

Challenge Paper 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

January 23, 2008

Contents

- 1. PURPOSE OF THE DIALOGUE 2
- 2. KEY CHALLENGE 3
- 3. WORKING DEFINITIONS 3
- 4. BACKGROUND STATEMENTS 4
- 5. DRAFT EXPECTED OUTCOMES 9
- 6. ASSUMPTION STATEMENTS 10
- 7. INITIAL PROPOSITIONS TO STIMULATE THE DIALOGUE 11
 - 7.1 SOME PROPOSITIONS REGARDING LINKING RESEARCH WITH ACTION FOR SUSTAINABLE POVERTY REDUCTION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION [THEME 1: CASE STUDIES WITH LESSONS LEARNED] 11
 - 7.2 SOME PROPOSITIONS REGARDING EVALUATION AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT [THEME 2: IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION APPROACHES] 13
 - 7.3 SOME PROPOSITIONS REGARDING CHANGES IN INSTITUTIONS AND BEHAVIORS FOR SUSTAINABLE POVERTY REDUCTION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION [THEME 3: INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF NEW APPROACHES] 14
- 8. NEXT STEPS IN THE DIALOGUE 15

- ANNEX 1. DEFINITIONS OF SOME WORDS USED IN THIS CHALLENGE PAPER..... 16
- ANNEX 2: REFERENCES 20

1. Purpose of the Dialogue

The *Collaborative Planning Team* for the Cali Workshop would like to catalyze and innovate with an informal network of researchers to learn and develop from different approaches for understanding, achieving and measuring a diverse range of impacts of research aimed at sustainable poverty reduction and social inclusion. To accomplish this, the Team wishes to engage the workshop participants in a focused and structured pre-workshop Dialogue about the workshop topic – *Rethinking Impact: Understanding the complexity of poverty and change*. The feedback received will help the Team design and orient the workshop to achieve its objectives of increasing understanding of 1) how research can contribute to action in terms of alleviating poverty, and fostering social inclusion and equity; 2) how impacts of such research can be best evaluated; and 3) how institutions and individuals can be changed to support different ways of conducting and assessing research on poverty alleviation, social inclusion and equity. Your perspectives on these topics are essential to helping us organize the workshop around the issues that are most relevant to the participants themselves.

The Team is adapting the *Challenge Dialogue System™ (CDS)* — a flexible but disciplined process for engaging diverse stakeholders to collaborate and innovate in accomplishing complex tasks — to help structure these conversations so that participants can respond to some initial ideas advanced by the Team and bring forward new ideas, questions and action-options of their own.

In light of the short timeframe, the process will comprise four steps: (1) initial scoping of the Dialogue and Workshop by the Collaborative Planning Team; (2) the development of this *Challenge Paper* by the Team and its distribution to the workshop participants and other key colleagues and stakeholders; (3) preparation and sharing of interim highlights from the responses; and (4) more complete analysis and synthesis of the responses, which will then be used to design the Workshop (agenda, flow, process) and build and inform the *Workshop Workbook* to guide and inform the workshop process.

In this Challenge Paper, we ask for your reactions and feedback and request that you answer particular questions and respond to ideas. To assist with efficient compilation of responses, please use the **Feedback Form** (which is in MS Word format) — *please e-mail the document to kjones@innovationexpedition.com by February 22, 2008.*

This Challenge Paper aims to provoke discussion and comments and that will help lead us to viable, effective ways forward. It is not intended therefore as a comprehensive or academically authoritative document. Rather, it is a working document; no assumption is set in stone and every assertion is open for discussion. We are looking for comments that will catalyze an open and productive conversation. We are seeking reactions from you that will further our current thinking, offer new understanding and insights, and will lead to some concrete collective action by this group of people as well as personal individual change.

