “as-is” *Consolidated Feedback* document. We had a total of 38 respondents which is considerably higher than normal. As promised, we have included all the comments received, un-attributed. They are organized following the same structure as the Challenge Paper.

We expect some of you will be interested in seeing everyone’s comments so you are more fully aware of the spectrum of reactions to the Challenge Paper prior to the workshop. However, we appreciate that many of you have many other priorities, so there is certainly no obligation to review all these detailed responses prior to the workshop.

No synthesis of the feedback has been done at this point. This effort will be tackled now by the Collaborative Workshop Planning Team. We will now use your feedback along with the paper abstracts to design the workshop and to inform it so it reflects best the many perspectives you have raised. While it is not a perfect process, we pledge to do our best to bring forward and build upon your views.

Our next product in the Challenge Dialogue journey will be the production of a *Workshop Workbook*. It will mirror the design and flow of the workshop and will be informed directly by your feedback. Don’t be surprised if you see a few direct quotes inserted, un-attributed, here and there to illustrate recurring themes on the one hand and the range of views on the other hand.

We will make every effort to have a DRAFT electronic version of the Workbook available for you to look at a few days before the workshop. Of course printed copies will be available for everyone at the workshop.

We are very excited about the Workshop and are looking forward to meeting with you in Cali to tackle these important challenges collaboratively face-to-face.

We wish you all a safe journey!

Warm regards,

Keith Jones, Facilitator, on behalf of the Collaborative Workshop Planning Team — Patti Kristjanson, Nina Lilja, and Jamie Watts

¹ The *Challenge Paper* is one of a number of tools developed by the *Innovation Expedition* for its *Challenge Dialogue System*TM — a disciplined process that engages diverse groups on discovering collaborative and innovative solutions to complex challenges. www.innovationexpedition.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INPUT REQUEST #1: KEY CHALLENGE STATEMENT.....	1
INPUT REQUEST #2: BACKGROUND STATEMENTS.....	6
INPUT REQUEST #3: EXPECTED OUTCOMES	25
INPUT REQUEST #4: ASSUMPTIONS	31
INPUT REQUEST #5: INITIAL QUESTIONS TO STIMULATE THE DIALOGUE.....	36
INPUT REQUEST #6: NEXT STEPS	55

INPUT REQUEST #1: KEY CHALLENGE STATEMENT

Please review the Key Challenge and provide your responses in writing below.

Is your thinking in alignment with our Key Challenge? What is missing? What is included but is not relevant in your view?

- To learn from the experiences and empirical findings of a diverse group of colleagues from across the agriculture and natural resources research and development community about how research approaches and institutions have contributed to sustainable poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity. We are particularly interested in approaches that attempt to address issues of how change comes about and who benefits.

1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basically, the Key Challenge is aligned with my own thinking and expectations. There are a number of “big” words, though. Some random thoughts: when we speak of impact evaluations, these can be internal (self-evaluation) or external or anything in between or some hybrid of the two. Then, “how change comes about” and “who benefits” and even what these benefits and changes are, depends a lot on whose perspectives held sway in the design of these evaluation approaches, in the definition of impact, and the choice and definition of indicators. I am very thankful for the opportunity to learn in in this Dialogue and Workshop.
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ My thinking is in alignment with the Key Challenge proposed. ▪ It might be interesting to include also the challenges and failures that the diverse group of colleagues face when working for poverty reduction and social equity.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learning is an answer to a challenge. I think the key challenge is not to learn..., it should be reformulated to reflect the problem for example: unclear how research has contributed or contributes to poverty reduction and other MDGs and which methodological approaches are in place to assess that contribution. But is this the challenge? or is the challenge what the title suggests: Complexity of Poverty....
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very much aligned. Nothing essential missing. All issues included seem relevant to me.
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes my thinking is in alignment. ▪ The point missing here refers to the last sentence. We also need to interest on “what makes change sustainable”
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Key Challenge statement emphasizes “learning from...a <u>diverse</u> group of colleagues from <u>across</u> the agric-NRM R&D community”. To what extent has this statement influenced decisions on the composition of workshop participants? Will the workshop put emphasis on experiences and findings from CGIAR-NARS collaborative research? If yes, then it would be appropriate to reflect this in the Key Challenge statement. If no, then the workshop organizers could seek to enhance wider participation, especially from CGIAR “outsiders”.

8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I find reference to the objective ‘to learn’ rather vague and unhelpful in knowing for what <i>purpose</i> we are seeking to learn. Is it to rethink our assumptions, to identify alternatives, to know what doesn’t work, to outline a new research agenda? I would like to see a more specific verb and purpose given to the event that enables us to say ‘yes’ we achieved this to some extent because ...’ or ‘no.... because...’. ▪ I miss a definition of the term ‘learning’ in Annex 1. This is important as it is the leading verb in the Key Challenge.
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I agree with the challenge of finding suitable “approaches” ▪ But I would add that besides finding approaches, certain “bottlenecks” which are almost inherent to research (driven by publishing instead of demand) and institutions (based on hierarchies), must be tackled before allowing the approaches written on paper to be implemented on the ground.
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I don’t know if this has been captured in the statement as it is but I wish to point out or include ... ▪ “ ... the importance of being able to capture processes and outcomes that indicate progress”
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At end of final sentence add “and who loses – and the precise nature of any benefits and losses experienced”. ▪ My thinking is basically in line with the challenge statement.
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I largely subscribe to the key challenge statement. My understanding through is that the statement places focus on research approaches and institutions, to the exclusion of, say, development institutions. If my understanding is correct, then I would reconstruct the last sentence to “We are particularly interested in research approaches”
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (1) The statement emphasizes poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity. I miss environment: ecology, climate change, biodiversity, etc. It might be that you rightly consider these aspects key ingredients of poverty. But it seems important to explicitly mention both development and sustainability goals. ▪ (2) The key challenge is also silent about the system level addressed. Since many agricultural researchers (in my Wageningen experience) explicitly or implicitly tend to focus on productivity per hectare, it might be important to explicitly also include the higher system levels at which conditions for innovation can be created.
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes. The last sentence of the Dialogue holds the key
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, the statement is quite close to what I think. But one more issue I would like to emphasize is the ‘management’ before the ‘approaches’ and after ‘research’. I think this is still missing in our discussions. One more thing that could be added is the capacity development around this research management approach.

18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would try and avoid the use of the word sustainable as it begs too many questions. I think we are looking at ensuring the human rights are met, which includes basic rights to food, water, subsistence and freedom (Development as Freedom – A. Sen) etc. The goal of basic human rights would then be met in a range of ways in different contexts. ▪ There is also a need to think in terms of the ability of poor households (relative and absolute) to have the adaptive capacity to cope with stress, shocks and high levels of risk, especially in the renewable natural resource sector where impacts of climate change may be felt quickly and with increased severity in poorer communities. ▪ To be able to more clearly articulate the quality of evidence used within the development community and RNR in particular (as much research in health and education already does). How good is our evidence for the assertions we make? This is not a qualitative/quantitative argument but overall do we have lots of suggestive evidence that creates a pattern when a single piece on its own is insufficient?
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, it is.
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The challenge statement should be expressed as a challenge: ▪ “How do we evaluate research so as to learn how it does (and does not) contribute to sustainable poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity, and so that we make it more likely that it does”.
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, the key challenge for the workshop would be to learn research approaches and institutions from diverse group of participants and stakeholders that have contributed to sustainable poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity. The current missing part of the workshop is not only to address how change comes about and who benefits but also who are involved in the decision makings and change process?
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, this is in line with my thinking. ▪ Slight proviso that phrase ‘research and development community’ itself subtly implies some linear-type ‘supply-led’ process whose actors need to learn lessons on how to do better. Hopefully the ‘diverse group of colleagues’ is diverse enough to reflect experiences well beyond the research actors.
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am in agreement with your key challenge, ▪ It may be considered what benefits are derived by different consumers of the goods generated through science, for different consumers have different level of access and use of the goods generated- for example, rural communities may have unique impediments to make use of scientific information so generated, ▪ Lack of information in a form that majority can utilize due to language barrier and levels of formal education, different level of infrastructural development in rural areas

24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Well, interactive learning about how research approaches and institutions have contributed to sustainable poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity is the main challenge, but the challenges that are missing or needs to be more explicit are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How research approaches and institutional change contributed to environmental protection and adaptation to climate change? How do research approaches help climate change adaptation is very important? Does participatory research approach provide leverage in this regard? ○ Poverty reduction implies pro-poor growth and social development, but how participatory research approaches contributes to overall economic growth (pro-poor as well as pro-market growth) needs to be explicit. ○ Our dialogue process should move beyond research approaches <i>per se</i> and learn ourselves how we practice such approaches in increasingly pluralistic systems. Learning ways to acknowledge alternative perspectives and changing the way we see the world is more important than emphasizing one research approach over another. We should be open to hear criticism on our work avoiding ‘autobiographic syndrome’ of writing our own progress. Reporting participatory research is different than reporting lab reports, the former would have more subjective elements.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ My thinking is aligned with the key challenge. What may be ‘missing’ is adequate representation amongst the ‘diverse group of colleagues’. We are of course focused on how agriculture and NRM research contributes to poverty reduction but ‘sustainable’ poverty reduction involves actors well beyond agriculture and NRM researchers i.e. private sector players. Will our diverse group be able to capture the thinking of these other key actors?
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes. However, I would like to know whether when you talk of ‘development community’ you include farmers (and their indigenous knowledge, experiences) as contributor to the knowledge base
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Key Challenge statement is a good one, as it refers to discussion and consideration of documented past instances of research impact, and the characteristics of research that correlate with the magnitude of benefits. However, it is a bit more focused than the propositions in section 7, which may need to draw in much more additional information.
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I recommend to include in this statement “We are particularly interested in EVALUATION approaches that attempt to address issues of how changes comes about and who benefits” In my opinion, the idea is to debate evaluation approaches an experiences. Include, also, not only colleagues from research and development but from de evaluation professional field.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is it worth saying that we would like to understand when and how research on agriculture and natural resource management can contribute to poverty reduction and what are the mechanisms for learning about how to do this more effectively?

32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes ▪ Missing: perhaps some attention on what is preventing poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity.
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The key challenge is in alignment with my thinking
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fine
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although the themes include both approaches for achieving impact and measuring those impacts, the challenge does not reflect the measuring impact dimension. The challenge should include how we should measure impact, methods and approaches for holistic measurement of research and approaches that take into account scientific evidence as well as stakeholder perspectives
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ My thinking is in alignment with the key challenge. However, the key challenge should also reflect documentation of major gaps in tested approaches and how they could be addressed in the way forward

INPUT REQUEST #2: BACKGROUND STATEMENTS

Please review the Background Statements and provide your responses in writing below. Please refer to the Background Statement numbers when appropriate.

In your view, are there any Background Statements that need clarification, that should be added or that are not relevant?

Changing world

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 1. | The world today is different from the one that existed when the Green Revolution began in the late 1960s. One of the changes is that the locus of agricultural research and development has shifted dramatically from the public to the private multinational sector. However, private sector research pays minimal attention to many crops cultivated by the world's poor. These farming systems require different research approaches, including broader-ranging public goods produced by this research, beyond just improved crops. |
| 2. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why starting from the Green Revolution when looking at a changing world? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I would add to "Private sector research pays minimal attention to crops cultivated by the world's poor" the sentence "and the priorities of the most marginalized people". ○ The last two lines are not clear to me |
| 3. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statement 1 unclear. What is the point? Need of different research approaches? |
| 14. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Re 'Changing world': 1. 'Broader-ranging public goods produced by this research, beyond just improved crops'. I couldn't agree more. Perhaps some specificity could be mentioned, e.g., the need to look into the institutional conditions for the poor to have access to opportunities for farming and off-farm work. (I personally believe that technology by itself only creates opportunity in special circumstances. Perhaps a research question for the seminar). |
| 24. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (#1) "The world today is different from the one that existed when the Green Revolution began..." How do we compare the contemporary world from the one existed long before the Green Revolution happen? Is the GR our baseline to assess today's achievement in the way we practice research? Again climate change and environmental issues are missing here! If I am not getting old already and correctly remember one of the challenges of the GR technologies was environmental protection. |
| 25. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No 1. It is less that the private sector pays minimal attention to many crops cultivated by the world's poor and (perhaps) more that the work they do e.g. breeding tends to be for less-poor farmers in higher-potential areas. ▪ No. 1. Another huge change is dismantling of state agricultural support (subsidized credit, state marketing boards, extension services) |

Changing world	
1. The world today is different from the one that existed when the Green Revolution began in the late 1960s. One of the changes is that the locus of agricultural research and development has shifted dramatically from the public to the private multinational sector. However, private sector research pays minimal attention to many crops cultivated by the world's poor. These farming systems require different research approaches, including broader-ranging public goods produced by this research, beyond just improved crops.	
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One thing missing is on point 1 and perhaps throughout the document is a more explicit discussion on the role of civil society. It is not a good idea to include civil society as part of the private sector, it is perhaps much more.

Changing world	
2. The agriculture sector has also increased in complexity causing need for the research to expand its horizon beyond traditional disciplinary areas. This condition has caused agricultural research to have to take more multi/inter-disciplinary approaches in order to embrace and understand this complexity.	
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 2: Two sentences but the second sentence is repetition of the first only
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Statement 2 refers to the increased <u>complexity</u> of the agriculture sector, thus the need for research to go "beyond traditional disciplinary areas". This complexity is also mentioned in Statement 3, thus the need to "involve more players... at multiple scales". However, the statements do not clarify the nature of this "complexity" that supposedly justifies the above-mentioned changes in the way agricultural research is conducted.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> #2 replace "to embrace and" with "to acknowledge, address, and"
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agricultural sector increases in complexity especially if one takes seriously the insight that agriculture does not only produce commodities for an increasingly liberalized world market but will increasingly be held responsible for delivering the ecological services on which human life depends. When discussing this issue in the definitions, I suggested that I see an important opportunity here for international agricultural research (as opposed to the story about the need to feed (the increasingly obese) world).
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. 2. The agricultural sector also has to link with many other non-agricultural sectors e.g. small enterprise development
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement # 2: Hasn't the agricultural sector always been "complex"? The argument that I've most frequently heard for an interdisciplinary focus for IARCs is that national capacity has developed sufficiently to address "disciplinary" issues.
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 2. Its important to emphasize that agricultural research is also a capacity building arena articulated with markets.

