

# ANNEXES

## **Annexes**

### ***Annex 1. CGIAR Challenge Program External Reviews (CPER) Guidelines***

#### **Background**

Challenge Programs (CPs) are time-bound, independently-governed programs of high impact research that target CGIAR research goals and priorities and require partnerships with a wide range of organizations. CPs are meant to improve the CGIAR's relevance and impact, better target and integrate existing activities, achieve greater efficiency and cohesion among CGIAR Centers, widen and improve their partnerships with non-CGIAR research partners and mobilize more stable and long term financing.

Three CPs were approved for implementation beginning in 2003: Water and Food (W&F); HarvestPlus (HP+); and Generation (GCP). At AGM04, the Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Program (SSA CP) was approved in principle for an 18-month inception phase. ExCo 6 (May 2004) requested the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat to synthesize some lessons learned from the three pilot CPs. One of the recommendations of the ensuing 2004 report was that "the current CPs be evaluated by an external panel after five years from start to assess the value added provided by the CP structure in terms of the effectiveness of partnerships and generation of outputs, evidence of adoption and impact of research, cost effectiveness of operations and sustained donor interest".

At the AGM 2005, the Group endorsed a set of 20 System Priorities to enhance the focus and cohesion of the CGIAR's research agenda. CPs may be an important option for the implementation of priority research and need to be reviewed also in this context to ensure that their rationale is validated by experience.

The guidelines for the CPERs have been prepared to address the particular characteristics of the programs that make their operations and governance distinctly different from those of the CGIAR Centers, and anticipating that CPs of different nature and duration will increasingly be used to implement a part of the CGIAR's research agenda, and help the CGIAR leverage external research capacities.

#### **Issues**

These guidelines provide the general principles that guide all CPERs. For each individual review, the specific Terms of Reference (TOR) will include both the generic issues listed below and a set of strategic issues identified through consultation with stakeholders, including the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat.

The CPER is aimed at informing the CGIAR members, stakeholders and other investors about the relevance of the program, and that the investment is sound, or

recommend measures to make it so. It will advise the program and its partners about the efficiency and effectiveness of their work and the appropriateness of their internal monitoring and evaluation, and make recommendations for improvements.

The CPER should address the overall scientific quality of the program, the program's effectiveness in reaching its research goals and the appropriateness of management and governance. The CPER should focus on the extent to which the key defining characteristics of a CP have been met: high-impact research; targets the CGIAR goals in relation to complex issues of overwhelming global and/or regional significance; requires partnerships among a wide range of institutions in order to deliver its products; is time-bound; and is independently-governed.

The individual CPERs are expected to provide inputs to a broader assessment or analysis of the extent to which the CP model is fulfilling its objectives, i.e. the purposes for which it was conceptualized and adopted.

The issues that the CPER needs to address can be clustered in two main categories:

***Programmatic issues:***

1. Is it likely that the CP research will eventually have a high impact based upon the conduct of the program to date? Has the CP clearly identified its direct and final beneficiaries? Were the CP's key assumptions/expected impact pathways concerning critical scientific and technological constraints, socioeconomic conditions, adoption, markets, researchers' motivation and donors' interests appropriate? Is there any evidence of progress along these pathways? Are there changes required to help increase the chances of success and the extent of impacts?
2. What has been the added scientific value from the CP; in particular, by the partnerships represented by the CP? What has been achieved by the CP that could not have been achieved without it, through Center activities or SWEPS? Is there any evidence of synergies and/or new modes of operation of the Centers involved in the CP? Can these synergies be improved?
3. Is the science in the CP overall and in the different components of high quality and are the scientific outputs recognised by peers? Does the CP, including all its partners, follow a clear policy of best practices regarding ethics and intellectual property?
4. Was the international public goods nature of the planned outputs clear at the outset and has this been reinforced from the conduct of the program?
5. To what extent have the objectives of the CP been achieved? Has the CP been effective in delivering outputs? Is there already evidence of adoption and other outcomes among the intended users? If there was a technology exchange process, how effective and efficient was it?
6. Is the CP cohesive, allocating a critical mass of resources to research with a clear set of goals in terms of outputs, outcomes, and impacts that can be monitored to measure collective progress at a system level? Was an appropriate M&E system included in the design of the CP and has it been implemented (including, inter alia, baseline data and outcome monitoring) in order to be in a position to generate,

disseminate and use credible and timely evidence concerning program impact?

7. In what ways has the CP contributed to capacity building of partners? Is capacity building included in the business plan and appropriately integrated into the program?

***Management/governance/partnership issues:***

1. Is there a clear, balanced, and formal governance structure involving research partners? Does it provide effective and adequate oversight, including financial oversight? Are there any perceived or real conflicts of interest in the governing body? Is there a clear and effective M&E system in place? What are the constraints and benefits for the CP (in terms of research, synergies, financial arrangements, etc) that result from the arrangements with the host institution?

2. What is the relationship between CP governance systems and the Boards of the Centers leading or participating in them?

3. Is the breadth of the CP in terms of partners optimal for reaching the objectives? Is there clarity of roles and responsibilities of all partners? Is there an effective system for internal knowledge sharing and communication across regions and research sites? Are the transaction costs in partnering well-managed?

4. What internal / external audit arrangements are in place, and do these cover site operations? For commissioned research, are the rules and mechanisms transparent? Is there a well-established, clearly defined and transparent internal control environment on implementing competitive grants?

5. How is the program's multi-year funding ensured? Is financial support diversified enough to avoid funding risks? How much is the deviation (if any) between budget and actual expenditures? What is the percentage of unidentified funding in budget at time of approval by the CP governing body? What is the proportion of transaction costs to expenditure/budget/funding?

The purpose and objectives of the CPER are to learn and to assess; hence the following general principles guide the conduct of the review:

- The Panel should take into account assessments made of the CP and available information such as MTP reviews, *ex ante* project reviews, reports to donors and any other information from internal monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.
- The Panel should identify key program assumptions, particularly those having implications for costs, benefits, outcomes and impact, indicating which items are expected to be included as costs or benefits, their expected magnitudes and time profiles.
- The Program needs to ensure that critical data on performance, benchmarks and context are available at the time of the CPER.
- The Panel needs to document any unexpected costs and benefits of the CP, including spillovers.

- The review process should involve adequate communication of the CPER with the CP both during the review and after it, and the results should be communicated using various approaches, preferably electronic means, reaching also external audiences.

### **Implementation**

The CPERs are commissioned by the SC on behalf of the Group. They are organized jointly by the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat and their implementation is coordinated by the SC Secretariat. They complement the other elements of the CGIAR's Monitoring and Evaluation systems, namely the annual MTP review by the SC and the Performance Measurement System, which will be adjusted also to accommodate the CPs.

An external review panel of at least two, maximum three members will be assembled. The Panel Chair should have demonstrated experience and skills in research management as well as in scientific research. The profile of the Panel Chair would also depend on the nature of the CP's research as well as the stage that the CP is in, in its life cycle. S/he would have an understanding of international agricultural research for development; have excellent analytical capability, and excellent command of English. S/he should have experience in reviewing complex research programs and demonstrated capacity to lead an independent external review. The Panel member responsible for the governance, management and partnership component of the review should have expertise in program governance, management of multi-partner consortia and program funding.

The review team may include 1–2 consultants to cover specific aspects corresponding to the complexity of the concerned program in which the Panel requires ad hoc expertise. Thus, the review Panel will have more flexibility to deal with issues that may not require an expert to be on board for the full period of the review. In consultation with the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat the Panel will determine if there is a need for consultants, who subsequently are selected through a standard Panel selection process led by the SC. The TOR of these consultants should include time for consultations upfront and towards the end of the review process.

All Panel members and consultants participate in the review in their personal capacity and should have no conflict of interest with the CP. Causes of potential conflict include: current employment with a CGIAR Center or CP; previous employment or consultancy with the CP; employment with any of the CP partners; participation or consultancy in planning of the CP or its components; representative of a donor to the CP with any responsibility related to the program funding.