We want to understand what you think are the most important issues and opportunities for the workshop to address. To accomplish this we need your feedback on material presented in this Challenge Paper. We are particularly interested in comments on section 7, “Initial Propositions to Stimulate the Dialogue.” Feel free to respond to just a few of our questions with notes, bullet points, or new issues. **We will keep your feedback confidential and no comment will be attributed to any specific participant in this Dialogue.** Please take a moment to note the next steps in the process in section 8.

2. Key Challenge

The Key Challenge for the Dialogue and Workshop advanced by the Collaborative Planning Team for your consideration is:

- **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.**

INPUT REQUEST #1: KEY CHALLENGE STATEMENT

Please review the Key Challenge and provide your responses in writing on the accompanying Feedback Form.

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

3. Working Definitions

We all operate in an environment where the words we use often affect how successful we are at communicating with one another. Yet, words often mean different things to different people and words evolve in their meaning. While there is no simple solution to this reality, the Team has advanced some working definitions for a few important terms we use regularly in this Challenge Paper and undoubtedly in the workshop ahead. They are included in Annex 1 for your reference and include definitions for: assessments, boundary organizations, evaluation, ex anti, ex post, impact, impact assessment, innovation, innovation system, institutions, monitoring, outcome, poverty, producers, public goods, research, social exclusion, and users.

4. Background Statements

The Organizing Team provides the following points to help set some context for this Dialogue.

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. The agriculture sector has also increased in complexity so that research has to expand its horizon beyond traditional disciplinary areas. Agricultural research has had to take more multi- and inter-disciplinary approaches in order to embrace and understand this complexity.
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.
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.

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%.
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.

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.
8. 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 *Sustainable Livelihoods Framework* and *Sustainability Science Framework*, that provide a basis for conceptualizing and assessing poverty.
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.

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.
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.

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.
13. 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.
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.

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.
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.

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.
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.
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
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.

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.

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
- 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).

INPUT REQUEST #2: BACKGROUND STATEMENTS

Please review the Background Statements and provide your responses in writing on the accompanying Feedback Form. Please refer to the Background Statement numbers when appropriate.

In your view are there any Background Statements that need clarification?

Are there any that should be added?

Are there any that are not relevant?

5. Expected Outcomes

The Team has identified four outcomes expected from the Dialogue (which culminates at the Workshop):

- 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]**

In addition to this Challenge Paper and the Workshop Workbook, specific publications expected from the Dialogue and Workshop are a proceedings of workshop paper abstracts (available on-line and on CD-ROM), full papers available on the web-site, briefs for decision-makers, and participants list.

INPUT REQUEST #3: EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Please review the Expected Outcomes and provide your responses in writing on the accompanying Feedback Form.

What Outcomes do you expect from this Challenge Dialogue (as in..."I would consider this Dialogue and Workshop in Cali a success if...")?

6. Assumption Statements

Please note that the numbers for each assumption are just for reference and are not meant to indicate any ranking.

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.
2. Within this Dialogue and Workshop, we are assuming that we can achieve useful clarity and alignment among the participants on:
 - 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.
3. A preparedness of participants for the Dialogue and Workshop to:
 - 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.
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.
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.

INPUT REQUEST #4: ASSUMPTIONS

Please review the Assumption Statements and provide your responses in writing on the accompanying Feedback Form. 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?

Are there any assumptions that you would add to the list?

7. Initial Propositions to Stimulate the Dialogue

In this section, we present some propositions for the purpose of stimulating the Dialogue. They are organized by the Workshop's three themes as described in Background statement 22. While we are asking for your reaction to these ideas, we also invite you, in the spirit of the Dialogue, to offer your own thoughts and to raise any questions that you may have.

The set of propositions in section 7.1 advances some thoughts on the kinds of things that seem to help increase the probability that research will lead to actions that contribute to sustainable poverty reduction and social inclusion.

Section 7.2 presents a set of propositions regarding lessons learned on improving the use of assessments of planned interventions in decision-making and program improvement.