Changing world	
3.	In order to reduce poverty, we need to understand its complexities and factors that contribute to poverty and its alleviation. These factors vary considerably in relation to their socio-economic, political and biophysical setting. Agricultural research has to include more players that operate in agricultural systems at multiple scales. Researchers and their partners in the delivery of research are learning to collaborate and to think in terms of broader systems and their inherent dynamics.
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The sentence “there is a need to understand the causes of poverty” might be expanded to include the different ways poverty is perceived by and impacts on different people.
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background Statement 2 refers to the increased <u>complexity</u> of the agriculture sector, thus the need for research to go “beyond traditional disciplinary areas”. This complexity is also mentioned in Statement 3, thus the need to “involve more players... at multiple scales”. However, the statements do not clarify the nature of this “complexity” that supposedly justifies the above-mentioned changes in the way agricultural research is conducted.
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In order to reduce poverty, we need to understand its complexities and factors that contribute to poverty and its alleviation. These factors vary considerably in relation to their socio economic, political and biophysical setting. Agricultural research has to include more players that operate in agricultural systems at multiple scales. Researchers and their partners in the delivery of research are learning to collaborate and to think in terms of broader systems and their inherent dynamics. ▪ I wish to add that the factors also vary significantly over time undermining traditional control setting experimentation, increasingly pushing research to innovation systems and patterns approaches.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #3 Qualify “are learning to collaborate” e.g. are at the threshold of learning to collaborate ...
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OK! I suggest looking for another word than ‘delivery of research’. It is a key idea in the linear model of technology supply push that I cannot fail to pick up.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (#3) “Researchers and their partners in the delivery of research are learning to collaborate...” How do we know if a genuine collaboration is happening?
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statement # 3: The blanket contention that “agricultural research has to include more players” is potentially problematic. While consortium approaches and broad partnerships certainly are needed for certain issues, the expansion of partnerships carries transaction costs and diminishing marginal returns. Thus, much research does not need more partnerships than are already pursued.

Changing world	
4.	As many political, economic and social studies of the “Green Revolution” experiences show, there is a need to recognize the specific setting within which agricultural systems operate and, hence, in which the research is conducted. Because of the enormous diversity in agricultural systems, there is a need to understand causes of poverty in order to design effective research projects and programs, and to assess their impact.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 4: There is a need to understand poverty in order to design effective research projects. Not just because of diversity in agricultural systems...
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 4. I don't think in terms of 'assessing impact'. Rather, I would advocate for the idea of 'understanding the trajectories of change'. It is the pathways of change that help us understand the process of development.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # 4 add to understand --- <i>the root causes</i> --- of poverty
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes! We found in our research in West Africa that this means that ag. research must pay considerable attention to diagnostic studies, opportunity scoping, and active farmer participation if it wants to contribute to technologies and institutions that not only 'work', but are also appropriate and fit people's needs, opportunities and aspirations.
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, in point 4. I think that is the moment to clarify between rural and urban poverty. Causes of poverty: scarcity of land, access to land, poor soil quality, crop prices decreases, sickness (HIV/AIDS), catastrophes. In order to design effective research projects and programs to assess their impacts.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (#4) "... political, economic and social studies of the “Green Revolution”..." What about environmental studies of the GR?

Changing world – General Comments	
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The section on Changing world could include issues such as climate change (mentioned at 6), bio-fuel, public goods issues related to bio-technology in the world of globalization etc.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the \$7 billion to the CG and \$100 billion on research to developing country farmers could be put into context. How much is being invested per year per poor person? How does this compare to other areas of research investment – drugs and health care, defense, etc? In current terms \$7 billion is what one rogue trader lost in a couple weeks.

Agricultural research for poverty alleviation	
5. In 2004, some 969 million people lived on US\$ 1 or less a day. The highest share of the world's poor is in Sub-Saharan Africa (41%). The rural share of the poor is 76%.	
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 5: don't we have a more actual figure than the one for 2004? The rural share of the poor is 76%? A better formulation could be: 76% of rural inhabitants live under \$1 dollar a day?
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re: Ag. Research for poverty reduction, 5. and 6. Agree, but the implication is to my opinion that we must address the way economic thinking is currently designing the world. It is obvious that the 'free world market' and the global agricultural treadmill fail in including (a) the millions of rural poor, and (b) the land and other resources they occupy, in the global human project. Inclusive development requires level playing fields and a fairer sharing of the market for agricultural products. This asks for a different kind of economics that the neo-liberal insistence on competition, relative advantage and other tenets. Big battle ahead!
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. 5. Not really necessary this statement

Agricultural research for poverty alleviation	
6. There is a growing groundswell of concern (based on scientific data) that the Millennium Development Goals (reduction to 800 million hungry, or 1.2 million income-poor by 2015) might not be met unless development is more effective. Current, unstoppable climate change may already increase the number of poor people in the world to 2 billion by 2020 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007). A major factor in making development more effective is better understanding of processes of change.	
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 6: to which change does the statement refer? In the statement appears to refer to climatic changes only.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 6. I hesitated when I read 'based on scientific data'. We know how tenuous some of this data is so using a term like 'scientific data' alludes to a certain rigour and quality that might not be found on closer observation. Can we use terminology that avoids mystification and reification?
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re: Ag. Research for poverty reduction, 5. and 6. Agree, but the implication is to my opinion that we must address the way economic thinking is currently designing the world. It is obvious that the 'free world market' and the global agricultural treadmill fail in including (a) the millions of rural poor, and (b) the land and other resources they occupy, in the global human project. Inclusive development requires level playing fields and a fairer sharing of the market for agricultural products. This asks for a different kind of economics that the neo-liberal insistence on competition, relative advantage and other tenets. Big battle ahead!

Agricultural research for poverty alleviation	
<p>6. There is a growing groundswell of concern (based on scientific data) that the Millennium Development Goals (reduction to 800 million hungry, or 1.2 billion income-poor by 2015) might not be met unless development is more effective. Current, unstoppable climate change may already increase the number of poor people in the world to 2 billion by 2020 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007). A major factor in making development more effective is better understanding of processes of change.</p>	
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would first give an impression that with all the successes in agriculture we failed to reduce poverty. The rate of poverty growth has been reduced gradually but not the absolute number. I will argue that we failed to ensure public good nature of the agricultural technologies for the poor to the extent all of us would hope for. I would give more emphasis on to act rather than only understanding as in para 6. ▪ There is no explicit indication of poor-farmer participatory research. It does not suggest all research need to be participatory but it should be aimed where possible.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (#6) “Current, unstoppable climate change may already increase the number of poor people...” Here the Challenge Paper refers to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Understanding the process of change would be a first step, but this can not be a major factor. It can be a process leading to formulating and reformulating strategies to adapt the change if it is unstoppable as the IPCC states. Both understanding climate change and building strategies to adapt needs to be more explicit in our statement that leads to the dialogue process. Again, does participatory research approach help achieve this goal?

Agricultural research for poverty alleviation	
<p>7. The international community has invested approximately US\$ 100 billion dollars over the last 30 years on research to serve the developing country farmers. Of this total, US\$7 billion has been conducted by the CGIAR. This fact has played a significant role in the whole impact assessment effort by research agencies and their donors who ask whether resources of this magnitude have been properly invested and are making a difference.</p>	
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statement 7: very relevant!
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #7 replace “properly” with wisely and appropriately”
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statement #7: The figures need to be cited. The CGIAR cost figure is too low, as it is now 6 years old. The global cost figure may be too high.
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statement 7 needs clarification to show what proportion of the international community investment has reached the farmers and the proportion that has ended in the pockets of the investors

Agricultural research for poverty alleviation	
8.	<p>The concept of poverty and the belief in technological solutions to address rural poverty have changed. The current definition of poverty goes beyond income and includes such things as access to social services and people's inability to participate in society. Furthermore some argue that the ability to learn and adapt to a changing world and the adoption of solutions that maintain the basic health of the resource base are also important factors. There are several frameworks, notably the <i>Sustainable Livelihoods Framework and Sustainability Science Framework</i>, that provide a basis for conceptualizing and assessing poverty.</p>
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 8. The SRL framework is actually very weak as a basis for assessing poverty. So I would posit this as an opinion of some people rather than a fact. Such frameworks would be interesting to explore <i>critically</i> during the event.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> #8 Change second sentence to "The current definition of poverty goes beyond income and includes such things as access to social services and people's ability to participate in society."
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In West Africa we learned the importance of opportunity. Small farmers are innovative and constantly struggling to improve their lives on a dwindling resource base. Their windows of opportunity are extremely limited. Most technologies do not make sense within those small windows. So the windows of opportunity must be stretched. This requires attention to institutional development. This is not a plea for social science! I don't think social scientists know much about institutions either (except for Steve Biggs). The institutional dimension seems to be an indelible aspect of agricultural research professionalism.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement #8: I am not sure about the statement that "the belief in technological solutions to address rural poverty have changed". The belief of whom? Recently, there has been much evidence regarding the efficacy of technological solutions. For what other research products do we have large scale evidence of benefits?

Agricultural research for poverty alleviation	
9.	<p>The multidimensional nature of poverty requires holistic approaches to the development of solutions that go beyond purely technological solutions. An "innovation systems" framework provides one way for thinking about how change happens. The emphasis is on the application of knowledge — of all types and not only limited to science/research-derived knowledge — in the production of goods or services. Other applications of knowledge include — learning through interaction among actors playing new roles; supportive policy environments; institutions and markets; and demand. The major implication is that in order for scientists to have impact, scientific research be recognized as being only one "piece of the sustainable development puzzle" and new knowledge seen as a co-creation challenge</p>
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 9: unclear "new knowledge seen as co-creation challenge"
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> #9 First sentence replace the second "solutions" with "contributions"
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree very much with this statement. It means that innovation is not the result of a linear process but the emergent process of interaction among synergistic contributions of various actors. It means not 'extension' of science beyond the walls of academia, but facilitation of that interaction process. This has implications for understanding and measuring research impact in terms of attention to social process indicators and to a theory of the 'pathways' of innovation. I think we have not gone very far in this understanding innovation beyond diffusion

Agricultural research for poverty alleviation	
9.	The multidimensional nature of poverty requires holistic approaches to the development of solutions that go beyond purely technological solutions. An “innovation systems” framework provides one way for thinking about how change happens. The emphasis is on the application of knowledge — of all types and not only limited to science/research-derived knowledge — in the production of goods or services. Other applications of knowledge include — learning through interaction among actors playing new roles; supportive policy environments; institutions and markets; and demand. The major implication is that in order for scientists to have impact, scientific research be recognized as being only one “piece of the sustainable development puzzle” and new knowledge seen as a co-creation challenge
	and adoption in the linear model tradition.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regarding point 9 – the use of an innovation systems framework may well be important but this needs to be defined in itself. There are different but overlapping frameworks developing some of which are perhaps more people /service focused whereas others come from the industrial sector and perhaps are more intervention focused. An approach which is explicitly pro-poor has yet to be articulated as this links partly to setting the boundaries of the system one is looking at. The complexity that you acknowledge can mean that the IS boundaries are set so widely that it becomes akin to the general national economic system of a country/region.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In statement 9, the innovation system framework is mentioned as one of the holistic approaches to poverty reduction. While I have learned quite a bit from innovation systems as a perspective, I have not seen it used directly in the framework of poverty reduction and there are many dimensions which it does not deal with which may be relevant to the poverty reduction debate, particularly in terms of resource endowments and power relations. I think that we might want to broaden our understanding about how rural and urban poverty have been studied – what are frameworks for understanding poverty and its causes and how can they be hybridized with an innovation framework which focuses on technology, goods and services. ▪ In statement 9, the dimension of capacity development is not mentioned. One of the aspects of innovation systems which is underemphasized is the capacity of actors and the education of new generations of different types of actors. The linkages part is easiest to diagnose, but linking up weak research with understaffed and funded extension will only marginally affect poverty. And even less if the formal education sector continues to produce poorly trained professionals, para professionals and citizens.

Understanding and measuring research impacts	
10. The complexity of measuring affects on poverty reduction mirrors the complexity of defining poverty, and increases where participatory methods are used and people define their own indicators of poverty and poverty alleviation. The entire field of poverty measurement has emerged in response to the need to define targets for international agricultural research and measure progress against them. Different models of poverty imply different indicators. At the project level, scientists are often left wondering which poverty model to use.	
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sentence “different methods of poverty imply different indicators” could also include different methods of assessing impact
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 10: Is this true ??: “the entire field of poverty measurement has emerged in response to the need to define targets for international agricultural research...” ?
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 10 needs more clarifications as it is one of the more important.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 10. Complexity theory, notably the Cynefin framework, says that indicators won’t actually be useful for certain situations. Let’s allow ourselves to diversify into narratives rather than only staring blindly at the holy grail of indicators.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> #10 delete the second sentence.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to point 10 I think you will find that the field of poverty measurement has developed in response to a lot more than the need to define targets for international agricultural research!
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the context of statement 10, I wonder under what conditions can agricultural and natural resource mgmt research contribute to poverty reduction. Land tenure and redistribution might be relevant, but is not a theme dealt with by IARCs.