In addition to the generic questions presented in this document, additional review questions will be included in the TOR for each CPER. These would reflect the specific nature and focus of the CP and its research and review history. The CPER should provide information to guide decisions about continuing the program's activities.

The review will include one visit to the host institution of the CP and also a visit to at least one CP partner. It is essential that the CPER reviews the efficiency of the partnerships and captures both the internal partners' and external stakeholders' perceptions.

The report should be clear and succinct. It should explicitly address all the points of the TOR with sufficient analysis to support the conclusions; and present clear and explicit recommendations for improvement, or for bringing the CP to closure. The report should be brief and concise (not to exceed 60 pages), and should include a short Executive Summary (not more than 2 pages). Any supplementary evidence and/or tables could be included in an annex, but the text should be self-contained.

The CP will prepare a response to the Panel report. The SC and CGIAR Secretariats will prepare a commentary to the report prior to its submission to the ExCo and to the Group. The SC and the CGIAR Secretariat will monitor the follow-up of the CPER through the MTP and report their assessment to ExCo.

### **Background Documents that the CPER Panel is expected to use**

1. CP specific Terms of Reference
2. CP full project proposal
3. SC commentary on CP full proposal
4. CP final Business plan
5. CP Annual reports
6. CP MTPs, including annual work plans
7. SC commentaries of CP MTPs
8. CP annual budgets
9. Description of competitive grants process
10. Major funding applications
11. Reports to donors
12. Donor assessments
13. Description of internal monitoring and evaluation processes
14. Internal monitoring and evaluation reports
15. List of program publications by category (to be decided)
16. List of program partners, the specific contribution to the research and the associated budget share
17. CGIAR documents of lessons learned from CPs (e.g. 2004)
18. Selected peer reviewed papers/books produced by the CP

## ***Annex 2. CGIAR External Review of the Water and Food Challenge Program. Terms of reference***

### **Background**

The Water and Food Challenge Program started with a one-year inception phase in 2003 and the implementation phase began in January 2004. The Challenge Program External Review (CPER) evaluates the progress of the CPWF as it is coming towards the end of its first phase. The CPER will be conducted following the **CPER Guidelines**, a companion document to this TOR that is available at [www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org).

For **logistics** please see the “Implementation” section of the CPER Guidelines. It is expected that this review will take up to a total of 30 working days. The schedule for the review as well as contract details will be specified in the appointment note to panel members.

### **Topics to be covered**

The main topics to be covered by the CPER are:

1. The seven (7) programmatic issues as described in pg. 2 of the CPER Guidelines.
2. The four (4) management, governance and partnerships issues as described in pg. 3 of the CPER Guidelines.

In addition, while addressing these issues, the Panel is asked to comment on the following specific items:

3. Assess priority setting at the various stages of the CPWF to determine whether an appropriate and consistent set of criteria have been used throughout the initial establishment and inception phase, the first call for projects and the second and most recent call. A specific issue to assess is whether the analyses and results of the Comprehensive Assessment of Agricultural Water Management (SWIM 2) have been used effectively in CPWF priority setting.
4. CPWF has responded to SC comments about an initial lack of cohesion by attempting to focus on fewer objectives, however, the program still consists of a large number of projects spread over nine expansive Benchmark Basins that cover a broad agenda. Assess the relevance of the research strategy and whether efforts to focus the program so far are sufficient considering the expected outputs and resources available.
5. An important issue for the CPWF is the need to identify the constraints to uptake based on a thorough analysis of the policy and institutional context in each of the Benchmark Basins. Has this analysis been carried out and translated into addressing a comprehensive set of researchable issues?
6. Assess whether the appropriate ex ante impact pathway analysis has been undertaken and partnerships established to ensure uptake of research outputs

through effective delivery channels.

7. Has the CPWF adequately defined its comparative advantage vis-à-vis the roles of alternative suppliers of research who are not part of the CP? A specific issue for this review is whether there is a transparent delineation between CPWF and IWMI that maximises their complementarities and minimises potential overlaps.



### ***Annex 3. People interviewed by the CPWF External Review***

#### **Initial planning, CIMMYT, Texcoco, Mexico (1-3 April 2007)**

Dr. Jonathan Woolley, CPWF Program Coordinator

#### **CPWF Secretariat and IWMI Headquarters, Colombo, Sri Lanka (19-24 April 2007)**

Dr. Peter McCornick , Director for Asia, IWMI

Dr. David Molden , Deputy Director General, IWMI

Dr. Mobin ud-Din Ahmad, Leader Karkheh BFP (IWMI staff)

Dr. Sophie Nguyen Khoa-Man, CPWF Theme 3 Leader (World Fish staff)

Dr. Francis Gichuki, CPWF Theme 4 Leader (IWMI staff)

Dr. Debbie Bossio, Director Research Programs, Theme Leader & Principal Soil Scientist, IWMI

Dr. Jonathan Woolley, CPWF Program Coordinator

Ms. Pamela George, CPWF Program Manager

Ms. Amena Mohammed, CPWF Communications Coordinator

Dr. Alain Vidal, CPWF Management Team Member (CEMAGREF staff)

Dr. Simon Cook, CPWF Coordinator Basin Focal Projects (CIAT staff)

Dr. Kim Geheb, CPWF Mekong Basin Coordinator and Management Team Member (MRC staff)

Mr. Amol Khisti, Head of Finance and Administration, IWMI

#### **Review meeting in New Delhi (26 April 2007)**

Dr. J. S. Samra, DDG, NRM, ICAR and member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)

Dr. A. K. Sikka, CPWF Benchmark Basin Coordinator, IGB and ICAR Research Coordinator, Eastern Region

Dr. Upali Amarasinghe, Sr. Researcher, IWMI, New Delhi and Project Leader-PN 48

Dr. Madar Samad, P. Researcher, IWMI, Hyderabad and PI, PN 48

Dr. Anik Bahaduri, Research Associate, PN 48, IWMI, New Delhi

Dr. Bharat Sharma, Sr. Researcher, IWMI and Project Leader-PN 42

Mr. Bob Yoder, IDE, USA and PI, PN 28 and SG 507

Er. Deepak Adhikari, Dept. of Irrigation, Nepal and Researcher, PN 28 and SG 507

Shri Sudarshan Suryavanshi, IDE, India and Researcher, PN 28

Dr. Dhruba Pant, Head IWMI, Nepal and PL, PN 23

Dr. Ravi Chopra, Director, People's Science Institute, Dehradun and Researcher, PN 23

Dr. A. K. Singh, Director, Water Technology Centre, New Delhi and PI, PN 16

#### **Field visit, Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh) 27 April 2007**

##### **At Shivri Farm**

Dr. D. K. Sharma, Head, CSSRI, RS Karnal and PI, PN 7

Dr. Naik, Sr. Scientist, CSSRI, RS Karnal and Researcher, PN 7

Dr. Ranbir Singh, Sr. Scientist, CSSRI, RS Karnal and Researcher, PN 7

Dr. Y. P. Singh, Sr. Scientist, CSSRI, RS Karnal and Researcher, PN 7  
Dr. Abdul Haris, Sr. Scientist and member CPWF IGB Coordinating Unit

**At Dhaura KVK**

Dr. A. K. Singh, Training Organizer and Facilitator, Farmers' Outreach Program  
Dr. S. K. Singh, Subject Specialist  
Mr. D. K. Srivastava, Subject Specialist  
Shri Shiv Dulara, Farmer  
Shri Shamsheer Singh, Farmer  
Shri Daya Ram, Farmer  
Shri Naresh Kumar Singh, Seed Trader  
Shri Vaidya Nath Pradhan, Farmer  
Shri Shiv Kumar Singh, Farmer

