CCAFS theory of change: envisaged change mechanisms, hypotheses, some key partners

**ToC**
- **HOW:** Working with partners to understand how information strengthens institutions and services
  - Effective use of climate information enables CSA
    - Better climate information response systems manage risk & build resilience
  - Overcoming climate information gaps improves women’s control of productive assets

**Assumptions in CGIAR SRF**
- **SLOs**
  - Monitoring, learning & evaluation
  - Site integration

**Partnerships and capacity for scaling CSA: five regions and global**
- Policy & institutional change
  - Communications
    - Knowledge management including open access
  - Policy and finance deliver CSA, food & nutrition security and poverty reduction at scale
    - Overcoming barriers to investment & adoption delivers CSA at scale
    - Scaling CSA enables women’s control of productive assets, food and nutrition security

**FP1 hypothesis**
- Multiple implementation partners e.g. NARES, CARE, Hivos, IIRR, CECOFACEN, FEDEARROZ, FENALCE, meteorological services, extension services, insurance and re-insurance companies

**FP2 hypothesis**
- Decision tools lead to better CSA policies & governance
  - Policies & mechanisms lead to large-scale low emissions development
  - Large-scale LED can increase decision making & control of productive assets by women

**FP3 hypothesis**
- Assumptions on political readiness for CSA

**FP4 hypothesis**
- Assumptions on institutional readiness for implementing CSA at scale

**GSI hypothesis**
- Multiple policy partners e.g. national governments in all target countries, GACSA, UNFCCC, WFP, WFO, CAADP, SEARCA, CAC, CCAC, Africa Group of Negotiators

**HOW:** Working with partners to understand what works for investment
- Multiple finance & policy partners e.g. regional development banks, bilateral donors, World Bank, IFAD, Green Climate Fund, ECOWAS, COMESA, ASEAN, SECC, Rainforest Alliance, Boot Capital

**How:** Working with partners to build field-based evidence
- Context-specific knowledge leads to local CSA adoption
  - LED practices can deliver significant GHG reductions & other CSA outcomes
  - Context-specific knowledge increases women’s control of productive assets

**How:** Working with partners to understand what works for investment
SLOs, IDOs, sub-IDOs targeted by CCAFS and relation to Flagships

FP1

Priority and Policies for Climate-Smart Agriculture

- Optimized consumption of diverse nutrient-rich foods
- Improved forecasting of impacts of climate change and targeted technology development
- Gender-equitable control of productive assets and resources
- Participation in decision-making
- Improved diets for poor and vulnerable people
- Enhanced environment for climate resilience
- Mitigation and adaptation achieved
- Enhanced capacity to deal with climatic risks, extremes

FP2

Low Emissions Development

- Reduced net GHG emissions from agriculture, forests and other forms of land use
- Increased incomes and employment
- More efficient use of inputs
- Enhanced smallholder market access
- Reduced production risk
- Increased capacity for innovation in partner development organizations and in poor and vulnerable communities

FP3

Low Emissions Development

- Land, water and forest degradation (including deforestation) minimized and reversed
- Natural capital enhanced and protected, especially from climate change
- Mitigation and adaptation achieved
- Improved natural resource systems and ecosystem services
- Reduced poverty
- Improved food and nutrition security for health
- National partners and beneficiaries enabled
- Increase resilience of the poor to climate change and other shocks
- Improved access to financial and other services

FP4

Climate-Smart Services and Safety Nets

- Reduced poverty
- More efficient use of inputs
- Enhanced smallholder market access
- Reduced production risk
- Increased capacity for innovation in partner development organizations and in poor and vulnerable communities
- National partners and beneficiaries enabled
- Increased resilience of the poor to climate change and other shocks
- Improved access to financial and other services

SLOs

Reduced poverty

IDs

Mitigation and adaptation achieved

- Reduced poverty
- More efficient use of inputs
- Enhanced smallholder market access
- Reduced production risk
- Increased capacity for innovation in partner development organizations and in poor and vulnerable communities
- National partners and beneficiaries enabled
- Increased resilience of the poor to climate change and other shocks
- Improved access to financial and other services