Understanding and measuring research impacts	
11. Quantitative economic analyses that attempt to measure impact are challenging, but much progress has been made on the application of these approaches to both ex ante and ex post analyses by research institutions and partner research teams. For this Dialogue, we are interested in approaches that attempt to address issues of “how” change comes about and “who” benefits. This often involves both quantitative and qualitative methods, some of the quantitative approaches coming from more traditional impact assessment experience.	
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 11: many studies using quantitative economic analysis, do not actually measure “impact” but “adoption of technology”
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 11: it is not enough addressing ‘issues of “how” change comes about and “who” benefits, we also need proactively influencing the change for the poor using their approach.

Understanding and measuring research impacts	
12.	A primary objective driving many past impact studies was to “demonstrate” impact, to show donors that their investments in research were well spent, and to build the case to mobilize additional resources. Although many rigorous studies have been carried out and positive impacts and returns found, they never seem to be enough for, or entirely convincing to, the diverse range of research investors involved. This is because many factors affect the way resources in agricultural research are allocated
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> #12 — The last four lines are not clear to me.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 12: Last sentence: is this the reason why donors are not convinced?
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The last sentence in Background Statement 12 seems out of place. There are many reasons why the findings from impact assessment studies are not “entirely convincing”, but I think “resources allocation in agricultural research” is not necessarily the primary one.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 12. The term ‘rigorous’ is subjective. Who defines this rigour? This entire point assumes that money is allocated based on ‘objective’ evidence. I would argue that this is a (very) erroneous assumption. We live in an imperfect information world – decision-makers don’t have access to important information and choose to ignore it when they do. Decisions are political. Can we discuss the notion of the value of ‘impact studies’ based on a different understanding of the link between evidence and decision?
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A primary objective driving many past impact studies was to “demonstrate” impact, to show donors that their investments in research were well spent, and to build the case to mobilize additional resources. Although many rigorous studies have been carried out and positive impacts and returns found, they never seem to be enough for, or entirely convincing to, the diverse range of research investors involved. This is because many factors affect the way resources in agricultural research are allocated. I would also like to add ... a disconnect in interests and expectations of investors, research implementers and benefiting stakeholders that may pan out throughout the life of a research program and make impact lessons irrelevant. These disparities have in many instances led to disillusion of stakeholder roles and strongly influenced subsequent activities, especially investment priorities.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> #12 Add “This is because many factors affect the way resources in agricultural research are allocated <i>and different players may choose to ignore those that they find inconvenient or challenging to their preferred perspective.</i>”
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. 12. Big problem in impact assessments is that we are expected to show impact in short time-horizons, often ‘imposed’ by donors when even the donors know that often impact takes rather longer than 2-3 years before it becomes ‘measurable’ No. 12. Donors want to see impact (and that is only correct) but neither do they have the tools to ‘help’ us assess impact.

Understanding and measuring research impacts

13.	<p>Attributing impact to the input of a particular organization may be misrepresenting the actual way in which much of our research is carried out today through, for example, the use of broad partnerships. Partnerships involve collaboration, negotiation and strong team-building skills. This approach aims to build capacity and encourage institutional and policy changes in search of solutions to complex sustainable poverty reduction challenges. It involves recognizing that how the research is carried out is just as important as what is done. In some cases, early feedback can indicate when specific changes in research approach are needed sooner rather than later.</p>
16.	<p>Statement 13: from <i>La Rovere, R. and Dixon, J. 2007. Operational guidelines for assessing impact of agricultural research on livelihoods. Good practices from CIMMYT. Working Document, Version 2007.1.0. CIMMYT, Mexico, D.F.</i></p> <p>http://www.cimmyt.org/english/docs/manual/ia/contents.htm</p> <p>We basically concord with the statement and add the following:</p> <p>It is not always feasible or desirable to attribute results to partners in collaborative research efforts, since often the actions of one partner alone would have not produced adoptable outputs without the contributions of others. Attempts to attribute credit may offend the partners involved. In such cases a viable solution is to consider and attribute collaborative efforts jointly. Identifying the application of agricultural and related research outputs may often be complex, especially in the case of research programs that do not directly produce finished tools or improved physical inputs. Good examples are the intermediate genetic research outputs of CIMMYT that are used by others but do not directly impact on livelihoods; or documents, recommendations, and policies that draw on agricultural research results but do not produce direct impacts. The impact of these can only be attributed by gathering evidence (through interviews and case studies) on the contribution they made from those involved. Refer also to your Statement 7.2.7.</p> <p>The standard way proposed by the CGIAR is synthesized in the following paper, yet in practice it can be used in limited occasions and is mostly inappropriate for complex partnerships, most IAs, and the reality of research.</p> <p>Alston, J.M., Pardey, P.G., 2001. Attribution and other problems in assessing the returns to agricultural R&D, <i>Agricultural Economics</i> 25 141-152</p> <p>The alternative (actually complementary approach) is in the following paper. Yet I suggest that the workshop pays a lot of effort on discussing this matter and developing methods.</p> <p>Douthwaite, B., Kuby, T., van de Fliert, E., Schulz, S. 2003. Impact pathway evaluation: an approach for achieving and attributing impact in complex systems. <i>Agricultural Systems</i> 78 (2) pp 243-265</p>
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In relation to point 13 I think one should also think about the career paths of researchers and what institutions are using to validate 'research'. In many cases academic publications, blue sky research is given a much higher career priority than the types of applied research often necessary in relation to pro-poor innovation. This applies to Northern and Southern institutions in many sectors.

Understanding and measuring research impacts

14. New approaches from a range of disciplines offer possibilities for improving how we evaluate impact. There is a growing set of literature now on organizational behavior, systems thinking and analysis, outcome mapping and impact pathways, value chain analysis, action learning, institutional learning and change, pro-poor innovation and many other applications from which to draw. These new approaches could offer an improved ability to assess multiple factors and dynamic interactions in addition to our understanding of outputs and outcomes. The use of such approaches shows a shift from predominantly economic views toward examining multiple factors and their evidence as informed by systems-based analyses. Challenges to the adoption of new approaches are varied but often include a mix of political, institutional and behavioral factors.

8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 14. Hear, hear! 😊
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> #14 Replace last two sentences with “The use of such approaches shows a shift from predominantly economic views to more multi-faceted views that include social, political, institutional and behavioural dimensions.”
16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 14: the above (see under #13) guidelines published by CIMMYT cite the many methods and approaches available out there, and their trade-offs, and provides a set of references.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (#14) Are we talking about different disciplines or different practices? The distinction between approaches and practices should be clearer.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. 14. A big challenge is that multi-disciplinary approaches often do not work because each of us approaches the situation from our disciplinary (often narrow) perspective. Each of us needs to be more cross- (inter-) disciplinary so that we are better able to communicate with ‘others’ but this is a tall order at times (education still tends to be stuck in disciplinary ruts) and there is a limit to how much each of us can be cross-disciplinary.
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In statement # 14, involvement of farmers in impact assessment should feature strongly and carefully designed to document how they have benefited from a particular technology

Measuring and understanding research impacts - General	
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally in this section 'impact assessment' is presented as a monolithic field of research while there are different types of impact assessment with different focus and methods that can be integrated to increase sustainability (as written in section 7.2)
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idem under impact assessment/evaluation approaches – I miss reference to 'monitoring'. I find the reference to quantitative and qualitative data a bit of a red herring. All quantitative data can be made qualitative and vice versa. I think the real issue is distinguishing between contextual and non-contextual methods of data collection (Booth et al 1998).
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no mention about evaluation of outcomes and impacts on research field, I suggest to include. Important issues are also how to evaluate empowerment and social capital, in the framework of an application knowledge and learning process. "Understanding and measuring research impacts" N° 10-14 A comment: evaluation has different objectives than research, so impact evaluation should be articulated to the development evaluation field that is now debating about how to evaluate capacities.

Key events leading to this dialogue	
15.	The agricultural research community globally is struggling with how to best increase the impact of their work on alleviating poverty. Many gatherings are being held to explore new tools, methods and understandings including those of an institutional nature. These forums have involved a diverse mixture of academics, NGOs, donors, researchers and practitioners.

Key events leading to this dialogue	
16.	The conference "Why has Impact Assessment Not Made More of a Difference?" (Costa Rica, February 2002) was attended by 150 participants from CGIAR Centers, national agricultural research organizations, universities, donors and others. The participants concluded that the success of impact assessment studies could be improved in three ways: (1) by better matching impact assessment results to the needs of decision-makers; (2) by making impact assessments more credible and understandable; and (3) by improving methods for assessing a broader range of impacts beyond traditional economic measures. An important outcome of the conference was the decision to create the CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative in 2003. ILAC aimed initially at improving the learning and change orientation of monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment so that research could be more dynamic and make a greater contribution to poverty alleviation.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> #16 Replace entire point number (1) with by selecting impact assessment approaches and methods that provide the kind and quality of information that allows stakeholders to make decisions
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 16: In ILAC discussions the proactive initiative to influence the research management approach for pro-poor impact could be added.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (#16) What needs to be more credible and understandable in impact assessment? Is it processes of impact assessment or results of an assessment that needs to be credible and

Key events leading to this dialogue

16. The conference “Why has Impact Assessment Not Made More of a Difference?” (Costa Rica, February 2002) was attended by 150 participants from CGIAR Centers, national agricultural research organizations, universities, donors and others. The participants concluded that the success of impact assessment studies could be improved in three ways: (1) by better matching impact assessment results to the needs of decision-makers; (2) by making impact assessments more credible and understandable; and (3) by improving methods for assessing a broader range of impacts beyond traditional economic measures. An important outcome of the conference was the decision to create the CGIAR Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative in 2003. ILAC aimed initially at improving the learning and change orientation of monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment so that research could be more dynamic and make a greater contribution to poverty alleviation.

clear to various stakeholders including rural communities?

38.
 - Statement # 16 needs clarification particularly with respect to strategy 1 & 2 for improving impact assessment.

Key events leading to this dialogue

17. The CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA)–CIMMYT Impact Assessment Workshop (Mexico, October 2005) revealed that a great deal of innovative research on poverty reduction and various types of social inclusion was being conducted that involved research and development partnerships and networks that worked closely with poor rural people. Key insights identified were: (1) while some planned interventions to reduce poverty and improve social inclusion (such as official policies, programs and projects) had not always had the outcomes forecast, there were within those interventions some elements that had still been effective; (2) positive changes were sometimes taking place alongside formal planned interventions; and (3) limitations with the current use of methods and tools to measure poverty and change including the theoretical assumptions behind these methods.

Key events leading to this dialogue

18. The PRGA Program’s third 5-year phase (2007–2011) places major emphasis on understanding processes of change in order to improve research effectiveness. In 2007, the PRGA’s Advisory Board recommended that a workshop be organized to further investigate where significant poverty reduction and social inclusion has taken place. Their particular interest is in situations where CG institutions have had a technological or policy interest and to bring these lessons together in an edited proceedings for dissemination among the CGIAR and its partners. The key interest is in documenting lessons on theories of change and for the development practice.

25.
 - No. 18. Are these proceedings going to be ‘package’ and ‘disseminated’ in a way that appeals to a broader range of partners than has perhaps been the case in the past?

26.
 - Number. 18 second sentence.Where significant poverty reduction and social inclusion has taken place.....[add→ due to research]

Key events leading to this dialogue

19. ILAC’s objectives have broadened in its new phase (2007-2011) to include research, methodology development and capacity development to increase our understanding of agricultural change processes and to increase the effectiveness of interventions to stimulate innovation for poverty alleviation. This new phase is longer term and better funded than in the past. This will provide new opportunities to address issues that were identified in earlier phases in a more substantial way.

Key events leading to this dialogue

19. ILAC's objectives have broadened in its new phase (2007-2011) to include research, methodology development and capacity development to increase our understanding of agricultural change processes and to increase the effectiveness of interventions to stimulate innovation for poverty alleviation. This new phase is longer term and better funded than in the past. This will provide new opportunities to address issues that were identified in earlier phases in a more substantial way.

Key events leading to this dialogue

20. The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) has recently launched an "Innovation Works" initiative that aims to mobilize cross-cutting teams that take on challenges that will help ILRI and its partners dramatically improve their performance by building capacity to collaborate, innovate and integrate. Applying disciplined thinking and processes, Innovation Works helps bring about new forms of experimentation and organizational learning. It also wants to mainstream important cross-cutting challenges such as linking knowledge with action, assessing outcomes and impacts from diverse perspectives, and addressing equity and sustainability issues early on in the research and outreach work.