**Field visit, Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh) 28 April 2007**

Dr. K. Vass, Director, CIFRI Barrackpore and Project Leader, PN-34  
Dr. P. K. Katiha, Sr. Scientist, CIFRI, Barrackpore and PI, PN 34  
Dr. N. P. Srivastava, P. Scientist, CIFRI, Barrackpore and Researcher, PN 34  
Dr. A. K. Das, Sr. Scientist, CIFRI, Barrackpore and Researcher, PN 34  
Shri Satish Kumar Bara, SRF, PN 34 (Bhopal Site)  
Shri Nirmal Kumar Biswas, SRF, PN 34 (Bhopal Site)  
Shri Tilak Singh Khushwaha, SRF, PN 34 (Bhopal Site)  
Ms Anurbha Saxena, SRF, PN 34 (Jhansi site)  
Shri Ramratan, Reservoir fisherman  
Shri Munna Lal, Reservoir fisherman  
Dr. U. K. Purohit, Joint Director, Fishery Dept. Madhya Pradesh  
Shri U. S. Tomar, Deputy Director, Fishery Dept. Madhya Pradesh  
Shri. D. S. Khare, Asst. Director, Fishery Dept. Madhya Pradesh  
Dr. T. A. Qureshi, Former Head, Barkhatulla University Bhopal  
Mr. Ghansi Ram, President Co-operative Society  
Dr. Kulkarni, Officiating Director, Central Institute of Agricultural Engineering,  
Bhopal  
Dr. Bhandakar, P. Scientist, CIAE, Bhopal  
Dr. Subba Rao, Director, Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal

**Other contacts in New Delhi**

Prof. Saifuddin Soz, Minister of Water Resources of India  
Mr. M. Gopalakrishnan, Secretary General, International Commission on Irrigation  
and Drainage, Delhi

**Vietnam field visit and project presentations (19-22 May, 2007)**

Dr. Elizabeth Humphries, Leader CPWF Theme 1 (IRRI staff)  
Ms. Ruvicy Bayot, Asst. Leader CPWF Theme 1 (IRRI staff)  
Dr. Sophie Nguyen Khoa, Leader CPWF Theme 3 (World Fish staff)  
Dr. Annette Huber-Lee, Leader CPWF Theme 5 and Management Team (IFPRI staff)  
Dr. Claudia Ringler, Co-Leader CPWF Theme 5 (IFPRI staff)

Dr. Kim Geheb, CPWF Mekong Basin Coordinator and Management Team (MRC staff)  
Dr. Simon Cook, Coordinator BFPs (CIAT staff)  
Dr. Mac Kirby, Leader Mekong BFP (CSIRO staff)  
Dr. Lang Nguyen Thi, Cuu Long Delta Rice Research Institute, Researcher PN 7  
Dr. Tuong To Phuc, IRRI, Project Leader PN 10 and CSC member  
Dr. Hari Garung, IRRI, Researcher PN 11  
Dr. Bas Bouman, IRRI, Project Leader PN 16  
Dr. Boonrat Jongdee, Ubon Rice Research Institute, Researcher PN 16  
Dr. Guy Trebuil, CIRAD, Researcher PN25  
Dr. Le Canh Dung, Can Tho University, Researcher PN 25  
Dr. John Dore, World Conservation Union, Researcher PN 50  
Dr. Nathalie Baxter, International Development Enterprises Cambodia, Researcher SG502  
Dr. Sieng Kan, International Development Enterprises Cambodia, Researcher SG502  
Dr. Prabat Kumar, Asian Institute of Technology, Researcher SG504  
Dr. Tri Khiem Nguyen, An Giang University, Researcher PN 35  
Dr. Duong Van Ni, Can Tho University, Researcher PN 35  
Dr. Will Allen, LandCare Research New Zealand, Member CPWF Gender, Institutions & Participation Panel (GIP)  
Dr. Kittasudthacheew Chayanis, Stockholm Environment Institute, Thailand, Researcher PN 50

#### **Review meeting in Rome (11-13 June 2007)**

Dr. Jonathan Woolley, CPWF Program Coordinator  
Ms. Pamela George, CPWF Program Manager  
Dr. Bernadette Resurreccion, CPWF Management Team Member (AIT staff)  
Dr. Annette Huber-Lee, Leader CPWF Theme 5 and Management Team Member (IFPRI staff)  
Dr. Kim Geheb, Benchmark Basin Coordinator, Mekong Basin Coordinator and Management Team Member (MRC staff)  
Dr. Elizabeth Humphreys, Leader CPWF Theme 1 (IRRI staff)  
Dr. Nancy Johnson, Leader CPWF Theme 2 (CIAT staff)  
Dr. Sophie Nguyen Khoa Manh, Leader CPWF Theme 3 (World Fish staff)  
Dr. Francis Gichuki, Leader CPWF Theme 4 (IWMI staff)  
Dr. Boru Douthwaite, Project Leader CPWF Impact Assessment (CIAT staff)  
Dr. Simon Cook, Coordinator, CPWF Basin Focal Projects (CIAT staff)  
Ms. Marcia Macomber, CPWF Capacity Building Coordinator  
Dr. Larry Harrington, CPWF Consultant, Synthesis, Basin Focal Projects and Phase 2  
Dr. Timothy Kelley, FAO/Science Council Secretariat (observer)

#### **Governance follow-up interviews (June and July 2007, mostly by telephone)**

Dr. Ania Grobicki, Head of the Bamako 2008 Secretariat, former CPWF Program Coordinator  
Dr. Chris Smith, Research Director CSIRO, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
David Molden, Deputy Director General (Research) IWMI, Chair, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)

Mr. Do Manh Hung, Mekong River Commission, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Prof. Frank Rijsberman, Google.org, former Chair, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Dr. Jean-Yves Maillat, Consultant, IWMI External Review Panel Member  
Prof. Joachim von Braun, Director General IFPRI, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Dr. Joachim Voss, Director General CIAT  
Ms. Liu Xiaoyan, YRCC, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Dr. Osamu Ito, Director JIRCAS, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Dr. Patrick Dugan, WorldFish, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Dr. Peter Lochery, CARE, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Yves Savidan, AGROPOLIS, Board Chair CIAT, member of steering committees of Challenge Programs HarvestPlus and Generation

**Other contacts (finance and evaluation)**

Mr. John Fitzsimon, Head, CGIAR Internal Audit Unit  
Dr. John Howell, M&E specialist  
Mr. Suresh Sitaraman, Consultant, IWMI External Review Panel Member

**Lausanne, Switzerland (3 July 2007)**

Dr. Willi Graf, Senior Adviser, Natural Resources & Environment, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)

## ***Annex 4. Documents made available to CPWF via dedicated web-page***

### First-tier documents

Last updated 19 March 2007

1. CPER specific Terms of Reference 2007
- 1.2 CGIAR guidelines for CP external review
2. CPWF full proposal 2002
  - 2.1 Annexes to CPWF full proposal
3. iSC commentary of CPWF full project proposal 2002
6. CPWF Medium Term Plan 2007 - 2009
  - 6.1 SC commentary on CPWF Medium Term Plan 2007 - 2009
  - 6.2 CPWF response to SC commentary on CPWF Medium Term Plan 2007 - 2009
8. CPWF Annual Budgets
16. Budget by partner, summary spreadsheet
- 17.1 Lessons learnt during the establishment of the CPWF 2004
- 17.2 CGIAR Synthesis of lessons learned from initial implementation of pilot Challenge Programmes 2004
18. List of peer-reviewed publications by themes

### Additional first-tier documents

- A. Executive summaries of project proposals and participation
- B. List of projects, present status
- C. CPWF Research Strategy 2005 - 2008
- D. CPWF Baseline 2004
- E. CPWF Synthesis 2005
- F. Programme Summary Brochures
  - General
  - Theme
  - Basin
- G. Key contacts for CPWF external review