The third and final set of propositions in section 7.3 is concerned with behavioral and institutional changes that may be needed to be understood.

Annex 2 provides some useful references for the material presented in this section as well as other useful references for this Dialogue and Workshop in Cali.

7.1 *Some propositions regarding linking research with action for sustainable poverty reduction and social inclusion [Theme 1: Case studies with lessons learned]*

Successful research that effectively links knowledge with action has the following characteristics:

1. **Problem definition:** Successful research requires dialogue and cooperation between those who produce knowledge and the decision-makers who use it. It is especially important that the problem to be solved be defined in a collaborative, but ultimately user-driven, manner.
2. **Research management:** Successful research generally adopts a "project" orientation and organization, with dynamic leaders accountable for achieving user-driven goals and targets. They avoid the pitfall of letting "study of the problem" displace "creation of solutions" as the research goal.

3. **Program organization:** Successful research includes “boundary work or actions” committed to building bridges between the research community on the one hand and the user community on the other, and creating networks that allow interactions among the different users and producers. This boundary work often involves constructing new informal arenas, in which project managers can foster user–producer dialogues, joint product definition, and a systems approach free from distorting dominance by groups committed to the status quo. A key step is to define joint “rules of engagement” in the new arena that encourage mutual respect, co-creation and innovation that addresses complex problems, while recognizing that—in order to implement changes—each partner is answerable, and has to return, to their institutional “homes” and the cultural norms, rules, constraints, etc., that go along with them.
4. **Systems Approach:** Successful research takes a systems approach that recognizes scientific research is just one “piece of the puzzle”, and aims to identify and engage with key partners that can help turn co-created knowledge generated by the project/program into action (new strategies, policies, interventions, technologies) leading to better and more sustainable livelihoods.
5. **Learning orientation:** Successful research occurs in systems designed for learning rather than systems for knowing. Recognizing the difficulty of their task, such programs are frankly experimental—expecting and embracing failure in order to learn from it as quickly as possible. Success requires appropriate reward and incentive systems for risk-taking managers, funding mechanisms that enable such risk-taking, and periodic external evaluation.
6. **Continuity and flexibility:** Successful research develops strategies that focus on strengthening linkages and effective patterns of interaction between organizations and individuals operating in the locality where impact is sought. A key role of boundary-spanning work/organizations is the facilitation of processes that create strong networks and build innovation/response capacity of the system. Co-created communication strategies and boundary objects/products are key to the longevity and sustainability of project outcomes and impacts.
7. **Asymmetries of Power:** Successful research uses strategies to deal with the often large (and largely hidden) asymmetries of power felt by stakeholders.
8. **Characteristics of People:** Successful research requires individuals that believe in the power of teams and are innovators able to span boundaries between diverse parties. It also requires understanding of the behavior of individual actors who appear to have been effective in bringing about positive changes (positive as regards the public goods concerning social inclusion, equity, poverty reduction).
9. **Broad framework:** Lessons and generalizations for future research, and development interventions from past science and technology activities can be misleading or unhelpful unless they are analyzed in a framework that adequately conceptualizes past activities in their

historical, political, economic and cultural contexts. This especially relates to institutional innovation concerning social inclusion, equity, economic poverty reduction and development sustainability.