Key events leading to this dialogue

21. The PRGA Program, ILAC Initiative and ILRI's Innovation Works Initiative have complementary objectives for promoting research for poverty reduction. They have therefore come together to co-sponsor the workshop in Cali.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 3. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statement 21: One additional challenge when working in the area of poverty is the gender issue. Is it going to be approached during the workshop? Maybe in the case studies with lessons learned |
| 30. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I like the explanation of the three partners organizing the workshop. It might be interesting to add which centers are integrated into ILAC and PRGA and how effective that integration is at an organizational level. Our DG at Bioversity is the sponsor and ILAC is based at Bioversity and poverty reduction is a buzz word, but I am not sure we deal with it in a systematic way. |

Key events leading to this dialogue - General

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 14. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very interesting! |
| 28. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aren't any of the SPIA initiatives key events? Isn't the latest World Development Report a key event, as well? |

Workshop Themes	
<p>22. The Workshop will be organized around three cross-cutting themes. Over the course of the Dialogue and Workshop, we will be open to incorporating other themes as they arise. For the moment the three themes are described as follows.</p> <p>Case studies with lessons learned in relation to, or that provide empirical evidence of, reductions in poverty, positive changes in social inclusion or equity, and analysis of how those changes happened, with a focus on one or more of the following: (a) System dynamics; (b) Roles of different players; (c) Innovation and markets; (d) Research-to-development processes; and (e) Learning processes as they affect actor behavior.</p> <p>Impact assessment and evaluation approaches that address issues such as: (a) Assessing contributions in complex partnerships; (b) Interdisciplinary research; (c) Combining quantitative and qualitative data; (d) Linking the contribution of processes to outcomes and impact; (e) Innovation systems analysis and new metrics for understanding and measuring outcomes and impacts.</p> <p>Institutionalization of new approaches for research management and impact assessment: (a) Communication lessons; (b) Training and capacity development for poverty-oriented research and impact assessment; (c) Policy and operational environments (including institutional culture).</p>	
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Under Workshop Theme <i>case studies with lessons learned</i> (statement 22), I would insert “scaling up” to the list, since the process of moving from one scale to the next adds complexity of achieving and assessing impact. ▪ Under Workshop Theme <i>impact assessment and evaluation approaches</i> (statement 22), I would insert “uses and users of impact assessment”, since these highly determine the value of assessing impact.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Point 22. under case studies – I would argue that case studies must also be asked to spell out the methodology they used to come to their insights as we are keen to understand HOW to understand poverty.
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I really think these are very well chosen. What worries me a little is that the attention to institutions (in North’ sense of rules that reduce uncertainty in human interaction) seems not very explicit. I think that attention to such institutions as normative, regulatory and cultural frameworks that guide individual behaviour and contextualise it in opportunity and incentive structures is a key point of attention for ag. research, that is equally important as technology development. Note: there needs to be clarity about the distinction between institutions as individual organisations (e.g., ‘institutional culture’) and institutions in the sense of say ‘science’, ‘marriage’ or ‘leisure class’.
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Para 22 Institutionalization ... b. : ‘Training and capacity ... impact assessment’ around a pro-poor research management approach expected to be more useful.
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Case studies include empowerment of different players, their roles and social networks. ▪ Institutionalization of new approaches ▪ Include Institutional learning processes and knowledge sharing.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Under workshop themes statement 22 Case studies, I wonder if we might also focus on what the case studies say about our understanding of the nature of poverty, the poor and their context. ▪ Under statement 22 Impact assessment an issue might be when should impact assessment be done in the process from research to development. I think it might also be useful to discuss the role of impact assessment ex post when the ex ante and other priority setting exercises are not very explicit. This is central to looking at the efficiency of resource use. There may have been a positive impact for a technology, but that does not mean that the investment was the most effective. What other alternatives were available for the same

Workshop Themes

22. The Workshop will be organized around three cross-cutting themes. Over the course of the Dialogue and Workshop, we will be open to incorporating other themes as they arise. For the moment the three themes are described as follows.

Case studies with lessons learned in relation to, or that provide empirical evidence of, reductions in poverty, positive changes in social inclusion or equity, and analysis of how those changes happened, with a focus on one or more of the following: (a) System dynamics; (b) Roles of different players; (c) Innovation and markets; (d) Research-to-development processes; and (e) Learning processes as they affect actor behavior.

Impact assessment and evaluation approaches that address issues such as: (a) Assessing contributions in complex partnerships; (b) Interdisciplinary research; (c) Combining quantitative and qualitative data; (d) Linking the contribution of processes to outcomes and impact; (e) Innovation systems analysis and new metrics for understanding and measuring outcomes and impacts.

Institutionalization of new approaches for research management and impact assessment: (a) Communication lessons; (b) Training and capacity development for poverty-oriented research and impact assessment; (c) Policy and operational environments (including institutional culture).

research investments?

Background Statements - General

1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> So far, the Background Statements are quite clear to me (some ambiguity is inevitable; as I mentioned earlier, there are a number of “big” words about here; Annex 1 is a big help).
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not so much a matter of clarifying, or adding, but more of adding emphasis to: evaluation for learning. I see mentions of similar issues in ILRI’s work on organizational learning (statement 20) and I know for a fact that it is considered as an important research topic by the ILAC initiative, and is a key component in PIPA (Participatory Impact Pathways Analysis). However, I don’t see specific references in this section to evaluation for learning, and adapting, only to other purposes of evaluation (mainly 12, 13).
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idem – under institutionalization, I miss the idea of frameworks for helping guide the institutionalization process (eg Levy 1996). Training and capacity development are only one of many elements needed in institutionalization. I miss reference to farmer-based research, amidst the references to ‘science/research’.
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues raised in the background statement are pertinent and relevant. In particular, the themes deal with the diversity of issues involved in impact assessment for poverty alleviation. The fact that research institutions should not only be concerned about their impact, but also of the impact of how they collaborate with the development partners and others is critical. This is covered by the themes.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to the definitions I would also like to ask how many of these definitions have been conceptually translated into other major languages let alone into many minority languages in the countries in which poverty is prevalent. I am not suggesting that it should be done for the workshop but the question of conceptual differences goes across languages as well as within a language used by people with different backgrounds. In thinking about the background statements the following link takes one to a paper by Mary Hobley in relation to pro-poor forestry and tenure reform raises some interesting questions

Background Statements - General	
	<p>and challenges a range of assumptions which could also inform the work of the conferenec. http://www.rightsandresources.org/library/publications/global/Hobley%202007%20Where%20in%20the%20World.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work on the Right to Food has been going on since 1977 (and before) with the World Food Conferences and yet we are no further forward – political will is a critical element here which one should not take lightly. ▪ If we are too really think about issues of poverty alleviation beyond work the practical work at the field level (highly important but insufficient) then we will also need to think v. carefully about how the international community and those who are wealthy can reduce our demands on renewable and non-renewable natural resources to give others a chance to meet their basic needs. Ethical discussions say to climate change and the responsibility we have to the 2 billion who may well end up back in poverty is vital as it is this that will drive change in the end. Witness the differing responses to the Montreal protocol for control of CFCs and the Kyoto Protocol / Bali roadmap in relation to climate change. ▪ In relation to maintenance of the health of the resource base – a v important topic – we should look beyond the individual intervention at the poor farmer level and examine the wider issues of resource health and why poor farmers are in the position of perhaps destroying their base to supply basic needs when others of us utilize resources without care (e.g. are we as a group going to do anything to offset the environmental costs of flying to the meeting?)The poor should not have their options limited by environmental concerns unless we are prepared to seriously compensate for this (links of RNR research to public goods at the national and international level).
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think there should be a background statement that acknowledges that a key driver of what is generally seen as 'best practice' will be the outcome of a paradigm war in evaluation between experimental evaluation, which uses controls, and other types of evaluation, such as realistic evaluation, that strive to understand what works where. This battle looks set to intensify with the Gates Foundation throwing its lot in with the former, and European Evaluators and the Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation (NONIE) taking the latter position. Experimental Evaluation seeks to remove context from the analysis by making sure the control group come from similar contexts to the treatment.
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background statements are very clear and relevant. I feel that there is no need of adding more on it.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Broadly agree with background statements, and they are fairly comprehensive, and all are relevant. I assume the statements are presented in no order of priority, but would stress 9, 11, 13 are particularly important in that they pose particular challenges to the way many in the research community work. ▪ The 'Key events leading to this dialogue' section seems somewhat out of place. Interesting background, but rather different from the background challenges of the other important general issues preceding.

Background Statements - General	
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The changes need to incorporate discussion on knowledge perhaps more explicitly. Agricultural research centres are not the sole repositories of knowledge anymore and this could be addressed more upfront. And there are several instances where their knowledge is in conflict with other forms of knowledge. ▪ This dimension of conception of knowledge could be included as part of the changing world. ▪ The large scale farming crisis is missing in the bg statements. Over 150,000 farmers have committed suicide in India in the last decade and reports suggest that farmers across the globe are facing severe stress due to processes of globalization compounded by environmental stress leading to increased input costs and decreased output prices, thanks largely due to bad agricultural policies globally. The conference cannot do much about that but the context cannot be ignored. ▪ Point 15 onwards I think it would be fair to acknowledge the debates on Farmer-first that has influenced and interested many researchers on agriculture in the key events leading to the dialogue. The attempt to get a mapping and timeline during the workshop in December could feed into the existing process with the relevant links. This should not be seen as only as a CGIAR initiative despite the lead from some CG centres.
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The background statements are well defined. ▪ I think that is important to use multidimensional and integrated methods. The reality today is independent evaluations and use of different approaches. This integration is very important for the future of the IA in agricultural research.
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To add: The structural adjustment program that led to liberalization of goods (farm inputs) and services has led to creation of poverty cycles in sub-Saharan Africa. Technological innovations alone cannot break such cycles unless they are accompanied by other strategies to enable the farmers regain production. ▪ To add: The fact that past agricultural research initiatives in the recipient institutions are donor-driven leaving little room for implementers to tailor such research projects to respond to the clients demands. At times the donor funds are accompanied by expatriates who concentrate on carrying out research focused on their areas of expertise.
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fine
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decentralization initiatives in some developing countries are on the increase and it is intended to transfer resources, power and responsibilities to local authorities. This development is accompanied by capacity building and other empowerment initiatives to enhance the capacity of local authorities to demand and pay for research (to be added)

INPUT REQUEST #3: EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Please review the Expected Outcomes and provide your responses in writing below.

What outcomes do you have for this Challenge Dialogue (as in..."I would consider this Dialogue and Workshop a success if...")?

1. Learning about new frameworks for understanding the role of science, technology and innovation in poverty reduction and social inclusion drawn from case studies and other experiences. [Theme: Practical case studies with lessons learned]
2. Increased understanding of impact assessment approaches, methods and metrics that deliver empirical evidence of the effectiveness of research processes in contributing to poverty reduction. [Theme: Impact assessment and evaluation approaches]
3. Increased understanding about institutionalizing new methods and approaches for research or impact assessment. [Theme: Institutionalization of new approaches]
4. Plans are developed (either by organizations, groups of participants, or individuals) to go forward. These could include:
 - a. production of publications and other methods of distributing findings and implications of the workshop,
 - b. joint projects,
 - c. creation of, or joining existing networks, and
 - d. plans to change your own personal behavior or actions (e.g., introduction of new methods into your own workplace based on learnings from this Dialogue and Workshop. [Theme: Institutionalization of new approaches]

5. Learning about new frameworks for understanding the role of science and technology in poverty reduction and social inclusion drawn from case studies and other experiences. [Theme: Practical case studies with lessons learned]

-

6. Increased understanding about impact assessment approaches, methods and metrics that deliver empirical evidence of effectiveness of research processes in contributing to poverty reduction. [Theme: Impact assessment and evaluation approaches]

5. ▪ I would consider this Dialogue and workshop important if

- outcome 2 (Increase understanding of impact assessment approaches, methods and metrics that deliver empirical evidence of the effectiveness of research processes in contributing to poverty reduction.

12. ▪ Theme 2

- Increased willingness to engage in cross-disciplinary approaches to assess impacts.
- Increased willingness to engage in participatory approaches to assess impacts in which stakeholders behave as peers

20. ▪ Outcome 2 should be: Increased understanding ofAND understanding of how it happened.

28. ▪ The difference between outcome #1 and #2 isn't immediately apparent. My suggestion would be to focus on #2, as specific methods that have been applied to identify the causal effects of research are probably more valuable than are general frameworks.

7. Increased understanding about institutionalizing new methods and approaches for research or impact assessment. [Theme: Institutionalization of new approaches]	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪

8. Plans are developed (either by organizations, groups of participants, or individuals) to go forward. These could include [Theme: Institutionalization of new approaches]:	
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would consider this Dialogue and workshop important if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outcome 4 and b (plans are developed for production of publication and of distributing findings and implications of the workshop, and joint projects).
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ...”I would consider this Dialogue and Workshop a success if we, at least, take the first step(s) towards 4b and/or c ”.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would consider this Dialogue and Workshop a success particularly if there are plans developed (as outlined in outcome 4d) that are likely to carry good ‘institutional support’ of participating research centres. Changed behaviour within organizations needs to go beyond a few key people appreciating the need to change, to include real incentives for changed behaviour within and between organisations. The ‘learning’ and ‘understanding’ outcomes of 1 – 3, whilst complex, are the relatively easy outcomes. Some activities addressing the particular challenges to such ‘intra- and inter-organisational change would help progress towards this outcome.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (#4d) “...plans to change our own personal behaviour or actions...” I don’t think the three day workshop will be enough to change our behaviours and actions which is entrenched into life-long experience of multitudes of factors at organizational and systems levels. This is a bit ambitious and sounds like revisiting a linear process of institutional change, such as train people to change their habits and practices! What we could achieve in this workshop is to learn some of the ways to appreciate alternative perspectives and avoid ‘autobiographic syndrome’ of writing our own progress on participatory research. Are there publications that reports failures of our own work or at least a critical assessment? I suggest the workshop facilitators keep eyes open throughout the workshop if presenters who are reporting an assessment of their own work report both success and failure stories.
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outcome a, b, and c are fine ▪ In outcome d. is there technical or otherwise support that the participants will receive from organizers? ▪ Would be good to have a workshop proceedings of the full paper as a reviewed document for ease of use and referencing.

