# SIAC Partnership: Virginia Tech, CIP & CIFOR

Minneapolis, July 25 2014

CGIAR | Independent Science and Partnership Council

# Description of Partnership

Independent Science and Partnership Council

**CGIAR**

# Partners

1. Jeffrey Alwang, George Norton, Brad Mills, and Catherine Larochelle, Virginia Tech
2. Guy Hareau, CIP; Daniel Suryadarma, CIFOR

# Project Objectives

Project concept grew out of DIIVA experience & a small project assessing impact of community forestry program with CIFOR. Main goal is to strengthen impact assessment.

Main objectives

- Classify research at CIFOR and CIP as to whether and how impact assessment can be done
- Suggest IA methods and approaches for the various research themes
- Assess CRP-specific impact pathways and theories of change, and develop means to measure impacts;
- Assess current impact-related data collection/archiving methods and suggest potential improvements
- Conduct two pilot IAs with CIFOR and CIP jointly with IA officers and scientists
- Conduct learning workshops for project participants and other audiences

CGIAR | Independent Science and Partnership Council

# Methods

- Planning meeting and interviews with Center administration and research theme leaders;
- Review data availability, utility for IA and a means of enhanced collection, storage and access to IA-related data;
- Center-located workshops on IA techniques;
- Two in-depth pilot IAs in each Center;
- Final synthesis workshop
- Project end-date is December 2015

# Progress to Date

1. **Planning meetings and initial visits completed**

   - 3-day visits (Alwang and Norton to CIP; Alwang and Mills to CIFOR);

   - Interviews with administration and scientists;

   - Overview of ongoing changes to data management;

   - Develop criteria for evaluating candidate IAs;

   - Workshop to build consensus about value of IA and identify pilot IAs

2. **Pilot IAs identified**

3. **Remainder of work plan agreed upon**

CGIAR | Independent Science and Partnership Council

# Criteria for selection of pilot IAs

1. **Feasibility**
   - **Time and resources (ability to leverage)**
   - **Amenable to measurement**
   - **Feasible counterfactuals**
2. **Potential to demonstrate impact/size of impact**
3. **Innovative study/showcase challenges/learning**
4. **Ability to attribute**
5. **High priority for Center**
6. **Regional preferences**

CGIAR | Independent Science and Partnership Council

# Data for IA

1. **Important differences across centers (both have major data initiatives)**

2. **CIP:**

   - **Experimental data from field trials being systematized and entered into a common database**

     - Need to incorporate IA-specific data into system

     - Patterns of diffusion over time; information on spatial spread

     - Market prices and other relevant data

3. **CIFOR:**

   - **Household survey data being catalogued and systematized**

   - **Not clear what data could be systematized to facilitate regular IA for policy-oriented research (meta-data on policy domain?)**

CGIAR | Independent Science and Partnership Council

# Pilot IAs

1. **CIP:**

   - C88 variety in China

     - Wide adoption, good attribution to CIP

   - The CIP genebank

     - Lower-bound estimate based on increased efficiency of research output

2. **CIFOR:**

   - Furniture value chain in Indonesia (action-oriented research)

     - Baseline survey conducted as a part of the initial work; several years of gestation; has impact grown or dissipated?

   - SWAMP: Measurement of carbon sequestered in peat bogs and mangroves

     - High potential impact; has already had impact on IPCC; forward looking

# Way forward

1. **Develop concept notes for pilot studies**

    • Leverage funds, where possible

2. **Develop concept notes for strategic IA for each Center**

    • Importance of data (CIP)

    • Classify research themes and appropriate IA (both centers)

3. **Identify data needs for pilot IAs**

CGIAR | Independent Science and Partnership Council

# Questions? Comments?