7.2 Some propositions regarding evaluation and impact assessment [Theme 2: Impact assessment and evaluation approaches]

1. **Purpose and focus of the assessment.** It is crucial to define and clarify the purpose and focus of the assessment, as different potential “users” frequently have very different concerns (e.g. investors may want to know the returns on their investments, while implementers want to improve performance), and different methods may be needed to respond to different questions.
2. **Involvement of intended users in the assessment process.** Ideally, the intended users of the assessment are included from the outset, helping to develop the overall approach.
3. **Impacts assessed.** Different approaches are needed to measure different types of impacts (e.g., economic, social, environmental), and impacts felt at different levels (e.g., household versus community levels). Thus, linking multiple approaches is as much of a challenge as refining existing approaches or developing new ones to fit the needs of specific assessments.
4. **Evaluation/assessment methods.** There is no shortage of good evaluation and impact assessment methods available from many different fields/sectors. Making this knowledge more easily accessible and useful to potential practitioners (e.g., what methods may be more appropriate under what circumstances) remains a challenge.
5. **Use of assessment results.** Optimal use of assessment results is strongly related to the assessment process and involvement of potential users in it. Good processes involve thinking carefully through the use issues (who, why, how, when and where) right from the beginning of the assessment.
6. **Power issues.** Power dynamics between the assessors/evaluators and those responsible for the intervention matter, and measures may need to be taken to address power imbalances to meet the goals of the assessment.
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.

7.3 ***Some propositions regarding changes in institutions and behaviors for sustainable poverty reduction and social inclusion [Theme 3: Institutionalization of new approaches]***

- 1. Changes in individual behaviors:** Changes in individual behaviors are often required for effectively linking knowledge generated by research with pro-poor action, or for the successful use of knowledge from impact assessments in decision-making. There are often large incentive issues and other institutional-related obstacles to such changes, and concerted efforts to address these institutional issues may be needed for sustainable poverty reduction to occur. These include things like spending more time and bringing in assistance in team-building and facilitation of teams; finding innovative approaches to fully involving users (e.g., policy-makers, community members) from project development stage.
- 2. Changes in organizational management:** Significant changes in organizational management practices and systems are often needed in order to link research more effectively with pro-poor action or to result in more use of knowledge from impact assessments for decision-making. These include changes such rewarding the team and not just individual performance; developing new support systems and expertise needed to assist researchers working with multiple institutions and teams.
- 3. Changes in policy practice:** Policy change is needed at different levels (e.g., community, district, national, international), and across different sectors if sustainable poverty reduction is to occur. Researchers have a tough time influencing pro-poor policies and need to come up with strategies to address this challenge when choosing and refining evaluation and impact assessment approaches.
- 4. Changes in knowledge-sharing practice:** Changes in inter-personal or inter-organizational relations are needed to more effectively link research with pro-poor action, or for more use to be made of knowledge from impact assessments in decision-making. These include efforts to capitalize on new technologies and approaches aimed at improving knowledge-sharing, networking, community action, and collective action.

INPUT REQUEST #5: INITIAL QUESTIONS TO STIMULATE THE DIALOGUE

Please review the *Propositions* presented in Section 7 above 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 on the accompanying Feedback Form.

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

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

Are there any propositions or aspects of the propositions missing?

8. Next Steps in the Dialogue

The following are the next steps in this Dialogue.

1. Deadline for submission of responses using the Feedback Form is February 22, 2008. Please send your completed Feedback Form to kjones@innovationexpedition.com.
2. Feedback will be compiled and made available “as-is” and posted on the Workshop web-site (www.prgaprogram.org/riw) by February 27, 2008.

In addition, key highlights from this Dialogue will be synthesized and provided to the Dialogue participants by February 29, 2008. **We will keep your feedback confidential and no comment will be attributed to any specific participant in this Dialogue.**

3. Feedback will be further synthesized and then used to design the Workshop program and develop a *Workshop Workbook*. The Workbook will serve to guide and inform the various Workshop sessions.
4. Workshop in Cali, Columbia, March 26–28, 2008.

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 on the accompanying Feedback Form.

Annex 1. Definitions of some words used in this Challenge Paper

Assessments are formal efforts to assemble selected knowledge with a view toward making it publicly available in a form intended to be useful for decision-making. Source: Mitchell RB; Clark WC; Cash DW; Dickson NM (ed.), 2006. *Global Environmental Assessments: Information and Influence*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Boundary organizations act as intermediaries between scientists [and others] who produce information, and decision-makers who use the information. These organizations operate in a dynamic environment, essentially straddling the shifting divide between politics and science. They draw their incentives from and produce outputs for principals in both domains. Source: Guston DH, 1999. Stabilizing the boundary between us, politics and science: The role of the Office of Technology Transfer as a boundary organization. *Social Studies of Science* 29(1): 87–111. Bank [Additions to this definition by the Planning Team are in brackets.]