### Second-tier documents

Last updated 25 May 2007

5. CPWF Annual Reports
  - 5.1 Annual Report 2004 [PDF 1.2 Mb]
  - 5.2 Annual Report 2005 [PDF 726 Kb]
    - 5.2.1 CGIAR Commentary on the Governance, Management and Finance Aspects of the Annual Reports (2005) of Challenge Programmes [PDF 17.1 kb]
  - 5.3 Annual Report 2006 - DRAFT [Word 176Kb]
    - 5.3.1 Annual Report 2006 - Financial Tables - DRAFT [Xls 51 kb]
9. Description of competitive grants process
  - 9.1 General:
    - 9.1.1 The evolution of procedures for competitive selection in the CPWF [PDF 142 Kb]
    - 9.1.2 Theme and basin coverage in the 50 CPWF projects [PDF 78 Kb]
  - 9.2 First call:
    - 9.2.1 Concept note assessment format with guidelines [PDF 159 Kb]
    - 9.2.2 Full proposal submission guidelines [PDF 236 Kb]

- 9.2.3 Full proposal assessment format with guidelines [PDF 141 Kb]
- 9.2.4 Proposal budget template [xls 171 Kb]
- 9.3 Second call:
  - 9.3.1 Concept note guidelines [PDF 26 Kb]
  - 9.3.2 Annex 1: Form for concept note submissions [PDF 82 Kb]
  - 9.3.3 Concept note evaluation format [PDF 150 Kb]
  - 9.3.4 Concept note weightings for evaluation criteria [PDF 80 Kb]
  - 9.3.5 Full proposal guidelines - In Confidence, Yet to be Released [PDF 199 Kb]
  - 9.3.6 Budget submission format, revised call
  - 9.3.7 Optional worksheets, revised call
- 9.4 BFP:
  - 9.4.1 Basin Focal Projects call for expressions of interest [PDF 223Kb]
  - 9.4.2 Assessment form for BFP expressions of interest [PDF 92 Kb]
- 13. Monitoring and Evaluation Processes
  - 13.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Process - draft working paper for discussion prepared for Consortium Steering Committee meeting (October, 2003) [PDF 126 Kb]
  - 13.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Briefing Paper (April 2006) [PDF 158 Kb]
  - 13.3 Use and Potential of Impact Pathways in CPWF Briefing Paper (April 2006) [PDF 502 Kb]
  - 13.4 CPWF Website Strategy [PDF 119 Kb]
  - 13.5 Impact Assessment of CPWF Research: Phase 1 - Volta, Mekong, Karkheh [PDF 333Kb]
  - 13.6 Impact Assessment of CPWF Research: Phase 2 - Indo-Gangetic, Sao Francisco, Nile, Limpopo, Andean System of River Basins [PDF 261 Kb]
  - 13.7 Cost Benefit Analysis - Assessing the Impact of the CPWF [PDF 115 Kb]
  - 13.8 CPWF Six Monthly Progress Report - Proforma [PDF 97 Kb]
  - 13.9 CPWF Annual Progress Report - Proforma [PDF 238 Kb]
  - 13.10 CPWF Completion Report - Proforma [PDF 222 Kb]
  - 13.11 CPWF Web Reporting Format (Draft) [PDF 181 Kb]
- 14. Capacity Building
  - 14.1 Capacity building in first call projects 2004 - 2006
  - 14.2 Capacity building strategy, revised 2005
  - 14.3 Capacity building webpage
  - 14.4 CPWF Capacity building brochure
  - 14.5 Future of CPWF Capacity Building Activities" - donor brochure
  - 14.6 M-Power Fellowships
  - 14.7 "Focus on Capacity Building: Lessons from the African Transboundary Governance Project" in Africa Water Figures (2006, issue 1, page 6)
  - 14.8 "International training and research course on groundwater governance in Asia: theory and practice" in Asia Water Figures (2007, issue 1: page 6)

Additional second tier documents

- H. Synthesis 2006 (Draft)
- I. Basin Profiles
- J. CPWF and CA Research Priorities [PDF 231 Kb]
- K. CA Summary Document
- L. Research Highlights
  - More animal per drop: searching for livestock-water productivity gains in the Nile basin [PDF 654 Kb]
  - Integrated farming enhances rainwater and soil productivity [PDF 650Kb]

- Science navigates new routes to sustainable agroforestry [PDF 651 Kb]
  - Participatory crop breeding reaps benefits for Eritrea [PDF 750 Kb]
  - Payment for environmental services: offering smallholder farmers a choice for sustainable change [PDF 587 Kb]
  - Guiding the sustainable management of rice landscapes in the uplands [PDF 566 Kb]
  - Safeguarding public health from farms to markets to households [PDF 670 Kb]
  - Multiple-use water services to address real-life water needs [PDF 688 Kb]
  - Managing risk in delta ecosystems to sustain diverse livelihoods [PDF 576 Kb]
  - Taking a second look at traditional institutional arrangements for transboundary water governance in Africa [PDF 577 Kb]
- M. CPWF working document toward Phase 2 design [PDF Kb]
- N. Outputs of the CPWF International Forum on Water and Food [PDF 585 Kb]
- O. Suggested sources of information for external review TOR [PDF 91 Kb]
- P. Most significant change stories [PDF 354 Kb]

#### Third-tier documents

Last updated 23 April 2007

Minutes for the virtual CSC meeting, 12 February 2007 [PDF 120Kb]

CSC proposal for new management structure, March 2005 [PDF 53Kb]

Draft Terms of Reference for CSC consideration, March 2005 [PDF 86Kb]

#### Additional Documents

Last updated 21 June 2007

Q. CPWF Management Team's responses to ER TOR's

R. Working Document Towards Phase 2 of the CPWF

S. Medium Term Plan CPWF 2008 - 2010

T. Participatory Impact Pathways Analysis and Priority Setting [pdf 193kb]

U. Impact Potential of the 'Temperate and Tropical Aerobic Rice (STAR) in Asia' project [pdf 3.15mb]

## **Annex 5. Review of selected CPWF Publications**

### ***Theme 2: Water and People in Catchments***

The focus of Theme 2 research projects is on “the multiple ways that people manage water between the plot and the basin scale”. It seeks to “identify institutional and technological innovations that improve people’s capacity to manage water collectively”. It is also directed at upper catchment issues.

*Jorge Rubiano, Marcela Quintero, Ruben Dario Estrada, Alonso Moreno (2006). **Multiscale Analysis for Promoting Integrated Watershed Management**, Water International, 31,3: forthcoming*

This is a useful paper that presents an innovative approach to landuse management. It integrates a biophysical response model with an economic optimizing routine and then investigates alternative adoption scenarios using game theory to account for social interactions. As such, it is a very comprehensive analysis of a complex situation.

A critical comment relates to the use of multi-criteria analysis to formulate the objective function in the economic optimization process used to establish the shadow prices for the non-market values associated with the land/water use management externalities. The subjectivity associated with the development of the weights integral to the use of MCA detracts from the analysis. This could be avoided by the direct use of non-market valuation techniques to estimate the values of the externalities and the integration of benefit cost analysis as the optimization framework.

A major concern is that the CPWR is not even acknowledged in this paper. That raises the issue of how much of this research can be attributed to the CP funding.

*Brent Swallow, Nancy Johnson, Ruth Meinzen-Dick, Anna Knox (200 ). **The challenges of inclusive cross-scale collective action in watersheds**, Water International, 31,3: forthcoming*

This paper presents a variety of frameworks that can be used for the analysis of collective action in catchments. The array of frameworks is useful for researchers and policy makers in developing ideas for innovation in collective action that is based on existing or traditional mechanisms.

The relationships purported in the paper to exist between water and poverty is overly simplistic. The confounding effects of other resources are acknowledged indirectly in the paper but needs to be made explicit. This is a problem with many of the CP initiatives in that the focus on water productivity ignores that it is total factor productivity that matters. Increased water productivity may come for example with the application of other forms of inputs. If these other inputs are the pressing constraints, improving water productivity is not warranted.