<p>9. Definite expected publications are the Challenge Dialogue Workbook, a proceedings of workshop paper abstracts (available on line and as a CD-Rom), full papers available on the web site, briefs for decision makers and participant list. Special issue of a journal with some of the papers? (criteria for selection?)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪

Expected Outcomes – General	
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ... I can facilitate the design of appropriate impact assessment studies with our partners, building on lessons and insights from this Dialogue and Workshop. Maybe we can have some guidelines or guide lessons, put into a sort of echo workshop guide/module ... and maybe in the process, “convert” more R&D managers and practitioners into the cause of “rethinking impact”.
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would consider this Dialogue and Workshop a success if they could increase my understanding of the dynamics of change at individual and collective level with a complex systems approach. I would also like to explore how to identify the role of inputs and outcomes in complex systems so that results of a given policy/programme can be evaluated in situations influenced by various factors. The creation of a network of people to collaborate with, in the future, could enhance these achievements.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ After reviewing the 4 outcomes, they look more as workshop outputs than outcomes to me. For example “increased understanding” appears to be possible by just participating at the workshop. In that case it would be an output. Maybe is necessary to review those outcomes? ▪ I would consider the workshop in Cali a success if 90% of the participants indicate in the workshop evaluation that the 4 expected points have been achieved.
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would consider this Dialogue and Workshop a success if I make significant headway in any or many of the expected outcomes!!! It is a tall order. ☺ Learning from others in the field and sharing our experiences thus far with a knowledgeable lot, I anticipate, will be rewarding on its own.
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There have been many workshops on “impact assessment”, and I thought this next workshop is unique in its attempt to step back and rethink “impact”. Afterall, we cannot successfully assess something that we (jointly) don’t clearly understand. Isn’t this the reason why the workshop title is on “impact” and not “impact assessment”? ▪ I would consider this Dialogue and Workshop a success if these would offer new ways of thinking about impact, including alternative/complementary notions on processes and consequences of planned change. Only then, can we proceed to talk about impact assessment and its institutionalization.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I find the outcomes are vague – ‘learning about’, ‘increased understanding about’. Can this be more specific and challenging please?

Expected Outcomes – General	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would consider this Dialogue and Workshop a success if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We had farmers there who said why they would like research to be more helpful to them and have them think actively alongside non-farmer participants during the event. ○ A number of core presuppositions about the process of understanding poverty/change are articulated (so not just assumptions, which are explicit but particularly those that might surface during the workshop) and their validity is challenged through explicitly facilitated sessions. Eg Socratic dialogues, Theory U process? ○ There is more clarity about the link between farmer-based science and scientist-driven research. And more commitment to making these issues discussable, especially the power inequities in the scientific domain. ○ A group of people dare to commit themselves to exploring the methodological implications of taking on board complexity theory and challenge funding agencies with their insights. ○ We take time to examine our own personal roles/mindsets/actions that help and/or hinder change in the research process. And discuss this with others. ○ We are facilitated through the heart and body, not just the head. Creativity can help to step outside our rational minds, which can keep us locked into an intellectual pingpong game with those we perceive to have other/wrong ideas. ▪ We, above all, not lose sight of the people, the poor. The term ‘poverty’ is an abstraction and sometimes makes us forget the human beings with/for/about whom this all is.
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ... a method/approach/guideline/action plan can be created aiming to sensitise researchers on the need for “real” participation, networking, multidisciplinary work, and presence in the field. (Indeed, literature speaks about those concepts since decades, and official reports and proposals sent to donors seem to include those concepts, but still, the reality on the ground does not always follow.)
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would consider the workshop a success if an agreement begins to emerge about how to deal with diverse aspects of poverty through research in agriculture and natural resource management.
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I have not comments but admiration for the formulation. I could mention that it seems that the Dutch Government might fund a 5 million Euro project called ‘Convergence of Sciences: Strengthening Innovation Systems’ in Benin, Burkina, Ghana and Mali. It is a sequel to our earlier Convergence of Sciences Project and is built in the lessons of that project. (see special issue on CoS of IJAS, Vol. 5, issues 2&3: 91-265)
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased understanding of how research management approach could be designed would ensure increased chances of pro-poor impact.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was some discussion around what a pro-poor innovation systems framework might look like and how it might be applied in practice. I wouldn’t expect to get agreement but perhaps some clarity about those areas where there is substantial agreement and those areas where

Expected Outcomes – General	
	there is substantial disagreement. The missing middle we would then focus work on in relation to ongoing studies etc.
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide me more insights for future research.
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Science Council and SPIA is about to publish a strategic guidelines to ex-post Impact Assessment. If this workshop could launch a group of people developing strategic guidelines for carrying out evaluation in the CGIAR, then that would be wonderful.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presented expected outcomes are in line with my thinking.
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would consider the dialogue challenge to be a success if specific ways of giving back information to the rural poor communities, policy makers and scientist are identified and these inbuilt into institutions that generate and disseminate knowledge for it to benefit the poor in a perpetual manner within their local environmental contexts- that is, suggest and explore new ways of passing on information to those who will implement the new found knowledge in a away and form in which it is consumer able to them—the poor who are tackling poverty as an everyday monster Which are productive ways through which the poor can participate in cogeneration and utilization of scientific knowledge that would inform their actions and serve their needs?
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The workshop would be a success if we achieved one or more of the outcomes. I would consider the Challenge Dialogue a greater success if the ‘thinking’ that came out of it i.e. the publications and more particularly ‘briefs for decision-makers’ really did reach a wide audience. With respect to the latter, who are the decision-makers? Will we have time to discuss how best to tailor outputs to different decision-makers because they are not a homogenous group.
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">we can come up with practical ways of institutionalizing new methods and approaches for research given the reluctance to change by research organizations especially in Sub Sahara Africa.
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We manage to Increase our understanding of impact assessment approaches, methods and metrics that deliver empirical evidence of effectiveness of research processes in contributing to poverty reduction. Particularly, if we manage to develop or refine some ideas on how to link the contribution of processes to outcomes and impact, and get to know and share innovative approaches for a better understanding and measuring outcomes and impacts.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The theme of the workshop begs an interesting issue that is omitted from the outcomes listed – to identify what goals international agricultural research can most efficiently serve (compared with other instruments). For example, there are often tradeoffs between efficiency and equity, and many empirical analyses suggest that such research more effectively contributes to poverty alleviation if it is targeted towards efficiency objectives. Do the participants have any comparable evidence to suggest that this analysis is incorrect? What evidence do the conference papers have to assess whether IPG oriented research is an

Expected Outcomes – General	
	<p>efficient instrument to promote equity or social inclusion?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It may be difficult to meaningfully generalize about “institutionalization” as there is no one size fits all solution for implementation ▪ The “elephant in the room” for learning from impact assessment, in my view, is priority setting, as we need more than insights from past research to determine future directions. The key issues then become – how do we get systematically consideration of impact potential into decision processes about research; and, in so doing, how can we get ex post evaluation results to be used to inform/explore/revise key assumptions? The workshop would be a success if we could begin to foster some change in this direction.
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments – I agree.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For me we should take into account agricultural and natural resource mgmt research and particularly the nature of the CG system. All three sponsors are linked to the CG system and are therefore trying to improve the way the CG does business. This is not given much attention in the expected outcomes statement, although it appears in other sections of the document.
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ... if newer coalitions emerge on discussing the issues of knowledge, relations on science and democracy, steps towards policy dialogues with stakeholders etc. ▪ Rest seem fine.
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the same direction, my opinion is that is important to stress the importance of the institutionalization of IA within the agricultural research organizations to advance in this area. In the literature we commonly see isolate studies (MSC and PhD thesis or consultant papers) with no link with the evaluation (PM System) and planning systems inside the organizations. ▪ It is also important to have an strategy to use and disseminate the results of the IA studies
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If at the end of Dialogue and Workshop, the limitations /challenges of the existing frameworks and approaches to poverty reduction efforts are discussed and recommendations made on how best they can be addressed.
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the workshop comes up with some general guidelines or best practices that approaches aiming at poverty reduction should have ▪ If the workshop also comes out with some guidelines or best practices for evaluation and impact assessment both of approaches and the impacts themselves
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The major gaps/shortcomings of previous case studies are also documented as expected outcomes of the workshop and are used to formulate the way forward.

INPUT REQUEST #4: ASSUMPTIONS

Please review the Assumption Statements and provide your responses in writing below. Please refer to the Assumption Statement numbers when appropriate.

Which assumptions require more clarification for you to understand? Do you strongly disagree with any of these assumptions? What assumptions, if any, would you add to the list?

1. The multidimensional nature of poverty, social inclusion and equity requires holistic approaches to the development of interventions and to the subsequent assessment of impacts. It is our contention that agricultural and natural resources research can contribute to more positive outcomes if we improve our understanding of how change comes about and who benefits from it.	
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Assumption 1, I am assuming “positive outcomes” takes a social welfare perspective. Reading further along, I think the Initial Proposition statement 7.1.8, which qualified “positive change” as those that relate to “public goods concerning social inclusion, equity, poverty reduction, confirms this.
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I suggest that assumption 1 be broken into two, i.e., each sentence becomes an independent assumption.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to point 1 – should include the research/development community in there i.e. are we prepared to hear the lessons and act on them especially if they are uncomfortable for us?
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (#1) As I mentioned earlier, improving our understanding of change processes is just a beginning, but an assumption statement like this more beyond this. We understand how smoking harms us but quitting the habit needs a lot more effort and commitment.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree with the assumption (#1) that “holistic solutions” are always required for achieving impact. Understanding of the broader context is necessary for <i>assessing</i> impact, but innovations do not need to address all problems simultaneously to be adoptable and beneficial.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to statement 1, another dimension might be that ag and natural resource mgmt research can contribute to reduction of certain types of poverty in specific situations, but may not be effective in intervening in other types of poverty. So we need to understand not only the nature of change, but also the nature of poverty.
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an implicit assumption in 1 that change is coming out of projects, collaborations etc from the formal science establishment. This is not necessarily the case. A greater need for openness to change from other environments outside the access of formal establishments could be sources of learning. This also relates to ideas about change. What is preventing change? Usually it is assumed it is funding and increased funding would do the magic trick.

<p>2. Within this Dialogue and Workshop, we are assuming that we can achieve useful clarity and alignment among the participants on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the use of empirically based methods for creating theory and practice in different academic disciplines, and the use of relevant qualitative and quantitative tools by different disciplines; b. the special concern for the production and use of public goods relating to poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity of the rural poor. 	
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2.b is not clear
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I do not think that assumption 2, shall be an assumption. Since the workshop participants are your target group, if you intend for us to have clarity and alignment on bullets a) and b), it would be necessary to have products at the workshop which will lead us to that. In that case our clarity would be an outcome from the workshop.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. 2a. Nothing wrong with the assumption per se but (as per earlier comments) do we have sufficient representation at the workshop from other disciplines? ▪ No. 2b. This requires more clarification for me to understand.
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2b.poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity in rural and urban poor. There is quite a bit of agricultural activities and natural resource exploitation going on in urban areas and CG centers such as Urban Harvest of CIP,, CIAT, ICRAF, IWMI, ILRI have been researching on.
<p>3. A preparedness of participants for the Dialogue and Workshop to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. listen and learn and potentially change their behavior; b. provide empirical evidence (qualitative or quantitative) that supports any statements concerning the effectiveness (and possible relevance to other situations) of any new (or old) tool, method or framework. 	
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assumption 3 needs more clarification
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In relation to 3 I would also include not only the individuals behaviour but be prepared to consider how their institution/agency/company they work with might also want to change its behaviour and what if anything they can do to help that.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (#3a) "listen and learn and change their behaviour" This is a bit vague. As I mentioned earlier behavioural change is not a linear process.
<p>4. There is recognition that "assessing impact" of past planned research and other interventions requires a wide range of skills, methods, etc., from a wide range of disciplines and experiences.</p>	
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In assessing impact we should also assume that the scientists interests/objectives are not in conflict with the farmers needs/interests

5.	There will be a belief among Dialogue and Workshop participants concerned with agriculture and natural resources, that "opening up" the discourse to knowledgeable and skeptical "outsiders" increases the chances that R&D resources will not be wasted.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (#5) This is a key point and needs to be emphasized in the workshop. Opening up the discourse to knowledgeable and skeptical outsiders increases the change of better results. David Moss (2005) writes in the preface of his highly objected book "Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Police and Practice" (Pluto Press) writes: "My colleagues and critics may or may not be satisfied with these explanations, but I am indebted to them for their objections. Indeed objection is crucial, and to my mind has three-fold significance: first, as research method, second concerning research relationships and, third, as project practice."(p.xi) ▪ Many of us still hesitate to listen to alternative perspectives or critical analysis of our habits, practices, behaviour and relationships. We ask comments on our work but when we receive critical comments, it frightens us if we are losing credibility of our scholarly practices.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. 5. And may also win over some of these skeptics!
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assumption # 5 not very clear otherwise I agree with the rest of the assumptions.
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I like point 5.
34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assumption 5 needs more clarification

Assumptions – General Comments

4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Don't disagree with any, agree with all, for now, can't think of any essentials to add
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although already implied, I would suggest making an explicit assumption that the workshop can take "impact" as a useful starting point for discussion, but at the same time it opens up to diverse (and perhaps radical) views -- which may even lead to rejecting the very notion of "impact" itself.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What does the 'we' and 'our' refer to? ▪ The purpose of the assumptions is not clear to me. Therefore I am unable to know which I would want to add.
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ During the International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) we found the following assumptions to lead to great controversy, also among the scientists: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agriculture is multi-functional in that it produces not only commodities but increasingly also the ecological services on which we depend; 2. Agricultural research is not only about technology, but also about institutional change;

Assumptions – General Comments	
	<p>3. Genomics is not the (only or most promising) answer to poverty;</p> <p>4. Markets and trade are key concerns for reaching development and sustainability goals and have to be part of any consideration of S&T for reaching those goals;</p> <p>5. Relative advantage is not an economic truth on which to build global society: it leads to great inequity and unfair trade, and underpins sloping playing fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One comes away from the IAASTD experience feeling that new International Public Goods are slowly emerging (and replacing the old pervasive concern with wealth creation). But it is not all certain whether the entrenched interests in wealth creation can be brought around to support the new IPGs.
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add: Poverty, social inclusion and equity requires holistic approaches, for that we need to focus on the CGIAR poverty eradication target. To fulfill the CGIAR objectives we should understand the causes and how it can be eradicate.
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OK
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most of the assumptions are very clear and understandable. I have some reservation that “there are no shortages of good evaluation / impact assessment methods available from different fields” propositions 7.2 (theme 2: impact assessment and evaluation approaches in number 4.)“ In my understanding we have some problems in designing good impact evaluation /assessments for attributing the specific impact of poverty oriented research due to lack of availability of suitable counterfactuals. There is also a lack of suitable SMART indicators to measure changes for specific interventions of complex multi-stakeholder partnerships poverty oriented research projects.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assumptions seem relevant and fairly complete.
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assumptions are alright
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments – I agree.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In general I wonder if there are assumptions about agricultural research which we are making in relation to poverty. What kinds of research are needed to deal with poverty and what is the role of research by CGIAR in relation to that whole body of other research.
31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Listening to community: Monitoring and evaluation process must open up new opportunities through which people can make their voices heard. ▪ Participatory and inclusive: Approach and methodology used for assessing and learning from change should be participatory, inclusive, and in tune with the views and aspirations of those most directly affected.
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I suggest to add an assumption related to the multidimensional dimensions of the impacts require multidimensional methodological approaches.