Evaluation is the systematic investigation of the worth, value, merit or quality of an object. Assessment of the operation or the outcomes of a program or policy, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to its improvement. The criteria for evaluation may include relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Source: Horton D *et al.*, 2003. *Evaluating Capacity Development: Experiences from research and development organizations around the world*. The Netherlands: ISNAR/CTA; Canada: IDRC.

Ex-ante is a term used in impact assessment that refers to analyses that are conducted before the intervention has been initiated and/or outcomes have been produced. Source: The Basics of Impact Assessment, CGIAR - <http://impact.cgiar.org/methods/basics.asp>.

Ex-post is a term used in impact assessment that refers to analyses that measure outcomes that have actually resulted from the intervention to date.

Impact is any effect, whether anticipated or unanticipated, positive or negative, brought about by a development intervention. In some cases, “impact” refers to the long-term effects of an intervention on broad development goals. Source: Horton, DA *et al.*, 2003. *Evaluating Capacity Development: Experiences from research and development organizations around the world*. The Netherlands: ISNAR/CTA; Canada: IDRC.

Impact Assessment is intended to determine more broadly whether the program had the desired [planned] effects on individuals, households and institutions and whether those effects are [can be and in what way] attributable to the program intervention. Impact evaluations can also explore unintended consequences, whether positive or negative, on beneficiaries [and a whole range of other development indicators]. Source: Baker JL, 1960. *Evaluating the Impact of Development Projects on Poverty: A handbook for practitioners*. Washington, DC: The International Bank for

Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank [Additions to this definition by the Planning Team are in brackets.]

Innovation is the process by which organizations “master and implement the design and production of goods and services that are new to them, irrespective of whether they are new to their competitors, their country, or the world.” Source: Mytelka LK, 2000. Local systems of innovation in a globalized world economy. *Industry and Innovation* 77(1): 15–32.

An **innovation system** can be defined as a network of organizations, enterprises and individuals focused on bringing new products, new processes and new forms of organization into economic use, together with the institutions and policies that affect their behavior and performance. The innovation systems concept embraces not only the science suppliers, but the totality and interaction of actors involved in innovation. It extends beyond the creation of knowledge to encompass the factors affecting demand for and use of knowledge in novel and useful ways. Source: World Bank, 2006. *Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: How to go beyond the strengthening of research systems*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Institutions are structures and mechanisms of social order and cooperation governing the behavior of two or more individuals. Institutions are identified with a social purpose and permanence, transcending individual human lives and intentions, and with the making and enforcing of rules governing cooperative human behavior. The term, institution, is commonly applied to customs and behavior patterns important to a society, as well as to particular formal organizations of government and public service. As structures and mechanisms of social order among humans, institutions are one of the principal objects of study in the social sciences, including sociology, political science and economics. Institutions are a central concern for law, the formal regime for political rule-making and enforcement. The creation and evolution of institutions is a primary topic for history. Source: Wikipedia.

Monitoring involves continuous, systematic observation and checking on [development intervention] activities and their results. The purpose is to ensure that activities are proceeding according to plan, to provide a record of how inputs are used, and to warn of deviations from initial goals and expected outcomes. Source: Horton DA *et al.*, 2003. *Evaluating Capacity Development: Experiences from research and development organizations around the world*. The Netherlands: ISNAR/CTA; Canada: IDRC. [Additions to this definition by the Planning Team are in brackets.]

Outcome: Changes in the behavior, relationships, activities, actions (or any combination of these) of a boundary partner that can be logically linked, although are not necessarily directly caused by, a program. Source: www.outcomemapping.ca.