Despite its value as a reference point, the paper does not involve any empirical (quantitative or qualitative) evidence of the prospects for the alternative collective



action recipes put forward. Hence the paper can only be seen as a foundation for potential future research.

Acknowledgement is given to CPWF funding but only for the material presented in Section 2. Attribution of the whole output to CPWF is therefore ill founded.

In addition, the paper (apparently) has not yet been accepted for journal publication. It is possible that a journal 'home' will be hard to find for the paper given its status more of a review than presenting much by way of innovation or contribution to knowledge expansion.

#### ***Theme 4: Integrated Basin Water Management Systems***

This theme seeks "innovative institutional arrangements and decision support tools and information to help establish integrated water resource management strategies in basins". The similarities in stated objectives for this theme and Theme 2 are clear. The one apparent distinction is that Theme 2 stresses the development understanding of upper catchment issues while Theme 4 is more holistic. By ignoring lower catchment aspects, the Panel considers that Theme 2 is in danger of producing research recommendations that subsequent analysis under Theme 4 would be concluded to be erroneous. It therefore **recommends an integration of the two themes.**

It is also notable that particularly this Theme has strong similarities with IWMI's overall goals of addressing water and food issues from an integrated basin-wide perspective. In this sense, the CPWF is replicating the role of IWMI in international agricultural research.

*Thomas Berger, Regina Birner, Jose Diaz, Nancy McCarthy, Heidi Wittmer (2006). Capturing the Complexity of Water Uses and Water Users within a Multi-Agent Framework, Water Resource Management 21(1): 129-148.*

This paper aims to justify the use of Multi-Agent Modelling as a means of investigating complex policy issues in water management. The context presented is the tradeoff involved in water supply infrastructure investment. There is no actual analysis presented. Rather the modeling framework is described. Unfortunately, nor does the paper give an in-depth description of just what multi-agent modeling involves. What description is provided is left at a relatively cursory level and for the uninformed, it is difficult to see exactly what the method involves other than the integration of numerous other modelling systems.

The paper does give some insights into the case study of interest but again, it only involves the setting of the scene and raising the issues that are deemed to be complex and hence of interest to multi-agent modellers. Hence, overall, it is a rather 'unsatisfying' paper because it achieves so little and leaves so many issues unresolved.

*Jinxia Wang, Jikun Huang, Scott Rozelle, Qiuqiong Huang and Amelia Blanke (2007). Agriculture and groundwater development in northern China: trends, institutional responses, and policy options, Water Policy, 9:61-74.*

This paper presents a straight forward description of groundwater expansion in Northern China and includes a detailing of institutional structures that have precipitated the decline in GW table. A key feature of the paper is a sensible analysis of the policy implications that arise from the analysis. The importance of the collection of further data necessary to set the direction for actual policy recommendations is noted as is a call for that collection to be undertaken.

However, the acknowledgement for this paper refers to the Comprehensive Assessment rather than the CPWF. Hence, attribution is again an issue: Can this work be really classified as a product of the CPWF investment?

*J. Liebe, N. van de Giesen, M. Andreini (2005). Estimation of small reservoir storage capacities in a semi-arid environment: A case study in the Upper East Region of Ghana, Physics And Chemistry of the Earth, 30: 448-454.*

This is a technical paper that explores the characteristics of water reservoirs in the Upper Catchment of the Volta. It represents a useful exercise in the development of a technique that will aid the development of models of catchment flows. With further work on the integration of the technique into broader scale flow models, it will aid the management of water resources in the region. However, it would have been useful in the paper to have included a conceptual framework and potentially an example to demonstrate how the research is linked to policy management considerations. This would have enabled a better assessment of the contribution that is likely to arise from the research.

The major issue arising from this paper in terms of its role in the CPWF is that it does not even acknowledge any CPWF funding. This leaves questions unanswered as to its status as an output of the CP?

### ***Theme 5: Global and National Water and Food Systems***

Theme 5 concentrates on policy issues at the regional, national and international levels and deals with transboundary issues. Again, it is difficult to tease apart the goal of this theme from other themes given their objectives include institutional issues. Nor is it apparent how this theme can be treated separately from the research issues tackled in the other themes.

*V. Smakhtin and M. Anpuhas (2006). An Assessment of Environmental Flow Requirements of Indian River Basins. IWMI Research Report 107.*

The motivation for the paper is in doubt because it does not make it at all clear why we should be at all interested in the specification of environmental flow levels at the National level. These are, importantly, specific to individual catchments and even sub-catchments. Hence, National level aggregators are meaningless.

Environmental flows are (correctly) stated on p8 to be a trade-off between water resource development and river health. The remainder of the paper however ignores the relevance of the resource development side of that trade-off and deals only with the river health/ecology story.

The ecological studies used as the basis for the river health determination are based on analyses of the condition of the rivers and their types. This approach does not consider how the river's health will respond to increases in flows. A river, for instance, may be so degraded that more water will not help or its degradation issues are not flow responsive. Hence, the ecological advantage from increased environmental flows – the required benefit to be traded off against any foregone developmental benefits that may be foregone as a result of the change in flow management is not considered. Put simply, what is required is a tool that will predict the ecological improvements that will be generated by a change in environmental flow. This can then be traded off against the costs to development of that water.

Hence the paper needs to take a different perspective ... one of trade-offs involving change.

*Anton Earle, Jaqui Goldin, Rose Machiridza, Daniel Malzbender, Emmanuel Manzungu and Tiego Mpho (2006). **Indigenous and Institutional Profile: Limpopo River Basin**, IWMI Working Paper 112.*

The ethnographic section of this paper is an interesting compilation but there is no attempt to develop the relevance of the material to current water management issues. The depth of information presented could be reduced to target the elements that are relevant and the relevance pointed out.

Similarly, the treatment of the pre-colonial period takes an historical perspective but does not attempt to interpret the relevance of the water management institutions that were in evidence. Contrary to what may be expected from such a piece, there is a heavy emphasis on the colonial period institutions. Expectations are that these institutions are largely irrelevant to the objective of the paper.

The work presented represents a relatively high risk research activity akin to “prospecting” for a water management institutional structure that if already established would have exerted evolutionary pressure to emerge as “successful” and then dominate other inferior options. A question that must be addressed in this type of work is what stops the comparative advantage of ‘prospective’ institutions from previous periods from being evident now and hence from being adopted?

A weakness of the paper is its failure to separate out the “chieftenship” (who is the leader) from what the leaders established by way of rules for water use. Customary organizational structures are important but it's the customary rules that are the most interesting in thinking about the establishment of new institutions that will be enforced by different, current, governance organizations. It is the “customary law” that deserves particular analysis.

So whilst this paper represents a useful, if somewhat superfluously detailed background, it does not leave the reader with any strong conclusions regarding the viability of customary law for water management.

## **Annex 6. Governance Survey Participants**

### **“CSC Group”<sup>26</sup>**

Dr. Hussein El-Atfy, NWRC, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Dr. James E. Hill, UC Davis, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Dr. Ruth Meinzen-Dick, IFPRI, representative, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Dr. To Phuc Tuong, IRRI, member, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)  
Prof. Frank Rijsberman, Google.org, former Chair, CPWF Consortium Steering Committee (CSC)

### **“Management Group”<sup>27</sup>**

Dr. Winston Andah, Basin Coordinator (CSIR staff)  
Dr. Luis Bassoi, CPWF Basin Coordinator (EMBRAPA staff)  
Dr. Simon Cook, CPWF Coordinator Basin Focal Projects (CIAT staff)  
Dr. Kim Geheb, CPWF Mekong Basin Coordinator and Management Team Member (MRC staff)  
Ms. Pamela George, CPWF Programme Manager  
Dr. Francis Gichuki, CPWF Theme 4 Leader (IWMI staff)  
Dr. Nader Heydari, Basin Coordinator (AERI staff)  
Dr. Annette Huber-Lee, Leader CPWF Theme 5 and Management Team Member (IFPRI staff)  
Dr. Elizabeth Humphries, Leader CPWF Theme 1 (IRRI staff)  
Ms. Marcia Macomber, CPWF Capacity Building Coordinator  
Ms. Maria Catalina Ramirez, Assistant Basin Coordinator (CONDESAN staff)  
Dr. Claudia Ringler, Co-Leader CPWF Theme 5 (IFPRI staff)  
Dr. Massoud Shaker, South Africa, former Basin Coordinator (ARC staff)  
Dr. Alok Kumar Sikka, CPWF Basin Coordinator (ICAR staff)  
Dr. Alain Vidal, CPWF Management Team Member (CEMAGREF staff)  
Dr. Jonathan Woolley, CPWF Programme Coordinator

---

<sup>26</sup> An empty survey form has been received electronically from the current Chair of the CSC, Dr. David Molden, who indicated having had technical problems.