Assumptions – General Comments	
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ To add: That CGIAR will put in place mechanisms to ensure that the NARS and other research institutions are committed to impact oriented research and adopt frameworks and approaches that serve the poor.
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The assumption statements seem to imply that change is always positive and desirable. In real sense, change can be negative and there are a lot of trade offs to change

INPUT REQUEST #5: INITIAL QUESTIONS TO STIMULATE THE DIALOGUE

Please review the Propositions presented in Section 7 and respond to any that particularly interest you. Please do not feel compelled to have to respond to all of them. Please provide your responses in writing below.

Which propositions or aspects of the propositions do you agree with?

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.1 – THEME 1 CASE STUDIES

24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (#7.1,1) Generally I agree with this statement but who are decision makers? Are they policy makers, managers or farmers
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1: 1. Agree
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1.1. there is an assumption that producers and users of knowledge are separate. But they can be one and the same in the case of farmer participatory research. There is some assumption in this proposition that needs unearthing.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1.1 But perhaps we need to be more 'imaginative' in defining better the actors that we should be 'collaborating' with in terms of problem definition.
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1.1 Research should not only be driven by problems but should also be opportunity oriented and should deal with the future and not just present immediate problems
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1.1 In 'Problem definition' it could be useful to specify that 'those who produce knowledge' include also the end users. I would emphasize 'working with' users rather than 'working for' them.
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1.1. There are cases in which the decision makers who area aimed to use the knowledge should be considered as part of those producing knowledge. Mostly in cases when applied research is relevant (e.g. when the research results are aimed to be used by the rural poor). In these cases dialogue and cooperation in defining the problem might not be enough to guarantee adoption and use, and a more interactive participatory approach of the rural poor may be needed, not just in identifying the problem but in implementing the research and evaluating its results. An approach like such could lead to more relevant results and a more effective level of adoption and use by the rural poor.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1 Proposition #1 My case illustrates an exception to this rule. The users of research may not be the decision makers themselves, but advocates who use research results as "ammunition". Thus, there may not be a need to involve decision makers directly
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Under 7.1, it is not helpful that Proposition 1 makes a distinction between two groups -- those who produce knowledge and those who use it for decision-making. To be consistent with the rest of the document (i.e. innovation systems framework), this proposition should instead

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.1 – THEME 1 CASE STUDIES	
	recognize that all players/actors play dual roles of knowledge production and utilization, in varying degrees.
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.2 While research management should take a project orientation, successful research in itself needs to go beyond a project orientation. It is the synergistic combination of different projects dealing with different issues that eventually lead to poverty reduction impacts
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree with all propositions. Some comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Prop 2</u>: I believe the “study the problem stage” can sometimes be bypassed by collaboration with the people who know the problem and context. They have the ability to filter out research ideas which do not fit in the local circumstances before the research process is started, and to propose ideas which fit better.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>7.1: 2</u>. Agree – and would add the importance of <i>flexible</i> approaches which can re-orientate in line with challenges emerging through the research process.
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.2 While this is generally true, there may need to be a place in a research portfolio for ‘blue sky research’ that does not have immediate application but which ultimately prove to be significant. The description also needs to acknowledge that sometimes research finds that something does NOT work –which is not usually the goal or target of the research.
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.2. There’s no doubt that “projects “are effective means to organize, budget and guide research initiatives. However, unless the research initiatives are effectively linked to broader long term processes in which social, institutional, organizational, and /or entrepreneurship processes are considered, effective and sustainable use of research results may not happened.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.2 disagree or possibly don’t understand.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.3. There is this assumption again about some research world disconnected from users. What is meant by ‘the research community’ and who is ‘the user community’? This needs specifying.
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.3 This is an important proposition.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>7.1: 3</u>. Agree, though I would suggest this way of working <i>effectively</i> in partnership across diverse organizations presents a massive challenge.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.4 agree – but gosh that could be worded more strongly. Knowledge is only a small bit of the change puzzle.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1 proposition #4: Are there really any research projects that do not recognize that research is just one piece of the puzzle?

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.1 – THEME 1 CASE STUDIES	
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1.4 There may be other aspects of a systems approach that would add value to conceptualizing research, including specific attention to boundaries and perspectives and to bi-directional causality.
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1. 3. I would like to mention that the champions should be able to challenge their institution's 'home' and cultural norms, rules and constraints for desired change.
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1. 4. I would like to add that plan research such that dissemination starts simultaneously with research do not wait till any final result to come.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1.4. Spot on.
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Under 7.1, Proposition 4 refers to "systems" approach without qualifying that there are divergent ways of systems thinking, and that oftentimes it is the traditional "hard systems view that hinders innovation.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1: 4. Agree
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Theme 1: Proposition 4, I do not agree with the methapora of research being one piece of the puzzle. It sounds to me as if a systems approach where a puzzle with pieces which only show how they interact once the puzzle is finished. I would rather use a methapora that says scientific research is one tire of a car which hopefully is going on the direction of contributing to better and more sustainable livelihoods.
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1.5 It is extremely important to develop and support an appropriate incentive system for evaluation – in particular not to focus solely on meeting targets and goals in a way that encourages data corruption, gaming and goal displacement.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1 - agree with: 5 (as long as we know what we mean by 'learning'), 6, 7, 9.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1.5. Spot on but institutions seldom fully support such learning orientation
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. 5 also needs not just a learning orientations but a more explicit adaptive management framework in which the learning can lead to change. Lots of talk about learning in many organizations but the managerial structures are too rigid to facilitate adaptive change – anything from procurement regulations through to the hierarchical organizational structures themselves
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1: 5 Agree, and would stress the importance of the 'reward and incentive' for 'risk-taking managers' component
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.1.6 I agree in broad lines but it is not simple to 'take measures to unend power inequities'. So I find it rather naïve and too tentative ('may' should become 'must'.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.1 – THEME 1 CASE STUDIES	
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1: 6 Agree
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1. 6. Flexibility is a key word that encourages individual researchers to be more innovative. It also helps adjusting to the need and change.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1: 7. Agree
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1 #7 Not only are asymmetries of power often hidden, there is often an unwillingness to even acknowledge that they exist. Indeed there may be a tacit agreement to ignore them by both the powerful (for fear of losing power) and the powerless (for fear of retribution). Another way of stating this would be to say that asymmetries of power may be so great that the powerful make it impossible for the less powerful to even consider addressing the issue for fear of retribution.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.7 speaks about the asymmetries in power between the researchers and the stakeholders. Another important asymmetry of power is between the researchers themselves: from senior researcher, to field technician, research assistant, student.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to No. 1 there is a strong requirement for user driven work to include a clear articulation around helping those (mentioned in no 7) that are the losers in asymmetrical power relations. It isn't enough for people to say that users should articulate their demands if you don't even know that this is possible in a given context.
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1. 7. Comment: Managers have a key role here to play.
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1. 8. Add: Reminding all these values on a regular basis is important. Capacity building is also important to develop individuals so that they can really do it with skill.
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.8 <u>Prop 8</u>: This would be the ideal context. Nevertheless, it is hard to combine this in the struggle and competition for data and publications.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1: 8. Agree – implies the importance of promoting and recognizing the 'soft-skills' needed for working effectively with the diverse range of 'people' in change processes.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to 8 – it is important to also accept that there are individuals who work in teams in different ways. Flexibility in team working rather than again a fixed commitment to a single team based approach is important.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.8 not sure I understand this one. It seems a bit of a mixed bag.
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.8 Add: Individuals who in addition to applying in depth skills in a certain discipline are also able to apply it and understand a wide scope of situations e.g. through constant ;learning and growing 'being versatile'

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.1 – THEME 1 CASE STUDIES	
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1.9 <u>Prop 9</u>: I agree with the statement, but still believe that although past research and lessons should not be copy-pasted, they should be looked at as a starting point to generate ideas and to avoid past mistakes. Literature about past projects has been mentioning lack of social inclusion, equity, etc. for many decades and still many researches do not seem to learn from it.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>7.1</u>: 9. Agree – lessons need to be specific enough to be practically useful, yet broad enough to be effectively applied across diverse environments/sectors.
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with 7.1.9 Broad Framework
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Theme 1: I agree with 1 and first sentence of 2 (I do not understand the second sentence). I agree with 3 and partially with proposition 4. I agree with 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with All propositions under 7.1 (linking research with action)
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propositions under 7.1: I agree with most of these. Nearly all use the phrase ‘successful research’. The criterion for ‘successful’ might not be shared by everybody. Some might believe research successful if it leads to a publication in ‘Nature’. Others might want to see proof that poverty has been reduced as a result of it. I believe this is going to be an important issue at the Workshop. For example, if ‘success’ includes some evidence of the research having led to innovation at the farm and/or policy level, this has a great many implications for methodology, the nature of research projects, funding, impact assessment, etc.
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with 7.1.4; 7.1.5; 7.1.6; 7.2.7.
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1 OK, No comments.
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propositions under 7.1 need to include not just linking knowledge to action but to impact as well
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linking knowledge with action is the cornerstone of impact monitoring and evaluation. This also forms the basis of applied research. The wording of the research management need to be revisited. “successful research generally adopts a “project” orientation and organization.” Does this imply programmatic research is not successful? In my view, the opposite is the case – that research management linked to long-term programs are more likely to be successful than short-term projects. The programmatic approach is reflected in the other characteristics listed – such as #6 & 3 and therefore conflicts with this statement.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In general, many of the postulates under 7.1 need substantiation by empirical analysis.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.1 – THEME 1 CASE STUDIES

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 30. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The section on linking research with action is missing a dimension on effectiveness of research. How do we know that we have used our research budget in the most effective way? What was the ex ante analysis? Is research in one area more useful than research in another area? A positive impact is better than a negative impact, but how do we know if another approach might have yielded even more positive impact.▪ I think we might develop a proposition on how propitious is the context for change and larger impact. This is important in power asymmetries. Only work where asymmetries are lower and change is already beginning. Work where problem is big enough and generalized enough that lessons can be applied from one place to another. This might be a proposition about our ability to select sites for developing relevant pilot initiatives. Are the successful cases just lucky in their selection of site or did they know what they were doing? |
|-----|--|