Poverty, Social Definitions of: Some people describe poverty as a lack of essential items - such as food, clothing, water, and shelter - needed for proper living. At the UN’s World Summit on Social

Development, the 'Copenhagen Declaration' described poverty as "...a condition characterised by severe deprivation of basic human needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information." When people are unable to eat, go to school, or have any access to health care, then they can be considered to be in poverty, regardless of their income. To measure poverty in any statistical way, however, more rigid definitions must be used. Source: http://library.thinkquest.org/05aug/00282/over_whatism.htm.

Poverty – Absolute: Absolute poverty measures set a 'poverty line' at a certain income amount or consumption amount per year, based on the estimated value of a 'basket of goods' (food, shelter, water, etc.) necessary for proper living. For example, if \$5 a day is determined to be the income poverty line in a country, then anyone with an income of less than \$1860 would be considered impoverished. If instead a poverty line based on consumption was used, anyone consuming goods with a monetary value of less than \$1860 would be in poverty.

The most commonly used definition of global poverty is the absolute poverty line set by the World Bank. Poverty is set at an income of \$2 a day or less, and extreme poverty is set at \$1 a day or less. This line was first created in 1990 when the World Bank published its World Development Report and found that most developing countries set their poverty lines at \$1 a day. The \$2 mark was created for developing nations with slightly better income levels than their \$1 a day counterparts. More developed countries are permitted to set their poverty lines elsewhere (it would be silly to assume a statistically significant group of people in the U.S. made less than \$1 a day, though there are obviously many impoverished people living there). For highly industrialized countries, such as Britain, Japan, and the U.S., the absolute poverty line is usually set higher (for example, the line has been set at \$14.40 in the past). The 2005 poverty line for single individuals in the United States is set at \$26.19 a day.

As of 2001, 1.1 billion people, or 21% of the 2001 world population, had incomes less than the World Bank's '\$1 a day' line for extreme poverty. 2.7 billion people had incomes less than the World Bank's '\$2 a day' line for poverty. While this is a decline from past years (in 1981, there were 1.5 billion people in extreme poverty), it still means that almost one-half of the world's population lives in poverty, mainly in sub-Saharan African and South Asia. Source: http://library.thinkquest.org/05aug/00282/over_whatism.htm.

Producers are meant to encompass the scientists, engineers, and practitioners [and all others] who through their formal and informal experiments, observations and trial-and-error probing create knowledge about how the world works. Source: National Research Council, 2005. *Knowledge-Action Systems for Seasonal to Interannual Climate Forecasting*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. [Additions to this definition by the Planning Team are in brackets.]

Public Goods: this term is used in the broad sense to include research and knowledge that leads to poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity. For example, science and technology activities that lead to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. In this Dialogue particular

attention is given to the MDGs concerned with rural poverty reduction, social inclusion, equity and sustainable economic activity. Source: Stephen Biggs, personal communication.

Research focuses on generating new knowledge, and technology development aims to create a supply of new production methods, innovation involves “the use of new ideas, new technologies or new ways of doing things in a place or by people where they have not been used before.” Source: Barnett A, 2004. *From “research” to poverty reducing “innovation”*. Policy Brief. Brighton, UK: Sussex Research Associates. (Available at: <http://www.cphp.uk.com/uploads/disseminations/NSIPolicyBriefbrochure23feb04.pdf>).

Social exclusion relates to the alienation or disenfranchisement of certain people within a society. It is often connected to a person’s social class, educational status and living standards, and how these might affect their access to various opportunities. It also applies to some degree to the disabled, to minority men and women of all races, and to the elderly. Anyone who deviates in any perceived way from the norm of a population can become subject to coarse or subtle forms of social exclusion. Source: Wikipedia.