<sup>27</sup> One member of the Management Team had erroneously forwarded the survey to several project leaders, of whom two completed surveys were received. These answers have, however, not been included in the analysis.

## ***Annex 7. Governance Survey – Analysis of Responses Received***

### **Recipient and response info**

#### **Survey timing**

- The online survey was started by means of an email by Jonathan Woolley on May 28, 2007, giving basic information and providing the link to the online survey website
- The survey was closed on June 11, 2007 after an extension of the deadline

#### **Survey target group**

- The survey has been sent to a total of 49 individuals that were grouped into a
  - “CSC” group of 25 individuals:
    - 17 current CSC members
    - 1 representative for a vacant CSC position
    - 5 former CSC members, including the former chair
    - 2 representatives to the CSC (representing members)
  - Management group of 24 individuals
    - 6 (all) members of the current management team
    - 4 theme leaders (one theme leader included in management team)
    - 1 theme co-leader
    - 8 basin coordinators (one basin coordinator included in management team)
    - 1 former basin coordinator
    - 4 other coordinators (basin focal projects, capacity building, communications, impact analysis)

#### **Survey response**

- A total of 21 completed<sup>28</sup> surveys were received from the original survey recipients<sup>29</sup>
- Only 5 individuals from the CSC group completed the survey, leading to a very low response rate of 20%. In addition to this, one of these respondents only answered questions 1 through 10, leaving questions 11 to 24 unanswered. **Therefore, the survey can not be considered statistically representative for the CSC group.**
- A total of 16 individuals from the management group answered the survey, leading to a response rate of 67%.
- Two additional survey responses were received from people not on the survey recipient list (due to forwarding of the invitation email by a theme leader) and were not included into the analysis.

---

<sup>28</sup> One CSC member stopped the survey after question 10 but was included nevertheless. All other incomplete surveys that were excluded from the analysis had total online times of 3 minutes or less and answered one or none of the survey questions. Another survey recipient indicated due to technical difficulties his completed survey was not saved.

<sup>29</sup> In one case, an assistant answered for his/her superior who received the survey.

Analysis	Number of respondents	Number of recipients	% of recipients responding
CSC	5	25	20%
Management	16	24	67%
All	21	49	43%

## B. Questions and answer statistics<sup>30</sup>

### 1. How satisfied are you with the overall program performance?

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Slightly unsatisfied	Highly unsatisfied
CSC	0 0%	3 60%	1 20%	1 20%
Management	2 13%	9 56%	5 31%	0 0%
Total	2 10%	12 57%	6 29%	1 5%
100% of survey participants answered this question				

### 2. Please comment on question number 1. (omitted because of confidentiality)

### 3. In your view, will the program be able to reach its stated objectives within the planned time frame?

	Yes, certainly	Probably yes	Probably not	No, impossible
CSC	0 0%	3 60%	1 20%	1 20%
Management	0 0%	12 75%	4 25%	0 0%
Total	0 0%	15 71%	5 24%	1 5%
100% of survey participants answered this question				

<sup>30</sup> Percentages may not add up exactly to 100% due to rounding.

4. Please comment on question number 3. (omitted because of confidentiality)

5. How important is achieving development impact (food security, poverty alleviation, improved health, environmental security) in addition to research results for the Water and Food Challenge Program?

	Research results more important	Equally important	Development impact more important
CSC	0 0%	4 80%	1 20%
Management	3 19%	9 56%	4 25%
Total	3 14%	13 62%	5 24%
100% of survey participants answered this question			

6. Please comment on question number 5. (omitted because of confidentiality)

7. How would you rate the partnerships of the program in terms of the dimensions below?

a. Quality

	Quality			
	Highly satisfactory	Somewhat satisfactory	Somewhat unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory
CSC	0 0%	2 50%	2 50%	0 0%
Management	2 13%	13 81%	1 6%	0 0%
Total	2 10%	15 75%	3 15%	0 0%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

b. Quantity

	Quantity			
	Highly satisfactory	Somewhat satisfactory	Somewhat unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	7 44%	7 44%	2 13%	0 0%
Total	8 40%	9 45%	3 15%	0 0%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

c. Appropriate type of institutions

	Appropriate type of institutions			
	Highly satisfactory	Somewhat satisfactory	Somewhat unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory
CSC	1 25%	3 75%	0 0%	0 0%
Management	3 19%	11 69%	2 13%	0 0%
Total	4 20%	14 70%	2 10%	0 0%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

8. Please specify for question number 7 above (and for quantity, please indicate whether too few or too many partnerships). (omitted because of confidentiality)

9. Does the program have the right balance between directly commissioning program activities versus allocating funds through competitive mechanisms?

	Yes. The balance is right	No there is too much activity directly commissioned,	No there are too many funds allocated through competitive mechanisms
CSC	1 20%	1 20%	3 60%
Management	10 63%	1 6%	5 31%
Total	11 52%	2 10%	8 38%
100% of survey participants answered this question			

10. Please specify for question number 9 above, what activities, if any at all, should be predominantly based on competitive bids. (omitted because of confidentiality)



11. Please indicate your satisfaction with the quality of Water and Food Challenge Program governance and management along the dimensions listed below

- a. Legitimacy. To what extent do the governance and management structures permit and facilitate the effective participation and voice of the different categories of stakeholders in the major governance and management decisions, taking into account their respective roles and relative importance?

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%	1 25%
Management	5 31%	8 50%	3 19%	0 0%
Total	7 35%	9 45%	3 15%	1 5%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

- b. Accountability. To what extent is accountability defined, accepted, and exercised along the chain of command and control, starting with the CSC and the participating centers' management and going down to the program coordinator, the program management team, theme leaders, basin coordinators and project leaders?

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	0 0%	3 75%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	1 6%	11 69%	3 19%	1 6%
Total	1 5%	14 70%	4 20%	1 5%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

- c. Responsibility to others. To what extent does the program accept and exercise responsibility to stakeholders who are not directly involved in the governance of the program and who are not part of the direct chain of accountability in the implementation of the program?

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	5 33%	4 27%	6 40%	0 0%
Total	7 37%	5 26%	7 37%	0 0%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

- d. Fairness. To what extent do partners and participants, similarly situated, have equal opportunity to influence the program and to receive benefits from the program (e.g. absence of barriers in terms of structure, process, language, technical or legal information)?

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	0 0%	3 75%	0 0%	1 25%
Management	7 44%	5 31%	4 25%	0 0%
Total	7 35%	8 40%	4 20%	1 5%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

- e. Transparency. To what extent are the program's decision-making, reporting, and evaluation processes open and freely available to the general public?

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	1 25%	1 25%	1 25%	1 25%
Management	5 33%	8 53%	2 13%	0 0%
Total	6 32%	9 47%	3 16%	1 5%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

- f. Efficiency. To what extent do the governance and management structures enhance efficiency or cost-effectiveness in the allocation and use of the program's resources?

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	1 25%	0 0%	2 50%	1 25%
Management	4 27%	5 33%	5 33%	1 7%
Total	5 26%	5 26%	7 37%	2 11%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

- g. Probity. To what extent do all persons in leadership positions adhere to high standards of ethics and professional conduct over and above compliance with the rules and regulations governing the operation of the program?