SLOs, IDOs, sub-IDOs targeted by CCAFS and relation to Flagships
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CGIAR Target</th>
<th>Target contribution</th>
<th>Unit of target</th>
<th>Amount Needed ($)</th>
<th>W1+W2 (%)</th>
<th>W3 (%)</th>
<th>Bilateral (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
<th>Synergies with other CRP's/ Platforms (click Ctrl for multiple selection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 million more farm households have adopted improved varieties, breeds or trees, and / or improved management practices</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>million farm households</td>
<td>53,823,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A4NH, Big Data, DCLAS, Fish, FTA, Genebanks, Genetic Gain platform, Livestock, Maize, PIM, Rice, RTB, WLE, Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 million people, of which 50% are women, assisted to exit poverty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>million people</td>
<td>35,880,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>A4NH, Big Data, DCLAS, Fish, FTA, Genebanks, Genetic Gain platform, Livestock, Maize, PIM, Rice, RTB, WLE, Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 million more people, of which 50% are women, without deficiencies in one or more of the following essential micronutrients: iron, zinc, iodine, vitamin A, folate and vitamin B12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>million people</td>
<td>24,315,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>A4NH, Big Data, DCLAS, FTA, Genebanks, Genetic Gain platform, Livestock, Maize, PIM, Rice, RTB, WLE, Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce agriculturally-related greenhouse gas emissions by 0.2 Gt CO2-e yr−1 (5%) compared with business-as-usual scenario in 2022</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Gt CO2e/yr</td>
<td>5,300,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>FTA, Livestock, Maize, PIM, Rice, WLE, Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 million ha of forest saved from deforestation</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>million ha</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>FTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning & Impact Assessment (MELIA) strategy

• Centred on adaptive management, self-reflection & iterative learning, outcome delivery, impact assessment, internal & external evaluations, performance management

• Results-based management used to operationalize research for development aimed at contributing to the SDGs

• Focused on impact pathways based on theories of change, leading towards outcomes and impacts

• An approach to (and guidance for) monitoring assumptions along the IP and assembling evidence of outcome contributions and impacts achieved

• Focus shift towards delivery of outcomes that are influenced by multiple factors often beyond our direct control: performance evaluation that goes beyond research output delivery
Evaluations & reviews, 2017-2022

To include:

• Testing IPs and evaluating ToC hypotheses & assumptions (all Flagships)
• Climate Smart Villages as testing and learning platforms
• CCAFS data and tools: uptake and impact
• Integrative work of ICRPs: integrating tools and mechanisms
• Regions, countries: should the focus change?
• Partnerships and capacity development: are they effective for outcome delivery
• Evaluating the gender & social inclusion IPs
CCAFS Baselines 2011-2013 for future program assessment

21 core sites, 15 countries, >2400 households, 120 villages. All data & instruments open access. Indicators include food security, assets, production & selling diversity, adaptation & innovation, mitigation behaviour, gender differences in information access & use.

Site KE01: Nyando / Katuk Odeyo

Food Security Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% households</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 hungry months/year</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 hungry months/</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hungry months/</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hungry months/</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food all year round/No hungry period</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food security organisation density links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation receives</th>
<th>Male groups</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation provides</th>
<th>Male groups</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female groups</th>
<th>Organisation provides</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of food security work of organisations based outside the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational link ratio</th>
<th>Male groups</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability (production)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access (market)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female groups</th>
<th>Organisational link ratio</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability (production)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access (market)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main source of food throughout the year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Households</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>own farm</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off farm</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Shortages throughout the year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Households</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shortage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no shortage</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to Managing Agricultural Research for Learning and Outcomes (MARLO)

MARLO is an online platform assisting CRPs in their strategic results-based program planning and reporting of research projects. It covers project cycle from planning to project reporting, learning, and outcome-focused programmatic report generation with some additional synthesizing input at the flagship and cross-cutting level.

PLEASE NOTE that by using the system, you consent to the information being used on the public CRP websites and other knowledge sharing platforms. The information you input should therefore be complete and suitable for an external audience.
Responding to perceived demand for epIAs and the external evaluation

- CCAFS program participants are required to submit ToCs and report annually on outcomes (lead indicators for impacts)

- Outcomes are formally appraised: a key criterion in CCAFS’ RBM

- Delivery of epIAs a formal requirement for all Centres participating

- The need to better link outcome and impact assessments:
  - Use IA for hypotheses testing and validating ToCs
  - Measure against the 2011-2013 CCAFS baseline (and other) surveys in 2018, for evaluating Flagship IPs
  - Ensure that epIAs assess impacts that are explicitly linked to the outcomes reported annually and associated ToC
  - Ensure that epIAs address hypotheses on gender, youth and social inclusion
Challenges, constraints, needs

- Completion of links from projects to the SLOs: there is work to be done (not just CCAFS)

- Do we have appropriate incentives in place at different levels (researchers, partners, project teams, CRPs, ...)?

- Methodologies needed for appropriate impact assessments at different stages along the IP: much work to be done

- Utilising impact assessment to show that the portfolio is bigger than the sum of the parts, at both CRP (Σ projects) and system (Σ CRPs) level: how (and who) to do this?