Users are those who may use knowledge in shaping actions that change how the world is working. This category includes decision-makers, such as policy-makers, managers, extension agents, farmers, executives, householders and citizens. Of course, the experience of such users also is a source of knowledge, and in good collaborative arrangements the distinction between producers and users of technical knowledge may become (intentionally) blurred. Source: National Research Council, 2005. *Knowledge-Action Systems for Seasonal to Interannual Climate Forecasting*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Annex 2: References

The material presented in section 7 draw from the frameworks and experiences of the Workshop Planning Team, as referenced below.

Adato, Michelle and Ruth Meinzen-Dick. 2007. Agricultural research, livelihoods, and poverty: studies of economic and social impacts in six countries. International Food Policy Research Institute. Washington DC

Biggs SD, 2007. Reflections on the social embeddedness of S&T in rural and agricultural transformations: learning from positive experiences of poverty reduction and social inclusion. Paper prepared for the International Conference on Policy Interventions and Rural Transformations: Comparative Issues, (hosted by the College of Humanities and Development of the China Agricultural University) Beijing, 10–16 September 2007.

Biggs S, 2008. Learning from the positive to reduce rural poverty and increase social justice: institutional innovations in agricultural and natural resources research and development. *Experimental Agriculture* 44(1): 37–60.

CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation. 2007. *New Strategic Platform*. Cali, Colombia: PRGA Program, 4p.

CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation. 2006. *Framing Participation for Agricultural Research*. Cali, Colombia: PRGA Program, 3p.

Clark W; *et al.*, 2002. *Science and Technology for Sustainable Development: Consensus Report of the Mexico City Synthesis Workshop, 20–23 May 2002*. Cambridge, MA: Initiative on Science and Technology for Sustainability, 37p. (Available at: http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/sustsci/ists/synthesis02/output/ists_mexico_consensus.pdf)

Horton D; Galleno V; Mackay R, 2003. Evaluation, Learning and Change in Research and Development Organizations: Concepts, Experiences, and Implications for the CGIAR. *ISNAR Discussion Paper* No. 03-2. The Hague: ISNAR, 32p. (Available via: www.cgiar-ilac.org/index.php?section=5&subsection=15#Learning)

Horton D; Mackay R, 2003. Using evaluation to enhance institutional learning and change: Recent experiences with agricultural research and development. *Agricultural Systems* 78(2): 127–142.

Kristjanson P; *et al.*, 2007. Linking International Agricultural Research Knowledge with Action for Sustainable Poverty Reduction., Proceedings of the ILRI workshop “Linking International Agricultural Research Knowledge with Action for Sustainable Poverty Alleviation. *ILRI Innovation Works Discussion Paper* 01-07. (Available at: www.ilri.org/InnovationWorks)

- Lilja N; Dixon J, 2008. Responding to the challenges of impact assessment of participatory research and gender analysis. *Experimental Agriculture* 44(1): 3–19.
- The National Academy of Sciences, 2008. *Linking Knowledge with Action for Sustainable Development*. Web-page available at: http://sustainability.nationalacademies.org/Linking_Knowledge.shtml).
- Science Environment, and Development Group, 2006. Center for International Development, Harvard University. Web-site at: <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/sed>.
- Sustainability Science Program. 2007. Center for International Development, Harvard University. Web-site at: <http://www.cid.harvard.edu/sustsci>.
- Watts, J., D. Horton, B. Douthwaite, R. LaRovere, G. Thiele, S. Prasad and C. Staver. 2008. Transforming Impact Assessment: Beginning the quiet revolution of institutional learning and change. *Experimental Agriculture* (2008) volume 44, pp. 21-35. Cambridge University Press.
- Watts J; Mackay R; Horton D; Hall A; Douthwaite B; Chambers R; Acosta A, 2007. Institutional Learning and Change: An Introduction. *ILAC Working Paper 3*. Rome: ILAC Initiative (Available at: www.cgiar-ilac.org/downloads/ILAC_Publications/Working_Papers/ILAC_Working_Paper_3.pdf)