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	2 50%	0 0%	2 50%	0 0%
Management	10 63%	6 38%	0 0%	0 0%
Total	12 60%	6 30%	2 10%	0 0%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

12. Follow-up to question 11: Please provide comments/suggestions and/or specific examples illustrating your choices in question 11 above. (omitted because of confidentiality)

13. Please indicate your satisfaction with the performance of the Consortium Steering Committee (CSC) in terms of the following functions:
- Giving strategic direction (e.g., exercising effective leadership that optimizes the use of the financial, human, social, and technological resources of the program. Establishing a vision or a mission for the program, reviewing and approving strategic documents, and establishing operational policies and guidelines. Continually monitoring the effectiveness of the program's governance arrangements and making changes as needed.

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	0 0%	1 25%
Management	2 14%	9 64%	3 21%	0 0%
Total	3 17%	11 61%	3 17%	1 6%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

- b. Exercising management oversight (e.g., monitoring managerial performance and program implementation, appointing key personnel, approving annual budgets and business plans, and overseeing major capital expenditures. Promoting high performance and efficient processes by establishing an appropriate balance between control by the CSC and entrepreneurship by the management team. Monitoring compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, and with the regulations and procedures of the host organization, as the case may be.)

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	4 29%	6 43%	4 29%	0 0%
Total	5 28%	8 44%	5 28%	0 0%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

- c. Fostering stakeholder participation (e.g., establishing policies for inclusion of stakeholders in programmatic activities. Ensuring adequate consultation, communication, transparency, and disclosure in relation to program stakeholders that are not represented on the governing bodies of the program.)

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	0 0%	1 25%
Management	2 17%	5 42%	5 42%	0 0%
Total	3 19%	7 44%	5 31%	1 6%
76% of survey participants answered this question				

- d. Risk management (e.g., establishing a policy for managing risks and monitoring the implementation of the policy. Ensuring that the volume of financial resources is commensurate with the program's needs and that the sources of finance are adequately diversified to mitigate financial shocks.)

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	0 0%	2 67%	1 33%	0 0%
Management	1 8%	7 54%	5 38%	0 0%
Total	1 6%	9 56%	6 38%	0 0%
76% of survey participants answered this question				

- e. Conflict management (e.g., monitoring and managing the potential conflicts of interest of members of the governing body and staff of the management unit. Monitoring and managing conflicting interests among program partners and participants, especially those that arise during the process of program implementation.)

	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	1 33%	2 67%	0 0%	0 0%
Management	3 23%	5 38%	5 38%	0 0%
Total	4 25%	7 44%	5 31%	0 0%
76% of survey participants answered this question				

- f. Audit and evaluation (e.g., ensuring the integrity of the program's accounting and financial reporting systems, including independent audits. Setting evaluation policy, commissioning evaluations in a timely way, and overseeing management uptake and implementation of accepted recommendations. Ensuring that evaluations lead to learning and programmatic enhancement.)

	Audit and evaluation (e.g., ensuring the integrity of the program's accounting and financial reporting systems, including independent audits. Setting evaluation policy, commissioning evaluations in a timely way, and overseeing management uptake and implementation of accepted recommendations. Ensuring that evaluations lead to learning and programmatic enhancement.)			
	Highly satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	0 0%	1 25%
Management	4 36%	7 64%	0 0%	0 0%
Total	5 33%	9 60%	0 0%	1 7%
71% of survey participants answered this question				

14. Follow-up to question 13 Please provide comments/suggestions and/or specific examples illustrating your choices in question 13 above. (omitted because of confidentiality)

15. How much do you agree / disagree with the following statements:

- a. "The CSC is representing the program's interests in a balanced way"

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	0 0%	1 25%	1 25%	2 50%
Management	0 0%	4 29%	8 57%	2 14%
Total	0 0%	5 28%	9 50%	4 22%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

- b. “The presence of IWMI and other CGIAR center representatives on the CSC introduces some institutional interests into CSC recommendations/decisions”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	0 0%	0 0%	4 100%	0 0%
Management	0 0%	3 19%	11 69%	2 13%
Total	0 0%	3 15%	15 75%	2 10%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

- c. “The CSC is an advisory body without decision-making power”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	6 40%	4 27%	4 27%	1 7%
Total	8 42%	5 26%	5 26%	1 5%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

- d. “De facto the CSC is a program steering committee with decision-making power”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	1 25%	1 25%	1 25%	1 25%
Management	2 14%	5 36%	3 21%	4 29%
Total	3 17%	6 33%	4 22%	5 28%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

e. “De facto the CSC is an independent governance body”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	0 0%	1 25%	3 75%	0 0%
Management	4 31%	5 38%	2 15%	2 15%
Total	4 24%	6 35%	5 29%	2 12%
81% of survey participants answered this question				

f. “Individual CSC membership should be limited to a couple of years”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	3 25%	5 42%	2 17%	2 17%
Total	4 25%	7 44%	3 19%	2 13%
76% of survey participants answered this question				

g. “The CSC should be smaller”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	1 25%	1 25%	2 50%	0 0%
Management	4 27%	3 20%	5 33%	3 20%
Total	5 26%	4 21%	7 37%	3 16%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

h. “The CSC should meet more often”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	0 0%	1 25%	1 25%	2 50%
Management	3 20%	4 27%	5 33%	3 20%
Total	3 16%	5 26%	6 32%	5 26%
90% of survey participants answered this question				



i. “The current CSC composition should be changed”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	1 25%	1 25%	2 50%	0 0%
Management	3 23%	5 38%	4 31%	1 8%
Total	4 24%	6 35%	6 35%	1 6%
81% of survey participants answered this question				

j. “Development NGOs should be (more) present on the CSC”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	1 25%	0 0%	3 75%	0 0%
Management	1 7%	1 7%	5 36%	7 50%
Total	2 11%	1 6%	8 44%	7 39%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

k. “Donors should be present on the CSC”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	1 25%	1 25%	0 0%	2 50%
Management	1 7%	6 40%	6 40%	2 13%
Total	2 11%	7 37%	6 32%	4 21%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

l. “The CSC should be chaired by a senior professional without institutional affiliation to the Water and Food Challenge program”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	0 0%	0 0%	2 50%	2 50%
Management	1 6%	2 13%	5 31%	8 50%
Total	1 5%	2 10%	7 35%	10 50%
95% of survey participants answered this question				

m. “The main governance body should include mainly senior professionals without institutional affiliation to the Water and Food Challenge program”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	1 7%	5 36%	6 43%	2 14%
Total	2 11%	7 39%	7 39%	2 11%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

n. “The CSC should set up an independent audit subcommittee”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	0 0%	0 0%	2 50%	2 50%
Management	0 0%	3 21%	5 36%	6 43%
Total	0 0%	3 17%	7 39%	8 44%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

o. “The overall governance setup should be changed”

	Strongly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Strongly agree
CSC	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	2 14%	4 29%	5 36%	3 21%
Total	4 22%	5 28%	6 33%	3 17%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

16. Follow-up to question 15: Please provide comments/suggestions and/or specific examples illustrating your choices in question 15 above. (omitted because of confidentiality)

17. Please indicate your satisfaction with the performance of the Program Management in terms of the following functions:

- a. Program implementation (e.g., managing financial and human resources. Reviewing proposals for inclusion in the portfolio of activities and allocating financial resources among activities. Supervising the implementation of activities. Contracting with implementing or executing agencies to implement individual activities. Ensuring that these agencies are self-monitoring and reporting their progress in a timely way.)

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Slightly unsatisfied	Highly unsatisfied
CSC	0 0%	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%
Management	3 20%	7 47%	5 33%	0 0%
Total	3 16%	8 42%	7 37%	1 5%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

- b. Regulatory compliance (e.g., ensuring compliance with all applicable laws and regulations at the international, national, and institutional levels, including the regulations and procedures of the host organization, as the case may be. Being aware of and adhering to these requirements and standards on a day to-day basis.)