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.2 – THEME 2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION APPROACHES	
11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Points of that I do not understand about 7.2.1. ...'the purpose and focus of the assessment should be different'. I assume that all the stakeholders in a project should be looking for similar more or less common outcomes and impacts. I do not understand how return to investment can be maximized with out improving the performance. Improving performance of the investment would necessarily mean working in favour of all the stakeholders, e.g. investors, implementers and beneficiaries. I do not quite understand why the purpose and the focus of the assessment should be different. I am neither clear nor convinced that merely use of different methods could address this issue.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2.1. Also need to clarify responsibilities of different actors in any assessment
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2 #1and #4: The two are strongly related
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I agree with all of the propositions Under 7.2 and 7.3 except 7.2.1
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2:1. Agree
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In relation to 2 – surely it is more than just the intended users i.e. often those who have paid for the assessment. Need to also include those who are more widely stakeholders in the assessment and the work being assessed?
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2.2 (it all depends on the purpose of the assessment)
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2:2. Strongly agree
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2.3. Good summary of the real challenge we face.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.2:3. Strongly agree – and this is a challenge to combine the necessarily qualitative/descriptive approaches of understanding processes with the necessary quantitative approaches needed to assess returns on investment.
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2 #1and #4: The two are strongly related
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2.4. I am not convinced by this. I don't think that there are always an abundance of good evaluation and impact assessment methods. In some case they may be available but just too expensive and un-wieldy to use. In other cases they may not exist at all.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2:4. Agree
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.2 statement 4 makes it sound as though there are not methodological constraints to IA, only "communication" constraints. This is not the case, as we simply do not have good methods for attributing the poverty effects of upstream research.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.2 – THEME 2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION APPROACHES	
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.4. I disagree. I think there are not enough participatory impact assessment tools/methods available in the international agricultural research system. It is possible that CG does it in partnership with available in-country resources.
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2 N° 4. I could be important to mentioned “Triangulation of evidences with actors”
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.4 It would be useful to distinguish between different types of assessment methods – some are good at identifying different impacts that are valued, some are good at getting evidence of these impacts, some are good at analyzing causal contribution. While there are many different methods, sometimes people use a method that does one of these tasks well and do not realize they have not adequately addressed the other tasks.
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.5 The process of planning for use is also an iterative one, where users’ understanding of their needs will also evolve over time.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to 5 – agree with this but there is a missing element i.e. the quality of the evidence itself and how this can made clearer. There are lessons from the health sector here in relation to making estimates of the quality of the evidence e.g. probably causal link, limited suggestive evidence of a link etc. This would help in relation to policy influencing relationships when often major policy changes are advocated on the basis of limited evidence that is ‘over-egged’.
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2 N° 5 Use <u>and communication</u> of results. Communication as a way to learn with different stakeholders.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2:5 Agree
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.6 don’t understand
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2:6. Agree
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2 #6: I could add that unequal power dynamics often lead to inefficient use of the results of impact assessment.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On theme 2: Proposition 6 unclear... Besides that who may need to take the measures to address power imbalances?
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2 #6 This is related to 7.1 #7 The tension may be between at least three parties, not just two – the assessors/evaluators, the implementers and the funder of the evaluation (and the funder of the R&D work if different). Funders of evaluations may scope the evaluation in such a way as to curb its ability to illuminate areas that the funder would prefer to be kept obscure.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.2 – THEME 2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION APPROACHES	
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.7 There are several issues to do with attribution combined in this proposition and they could be usefully unbundled. Causal analyses that use simple before and after or with and without comparisons are vulnerable to several threats to validity which might be addressed through research design or through systematic search for evidence that supports alternative explanations (Mayne’s contribution analysis). It would be useful to identify two different ways in which causal contribution would be more useful than causal attribution – where the intervention is not sufficient to produce the outcome without the contribution of favourable contexts or other interventions, and where the efforts of one agency are only effective in combination with the efforts of a partner organization.
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.7 Attribution issues. Attribution is always a tricky issue in impact assessment efforts. Research designs can focus on before–after, or with–without intervention comparisons, for example, in an effort to measure impacts and attribute them to particular investments or efforts of a particular organization or group. However, attributing impacts in multi partner contexts can actually be detrimental to partnerships. It may be more important to be able to measure and document diverse outcomes and impacts than to attempt to “parcel out” attributions to any particular organizations or investments.
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.7 Attribution issues need more clarifications. As it is I will disagree mainly when the word “detrimental to partnership” is used.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2:7. Agree – and there is a disconnect between the pressure from some funders to work in broad partnerships, and the pressure from the same funders to demonstrate attribution.
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.7 The attribution issues are even more complex than described here, and tend to get a great deal of attention, especially when talking with donors. On the one hand, the “bigger” the scale of the impact (bigger geographical areas, more people, or more impact on livelihoods, especially those dealing with the intangible capitals), the harder it is to pin down any attribution, even slight cases for attribution. On the other hand, if all you can “prove” are very limited and immediate outcomes- how useful is this project, method, innovation, or other? How “fundable” is it? I would be very happy with ideas about how others deal with this issue.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2 statement 7: While partitioning of credit among partners may not always be a productive exercise, the assessment of impact requires the attribution of causality at some level.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On theme 2: Proposition 7 Nowadays it is accepted that we cannot talk about “attribution” but only about “contribution”
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.7 Attribution issues. “Research designs” there is a confusion, impact assessment or evaluation are a type of research, but they have different objectives and uses. I firmly agree with this point.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.2 – THEME 2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION APPROACHES	
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2 #7: I would say maybe, but “parceling out” attribution may also present an opportunity to better understand the sources of success or failure, or even generate an understanding of the value of collaborations.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2.7. I agree but then we are pressured by peers and donors to demonstrate some degree of attribution linked to a particular organization. So are between a rock and a hard place!
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.2.12: Involvement of intended users in the assessment process. This is a bit tricky, though we strive to do this. This assumes that we have taken steps to define how an innovation will be put to use, and thus define – more or less – a user group or population. However, as “intended users” interact with their communities and social networks, adaptation and innovation takes place beyond the “site”. There can be un-anticipated groups of users – whose characteristics and behaviors vary considerably from what has been anticipated. Thus, an inflexible/“insensitive” impact assessment strategy may misreport impact, as well as the innovation process. Maybe an evolving assessment process that makes adjustments for who’s in as well as who’s out, at what points during the process?
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree with all propositions included in 7.2. and those in 7.3.
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.2 While external evaluations and impact assessments are useful, internal monitoring and evaluation systems are critical for organizational learning and change
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On section 7.2, I have some concerns with the conclusion of the attribution: “it may be more important to be able to measure and document diverse outcomes and impacts than to attempt to “parcel out” attribution to any particular organizations or investments.” I fully agree with the complexity of attribution on social sciences but this does not mean that we should run away from attribution. If we can’t attribute impacts to (actions aka interventions) then this really defeats the purpose of impact assessment. In my view, which is also reflected in other sections is to use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, which complement rather than compete. Such combination improves attribution
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact assessment methods and approaches have focused too much on the “post-mortem” that is the impacts of past actions. There is need to pay more attention to guiding plans to make actions to have greater impacts. This means assessing the potential impacts before the actions. How can this be done? Impact assessment using quantitative methods are increasingly becoming too “experimental.” In many projects or programs using demand-driven and/or participatory approaches the “experimental” approaches that require randomization become irrelevant. This workshop needs to devote some time to address this problem.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Theme 2: I agree with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with most proposition under 7.2: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.2 – THEME 2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION APPROACHES	
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with 7.2: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 7.2, I fully support the propositions emphasizing the uses and users of assessment/evaluation (1,2,5).
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Propositions under 7.2: I gladly leave these to Irene Guijt. The criterion for ‘successful research’ is implicit in most of these points. In CoS we have used different criteria: (1) research produces something that ‘works’, i.e. the experimental intervention leads to some (desirable) change, usually in plants, animals, soils, etc., but that could also be in institutions; (2) research produces something that works AND that is appropriate to the conditions of the intended beneficiaries, be they climate, ecology, opportunity structures; (3) research produces something that works AND that is appropriate, AND that intended beneficiaries actually can and want to use, given their resources, labour, and preferences. One could add: (4) Research produces something that can be replicated, scaled out or scaled up. For (1), you can get away with station research, for (2) you need local testing and for (3) you need interactive research methods with intended beneficiaries.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For 7.2, in an accountability context, direct user (i.e. donor) involvement in IA planning may not appropriate.
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would the assessment of outcomes include an elaboration of patterns of interactions and transformation linking between the ‘before’ and ‘after’ scenarios? Which is the essential contribution of innovation research.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the section on evaluation and impact assessment, I think we are not giving enough attention to the ex ante component or priority setting. I think we might also make greater mention of when to do impact assessment, outcome evaluation and monitoring of effectiveness of project activities or other approaches to learning. Probably we are weakest in pre-project learning about poverty and poverty reduction.
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In section 7.2 there could be more attention to ‘in-itinere assessments’ (not only ex-ante and ex-post). If we focus on change, the process of change is as (if not more) important as the final results. In-itinere assessments can also increase the self-reflective dimension of research and adjust it to better achieve the final goals before its completion.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.2 – agree with 1 (with a caveat of ongoing refining of purpose as this is not static), 3, 4, 5 (with the caveat that there is a limit to the extent that information can influence policy decisions as this is also a matter of personality, chance/luck, who is considered part of the in-crowd, timing, etc), 7

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.2 – THEME 2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION APPROACHES	
16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unsurprisingly, we agree with all statements 7.2 – 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. All but 6 coincide in substance with those in http://www.cimmyt.org/english/docs/manual/ia/p2.htm#fig4 , from <i>La Rovere, R. and Dixon, J. 2007. Operational guidelines for assessing impact of agricultural research on livelihoods. Good practices from CIMMYT. Working Document, Version 2007.1.0. CIMMYT, Mexico, D.F.</i> ▪ These in fact were developed through a process of institutionalizing IA at CIMMYT and developing guidelines, to which also ILAC participated and contributed. The only statement that we do not include is 6. on Power. Yet we recognize, and the last years of field experience have proven that, that this matter is important and influences the results of an IA much more than methods chosen or other aspects. In addition, we suggest the Challenge Paper team to look at the above link and see if in our document you find as useful, to be added to your statements, other statements from our Figure 4 flow chart.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.3 – THEME 3 INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF NEW APPROACHES	
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposition 7.3 1, Our experience from working with communities indicates that patience is required to build and sustain trust owing to past experiences communities had had with researchers – frequent feed backs are important , non prescriptive approaches to new or tested ways of doing things elevate levels of trust and participation by teams with different educational, socio cultural backgrounds etc, ▪ This could lead to ownership of results or outcomes of research and mutual trust and enduring partnerships could be realize.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.3.1 who are these individuals that need changing? Everyone in the knowledge nexus? We need to go much further in understanding disincentives, eg cultural aspects that frown on ‘embracing error’, constant retrenching of government staff, lack of regular/high enough salaries, etc.
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.3.1. I strongly agree with the point and want to flag ‘Facilitation’ as the key role that needs to be strongly built in the system which is not often a case.
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.3.1. Spot on.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On Theme 3: I agree with 1,
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.3:1. Agree
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On theme 3: Proposition 2 unclear
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.3.2. Organizational accountability for instance through a governance structure such as a committee or gender advisory group, and political will e.g. through financial support and support by management are important recipes for realizing organizational changes.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.3. 2. Agree
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.3.2. Organizations need to create environment for the champions to emerge and nurture them. Creating organizational memory to capture best practices is also important.
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7.3. 3. Agree – and working at policy level presents particular challenges, both in terms of (i) research actors crossing boundaries towards ‘influencing’ or even ‘advocacy’ (highlighting the need for innovative partnerships with civil society partners in particular) and (ii) assessing the process of change, and influence of research on this process, given often highly complex policy-making processes, and long time-scales between policy-influence and actual positive livelihood changes.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On theme 3: Proposition 3 unclear

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.3 – THEME 3 INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF NEW APPROACHES	
25,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.3.3. I feel that often as researchers we under-estimate what we can do vis-à-vis contributing to policy debates (see ODI's work on linking research and policy) and that we are partly to blame by thinking that our contribution is confined to producing a policy brief or something at the end of the project when actually we can do so much more. So yes we do need to come up with strategies but they may not be that complex or taxing!
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.3.3. and 4 Agreed, but would add that a new sort of communication needs to exist between policy makers or influencers and researchers. More research on how policy makers and lobbyists work and how to take advantage of their work is needed, but the issue is that this research has to be done very locally- it is hard to talk about IPGs in this context.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...About proposition 4, what changes are needed?
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>7.3.</u> 4. Agree
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with all proposition under 7.3 (changes in institution and behavior)
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.3 – generally agree with all of these but they are also a bit weak I find. Nothing new under the sun here. Who could disagree with these?
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propositions under 7.3: These raise very challenging issues. If I were to add some ideas, I would focus on a few points. In the first place, in many cases research might not be seen as the initiating actor, but as responding to opportunities for making a contribution to reaching development and sustainability goals. This implies that research is conceived, not as the maverick growth point of human knowledge, but as a non-profit marketing agent that has to live by proof of impact with respect to those goals. This might be controversial. In the second place, I believe these propositions are not radical enough in addressing the higher level policy and institutional conditions that define space for innovation in terms of marketing opportunities, greater social justice, reduced slope of the playing field, increased access to inputs and credit, etc. During our CoS research in Benin and Ghana, which started out with the intention of developing technologies with and for small African subsistence farmers, we really ran into the very limited room for maneuver these farmers have. Our students helped farmers to produce some surpluses: it turned out they could not sell them at a reasonable price. Cheap imports preempt the development of African smallholder agriculture in such areas as rice, coffee, chicken, and so forth. Cheap commodities depress prices of substitute subsistence staples. In those conditions agricultural research can only make a VERY MARGINAL contribution. Therefore, the assumption that agricultural research can actually do something about poverty reduction both in terms of farmers' incomes or in terms of improving their environments is a huge one in itself and requires careful examination.
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree with all propositions included in 7.2. and those in 7.3.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.3 – THEME 3 INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF NEW APPROACHES	
15.	<p>As of 7.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I have a problem in seeing/commenting on them as prepositions for purely research Projects. Research projects entailing sustainable poverty reduction, equity and social inclusion are best designed, in my opinion, as components embedded in Development Projects. Projects which are frankly-research oriented and with out a built-in Development component are unlikely to get the host country support (partnership) which is crucial for understanding the Knowledge to Action paradigm. ▪ For example a research project in a Developing country drawn in the frame of innovations systems research may be trying to develop principles for improved innovation capacity of the 'System' in terms of improved linkages and knowledge flows. The 'change' sought (improved innovation capacity) can be only understood in the light of existing actors-linkages-scenarios which, in turn, are evolved(well or ill) in the process of Development, more correctly in the process of executing poverty programs and projects. Hence the need for explicit links with development stream of actions. ▪ I appreciate that these prepositions are 'public goods' and they transcend the specific institutional /policy contexts. But public goods were in the first instance local/national goods. So research projects in the first instance need to be embedded in the social institutional context. I am making this point because, more often than not, in Project meetings we hear comments like: 'look, ours is a research Project, not a development project, we are not interested in implementation....'. This is perhaps not well taken. The 'attribution gap' could be a problem. ▪ Given this I consider preposition 6, continuity and flexibility taken along with preposition 5 (learning orientation) are more important than others in Indian or south Asian contexts. ▪ Preposition 9 (broad framework) may have an element of what I have mentioned above. But the way the preposition was phrased, I do not know if the focus is on having a broader framework or a frame work that is sensitive to the historical, political and cultural contexts.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statements under 7.3 tend to mix reference to the practices of researchers, external audiences and evaluators in a somewhat unclear manner.
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Probably in 7.3 there should be greater discussions on rewards and incentive systems that need radical change if there should be greater emphasis on poverty reduction. Current ones do not recognize team work, coalitions, joint work etc sufficiently and in many cases are biased against it. ▪ In knowledge sharing practice there needs to be more discussion on the ethics of research where the people providing knowledge (tacit or otherwise) are rarely informed on how the knowledge is packaged in other contexts. There should be a right to information by every farmer, civil society, government official who is involved in helping the researcher in some way or the other even if there are disagreements.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS 7.3 – THEME 3 INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF NEW APPROACHES	
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propositions under 7.3: All refer to “changes”. Would it be possible that some aspect/s of the status quo in some specific cases/contexts may actually be good to maintain, and even promote?
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.3 – I miss something on who ‘owns’ the knowledge, both in a legal sense (IPRs) and also in terms of a more lived sense of ownership.
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With regard to 7.3: the preposition Changes in Policy practice is an important one. Is this not the place to focus on political institutions/priorities /processes? The politicized part of policy practice is usually addressed less explicitly in research. There is an urgent need to understand how political interests match with sustainable poverty reduction, equity and social inclusion. More correctly, how to make sustainable poverty reduction, equity and social inclusion politically more attractive to the elected representatives.
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There’s the assumption that individuals and organizations are prepared and know how to put in place the propositions proposed for this workshop, as well as those included implicitly or explicitly in different assessment approaches and methods. Little attention is posed on what’s needed at the individual and organizational level to bring propositions to practice (e.g. how to effectively balance interest when defining the assessment purposes, implementation, analysis and sense making of the emerging information; how to effectively involve users to guarantee relevance of the assessment and use; how to deal with limited capacity, resources, and cultural aspects, etc.). These aspects are somehow considered in 7.3 propositions, however, sometimes the level of investment , time and effort needed to create an appropriate environment and the individual conditions to put effective assessment systems in place is underestimated.
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.3 should include a proposition on research priority setting, such as something along the lines of: “To ensure that research is most effectively targeted to support sustainable poverty alleviation, research choices should be based on systematic and transparent analysis of the impact potential of research alternatives. To embed learning, assumptions embedded in such analysis should draw on the findings of ex post evaluation, and should provide a basis for subsequent monitoring and evaluation of project progress and mid course corrections.”
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the section on organizational mgmt, we need more direct reference to poverty reduction in the organizational agenda. Is poverty reduction a justification for business as usual or are there effective mechanisms for priority setting and to build capacity in the area of research and development targeted to poverty reduction.
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aspects missing in preposition 1 in section 7.3. Changes in the attitudes of users (poor farmers) to appreciate new innovations and participate fully in development efforts. Some farmers seem to be contented with their poor status (resist change) and view development efforts as foreign.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS – GENERAL COMMENTS	
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree with all
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I agree with all assumptions.
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I agree with most of them but I have some additional points that are mentioned below.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Generally agree but with the concerns below.
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree with: Problem definition, program organization, learning orientation, continuity and flexibility, purpose and focus of the assessment, impacts assessed, evaluation/assessment methods, use of assessment results, attribution issues, changes in policy practice, changes in knowledge-sharing practice
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are we talking about propositions or assumptions?
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree with all
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are many good elements in many of the statements. The propositions generally give useful attention to the need to understand the context for the adoption of research products, the need to have management mechanisms that align research activities with insights from evaluation, the need to carefully think through dissemination mechanisms, and general issues concerning “demand driven” research and evaluation practice.
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The statements are complete, but the question may be about how specific they are in leading us forward.
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I wonder if the order could be reworked perhaps starting with asymmetries of power and broad framework, systems approach etc and then problem definition, organization etc. ▪ This would help placing the problem definition better. ▪ I agree with all statements but feel they need to be ordered differently. ▪ For example problem definition needs to be mediated by discussions on power asymmetries etc so that the problem definition includes the possibility of reworking the axioms of research. What researchers should work on and how needs more deliberate dialogue and informed discussions on knowledge.
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I agree with all
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree with all.
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree with all.