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Slightly unsatisfied	Highly unsatisfied
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%
Management	8 53%	7 47%	0 0%	0 0%
Total	9 47%	9 47%	1 5%	0 0%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

- c. Reviewing and reporting (e.g., taking stock of the overall performance of the portfolio in relation to the program's objectives and strategies. Reporting progress to the CSC including any adverse effects of the program's activities. Serving the needs of the CSC by preparing strategies, policy statements, etc.)

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Slightly unsatisfied	Highly unsatisfied
CSC	0 0%	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%
Management	5 36%	6 43%	3 21%	0 0%
Total	5 28%	7 39%	5 28%	1 6%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

- d. Administrative efficiency (e.g., maintaining a lean administrative cost structure (while recognizing that administrative costs tend to be higher during the launch period of a global partnership program). Proposing ways to maintain high performance while reducing costs to increase operational effectiveness.)

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Slightly unsatisfied	Highly unsatisfied
CSC	0 0%	3 75%	0 0%	1 25%
Management	3 20%	7 47%	5 33%	0 0%
Total	3 16%	10 53%	5 26%	1 5%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

- e. Stakeholder communication (e.g., implementing CSC-approved policies for stakeholder inclusion in programmatic activities. Finding ways to increase the effectiveness of stakeholder participation in all aspects of the program.)

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Slightly unsatisfied	Highly unsatisfied
CSC	1 25%	2 50%	0 0%	1 25%
Management	3 21%	4 29%	7 50%	0 0%
Total	4 22%	6 33%	7 39%	1 6%
86% of survey participants answered this question				

- f. Fostering learning (e.g., distilling and discerning lessons from the implementation of activities across the portfolio. Transmitting these lessons to both Consortium partners, CPWF participants and beneficiaries in general, in order to inform policy making and to enhance implementation of activities.)

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Slightly unsatisfied	Highly unsatisfied
CSC	0 0%	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%
Management	4 27%	4 27%	5 33%	2 13%
Total	4 21%	6 32%	6 32%	3 16%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

- g. Performance assessment (e.g., reviewing the performance of program participants on a regular basis, as well as the performance of consultants at the end of their assignments.)

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Slightly unsatisfied	Highly unsatisfied
CSC	0 0%	2 50%	1 25%	1 25%
Management	2 13%	9 60%	4 27%	0 0%
Total	2 11%	11 58%	5 26%	1 5%
90% of survey participants answered this question				

18. Follow-up to question 17: Please provide comments/suggestions and/or specific examples illustrating your choices in question 17 above: (omitted because of confidentiality)

19. The Challenge Program Secretariat is hosted by the International Water Management Institute (IWMI); the program coordinator and the secretariat staff are employed by IWMI on behalf of the CPWF. To what extent does this situation lead to a two masters problem, i.e. to a situation of unclear or overlapping responsibilities of program management towards the CSC on the one hand and towards IWMI management on the other hand?

a. The Program Coordinator?

	100% responsible towards IWMI	Mainly responsible towards IWMI	Responsibility evenly distributed towards IWMI and CSC	Mainly responsible towards CSC	100% responsible towards CSC
CSC	0 0%	1 25%	0 0%	2 50%	1 25%
Management	0 0%	0 0%	5 33%	4 27%	6 40%
Total	0 0%	1 5%	5 26%	6 32%	7 37%
90% of survey participants answered this question					

b. The Program Management Team?

	100% responsible towards IWMI	Mainly responsible towards IWMI	Responsibility evenly distributed towards IWMI and CSC	Mainly responsible towards CSC	100% responsible towards CSC
CSC	0 0%	0 0%	2 50%	2 50%	0 0%
Management	0 0%	0 0%	3 21%	5 36%	6 43%
Total	0 0%	0 0%	5 28%	7 39%	6 33%
86% of survey participants answered this question					

c. The Program Secretariat?

	100% responsible towards IWMI	Mainly responsible towards IWMI	Responsibility evenly distributed towards IWMI and CSC	Mainly responsible towards CSC	100% responsible towards CSC
CSC	1 25%	1 25%	0 0%	2 50%	0 0%
Management	0 0%	1 7%	5 33%	3 20%	6 40%
Total	1 5%	2 11%	5 26%	5 26%	6 32%
90% of survey participants answered this question					

20. The Water and Food Challenge Program itself is based on a Joint Venture Agreement, originally between 18 national and international organizations, including 5 CGIAR research centers, 6 National Agricultural Research and Extension Systems (NARES) institutions, 4 Advanced Research Institutes (ARIs) and 2 international NGOs and 1 River Basin Organization. The composition of the Consortium Steering Committee reflects this setup. IWMI chairs the CSC and also hosts the secretariat. To what extent does this setup lead to potential conflict of interest in the sense that CSC decisions may be driven by institutional interests of CSC members rather than programmatic interests?

a. CGIAR centers in the CSC?

	CSC decisions tend to be mainly driven by institutional interests of this CSC subgroup	Some institutional interests of this subgroup tend to be reflected in CSC decisions	CSC decisions are taken independent of institutional interests of this subgroup
CSC	1 25%	3 75%	0 0%
Management	7 54%	5 38%	1 8%
Total	8 47%	8 47%	1 6%
81% of survey participants answered this question			

b. IWMI?

	CSC decisions tend to be mainly driven by institutional interests of this CSC subgroup	Some institutional interests of this subgroup tend to be reflected in CSC decisions	CSC decisions are taken independent of institutional interests of this subgroup
CSC	1 25%	3 75%	0 0%
Management	1 8%	11 85%	1 8%
Total	2 12%	14 82%	1 6%
81% of survey participants answered this question			

c. NARES in the CSC?

	CSC decisions tend to be mainly driven by institutional interests of this CSC subgroup	Some institutional interests of this subgroup tend to be reflected in CSC decisions	CSC decisions are taken independent of institutional interests of this subgroup
CSC	0 0%	3 75%	1 25%
Management	0 0%	6 50%	6 50%
Total	0 0%	9 56%	7 44%
76% of survey participants answered this question			

d. ARIs in the CSC?

	CSC decisions tend to be mainly driven by institutional interests of this CSC subgroup	Some institutional interests of this subgroup tend to be reflected in CSC decisions	CSC decisions are taken independent of institutional interests of this subgroup
CSC	0 0%	1 25%	3 75%
Management	1 8%	9 69%	3 23%
Total	1 6%	10 59%	6 35%
81% of survey participants answered this question			

e. NGOs in the CSC?

	CSC decisions tend to be mainly driven by institutional interests of this CSC subgroup	Some institutional interests of this subgroup tend to be reflected in CSC decisions	CSC decisions are taken independent of institutional interests of this subgroup
CSC	1 25%	1 25%	2 50%
Management	0 0%	5 38%	8 62%
Total	1 6%	6 35%	10 59%
81% of survey participants answered this question			

f. RBOs in the CSC?

	RBOs in the CSC?		
	CSC decisions tend to be mainly driven by institutional interests of this CSC subgroup	Some institutional interests of this subgroup tend to be reflected in CSC decisions	CSC decisions are taken independent of institutional interests of this subgroup
CSC	0 0%	1 25%	3 75%
Management	0 0%	4 31%	9 69%
Total	0 0%	5 29%	12 71%
81% of survey participants answered this question			



21. Do you think the current situation as described in the above questions 19 and 20 needs to be improved in any way?

	Yes	No
CSC	3 75%	1 25%
Management	13 93%	1 7%
Total	16 89%	2 11%
86% of survey participants answered this question		

22. If you answered yes to question number 21 above, what could be realistic options? (omitted because of confidentiality)
23. Please comment on the advantages and disadvantages of the current hosting and joint venture arrangements. (omitted because of confidentiality)
24. Please add any additional suggestions, comments or feedback you might have. (omitted because of confidentiality)