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS – GENERAL COMMENTS	
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Additional Proposition: Successful research requires the collaboration of a chain of people in different hierarchical positions within the research team. Lower levels have a larger contact to the field and the stakeholders, which allows to direct projects towards local needs and identify problems early. Upper levels have more experience and publishing power, but little or no time to know or understand their stakeholders. The equal collaboration and decision making of different levels of hierarchies within research teams allows avoiding failure.
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The set of propositions under 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 are well-spelt out
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree with most except that successful research usually adopts a “project orientation”. Projects only last 3 years or so. Achieving impact takes much longer. Continually setting up new projects and partnerships makes it very difficult to keep a piece of work going long enough with the same partners to make a difference. Research is most effective when it is linked to reality and partners who want and make use of research results, over time.
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though current challenge is making availability of suitable methods for specific context of impact assessments, I feel that some revision in the assumption in 7.4 number 4 should be made. There is still inadequacy of good evaluation / impact assessment methods available from different fields. For example in the past most poverty impact assessment studies used mainly income and consumption as the main indicators for measure income poverty. They have not used methods to disaggregate poverty by social groups. Further work is needed to develop, discuss and agree on the good evaluation / impact assessments methods for complex partnership research projects. I feel that this Pre-Dialogue and Workshop to be held on March 26-28 will provide some learning and understanding about this as well as develop plan to move forward in the future.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although I have agreed with most of the propositions and they sound valid to me, I remain with a feeling of who could implement all this? What type of profile is needed for the person(s) who could take care that the issues on the propositions are met...Or do they remain good wishes? What are the basic requirements under which the propositions have a chance to exist? For example on Theme 7.1 successful research has following characteristics....Do you have best practices that meet those characteristics? How did they do it? Is it possible/ What can we learn of their path to be best practices?
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the aspect of gender equality purposefully not mentioned in the propositions (or only laterally as a component of social inclusion)?
8.	<p>Here are some more that might be interesting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mainstream assessment (M&E) protocols that guide most development initiatives, including research efforts, do not recognise that working in ‘messy partnerships’ on institutional transformation requires a fundamentally different conceptualisation and practice. Given the dependence of learning on diverse forms of monitoring, there is a fundamental disconnect between the rhetoric about the need for learning in development and the reality of

INITIAL PROPOSITIONS – GENERAL COMMENTS	
	<p>the M&E procedures that funding agencies require.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Those engaged in decision-making and policy formulation increasingly face situations where assumptions about the way the world works, such as about cause-effect, rational choice and intentional actions, are not valid, yet their tools and procedures assume these assumptions hold true (after Kurtz and Snowden 2003). ▪ Surprise is essential to expand the boundaries of understanding (after Lee1999), yet our research processes and assessment systems are focused on confirming preconceived ideas.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A proposition should be included that addresses the ideologies of stakeholders and in particular ideologies that may not be made explicit but which make discourse either impossible because of the entrenched positions or that instead of encouraging dialogue result in sequential monologues because the different ideologies exclude the possibility of a common language.
31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasis on the ‘Rights Based Approach’ is missing in this! : Viewing the programmes from a rights perspective will help participants to better analyze the process in identifying/measuring impact.
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multidimensional approaches is needed (Integration of the studies – economic, environmental, social, etc.) ▪ Clear institutionalization of the IA studies within the organizations
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action research and participatory methods also need some discussion. There has been valid criticism of the approaches becoming too action oriented. An example is the Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Program research approach – integrated agricultural research for development (IAR4D) – which was criticized by the CGIAR science for being too action oriented and involving too many “cooks in the kitchen.” What should be the balance between action and research and the right blend of development partners?
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes in putting more emphasis in the development of a basket of options

INPUT REQUEST #6: NEXT STEPS

Do you have any questions about the Next Steps or are there any other comments you would like to add? Please provide your responses below.

4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thanks- it will be my first in one of these (formal) pre-workshop dialogues. At least the idea and this feedback form felt very participatory- always grateful for this!! ▪ Reading the challenge paper was an interesting experience all on its own- a good summary of the recent orientation in impact evaluation. Many thanks for the chance. ☺
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I hope there will be a step to discuss “disagree” issues
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As requested I have made some initial comments on the challenge paper which are attached. I have also attached the document produced for the meeting of NONIE (Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation) which sets out some ideas about the different aspects of impact evaluation that need to be adequately addressed and the contribution that systems approaches might make - particularly when evaluating the impact of complex and complicated interventions. ▪ I largely support the propositions outlined but have some suggestions about how they might be usefully expanded upon. ▪ One issue that seems to be missing is the notion of identifying whether it is most useful to consider the aspects of an intervention as simple, complex or complicated - and what this might mean for impact evaluation. ▪ I will have more developed responses to you by Feb 22.
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can you build in active moments in which dissent is encouraged (and facilitated)? Eg based on the Cynefin framework approach for dealing with complexity?
11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In order to target impacts and benefit the poorest of the poor we probably need to have more forward looking approach. Our time, energy and wisdom should be focused on identifying appropriate partners for technology generation, verification through to implementation and creating impacts. Unless we have right partners and right approaches in place for the implementation of the projects, we can not expect great impacts. Therefore to improve the overall impacts in agriculture and natural resources management research, I feel following issues would be very crucial. ▪ <u>Re-defining partnership</u>: It is obvious that poorest of the poor live in remote, marginal and difficult areas. If any agency or programme is interested to create impacts on the lives of disadvantaged communities, there should be a mechanism as to how to reach to them. Now, it is a time to review as to why the benefits of green revolution technologies have not reached to these rainfed, marginal and difficult environments. One should review the way technology transfer model works. In a typical CGIAR centre managed project their natural partners are the NARSs, which means the government research councils of the concerned countries. But the vital actors of the national system who are responsible for dissemination and scaling out are mostly missing. For example even governments Department of Agriculture are also not

	<p>properly represented in such projects. As a ritual, some of them may be included in the project but their roles and responsibilities are very limited. Therefore to make the project genuinely inclusive the definition of the National system in the context of CGIAR and other international organizations should be refined. The definition of NARS should include government extension agencies, NGOs and other private sector organizations working on agriculture and natural resources management research and development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is very important because most of the poorest of the poor people live in the remote, marginal and difficult areas, where presence of government research systems is very thin or non-existent. This is the reason why in most cases new technologies and innovations do not reach to such places. ▪ Another important point is that often the mandate of research systems is not to involve in any dissemination activities; their roles are limited just up to the field verification stage at the most. This reality strongly demands active involvement of government extension, NGOs and other private organisations in a project designed to create impacts. ▪ Projects particularly designed for scaling out and managed by CGIAR system that do not involve extension agencies (GO and NGO) again result in a failure. Not involving extension agencies in a scaling out projects would mean that it is again a top-down linear approach where basic assumption would be to work on technology transfer model rather than participatory. There is again a need for change in the mindsets in terms of involving extension agencies right from the beginning of the project so that they understand about the concept of the project, develop ownership, be accountable for what has been achieved and this approach can be more sustainable. ▪ Use of participatory approaches: increasingly participatory approaches are becoming accepted but there is a great difference the way these are interpreted and used. In most cases there have been re-labeling of old practices as 'participatory'. As every body loves the terminology 'participatory' no one dares to oppose this but there are very few individuals and organizations that genuinely use participatory approaches in a true sense. This terminology has been widely distorted and greatly misused. Most mis-use has been in the form of re-labeling of business as usual to attract funds from the donor communities. ▪ The short cut taken by many 'new' believers of this approach is to re-label their activities as participatory, e.g. Front Line Demonstration (FLD) being relabeled as Participatory Varietal Selection (PVS). However, one should know that former is a researcher designed and researcher managed trial meant to demonstrate that the recommended technology is best, whereas PVS in its true sense is a researcher designed but farmer implemented under farmer level of inputs and management and meant to identify best variety or technology to the local conditions with out any intervention by the researchers. There is no comparison between the two.
12.	<p>ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the final version of the Challenge Paper, indicate by underlining, the words that are defined in Annex 1. ▪ Avoid using both quote marks and italics to indicate stress. Use one or other and use sparingly.

14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I sometimes felt a bit hesitant. You have done a fantastic and hugely imaginative and insightful job in writing this challenge paper. But then I gladly complied with your request because I believe that this format with people making comments on a challenge paper really holds promise of the workshop leading to some advance in our collective thinking. I have recently participated in workshops with other formats that did not achieve this.
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will the workshop workbook be available PRIOR to the meeting in Columbia – even in draft? It would be good to be able to digest the material in advance and check references etc.
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The feed backs and comments collected from Pre-Dialogue Workshop should be shared and discussed to all the participants before the actual planning for the workshop discussion in Cali on March 26-28, 2008.
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There exists need to improve information available about trade-offs between poverty alleviation and natural resource conservation among the rural poor ▪ Reach out to bridge the gap between science and real problems ▪ Strengthen existing and new organizations to promote and internalize tested and new approaches to natural resources utilization and conservation. ▪ Put research language into information and knowledge that addresses community issues some are immediate others are long term- for example land use policies and involvement of the rural poor in policy formulation processes.
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (p.17) Definition of institution. This definition is not clear whether institutions different from organizations. If we don't see a clear distinction between these two, we tend to confuse ourselves. I passed through this struggle for several years, but now I am convinced that these are two different things (Please see Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance by Douglass North (2004) (Cambridge University Press). An organization is a social arrangement which provide a structure to human interaction in pursuit of collective goals, and institutions lubricate the flow of goods and services in the structure/system.
30.	<p>Observations about definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The definition of innovation does not seem to be adequate. It is not only organizations, but is also individual. I also think it is important that innovation refer to goods or services which generate additional economic or social value. Perhaps this is implicit in goods and services, but the emphasis on economic or social value is important. Innovation is not discovery or experimentation, but needs to have significant economic or social value attached to it. ▪ In the case of innovation system I don't like the word network, since the word network is used in other contexts and connotes certain things for many people. Better to say "set of" and it may also be better to say "implicated in the capacity to generate new products ... " In fact, I think innovation system is really a framework for analysis of the capacity of a set of individuals, organizations, enterprises etc to resolve problems and take advantage of opportunities related to the creation of new social or economic value.

31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Thanks for the work on Challenge Paper; the paper fairly captures the background and content.
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ I am a bit unclear about the changes on presentations for the dialogue. It is not clear if I have to now continue to prepare for a full fledged paper or presentation or not.
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ We need to form a blog to discuss the impact challenges. We will not have enough time in this workshop to discuss many aspects.▪ Further discussion on blending qualitative and quantitative methods need to be given more attention. If possible, a workshop on blending qualitative and quantitative methods needs to be held.
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The next steps should strongly build on lessons/gaps identified in previous initiatives rather than duplicating previous efforts.