



# FIRST WORKSHOP OF CGIAR EVALUATION COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE (ECOP)

ROME, 29-31 OCTOBER 2013

## WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

41 people, including 26 from CRPs and Centers, as well as representatives of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA), the Consortium Office and the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) attended the launch workshop of the CGIAR Evaluation Community of Practice (ECOP), held near Rome, Italy from 29-31 October 2013.

The main objectives of the workshop were to launch the Evaluation Community of Practice (ECOP), strengthen networks of people working on evaluation across the CGIAR, introduce key elements of the CGIAR evaluation policy and guidance, and finally to collect initial ideas on the focus and future activities for the ECOP.

The workshop combined information sessions, which included presentations on the CGIAR Evaluation Policy and its practical implications for CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs); as well as discussion sessions that provided opportunities for participants to raise common issues and challenges and suggest ways forward. Six CRPs presented their current evaluation and/or monitoring plans for participants to discuss and provide feedback.

Workshop participants raised a number of important issues for evaluation in the CGIAR, including lack of human and financial resources as well as the need for clarity on the different roles between IEA, Consortium Office and the SPIA. It was also noted that many of the participants in the workshop have professional responsibilities beyond evaluation, such as monitoring, impact assessment, or knowledge management. Only a handful of people have a background in monitoring and evaluation (as opposed to social research, economics, or impact assessment) and many of these are in specific donor-funded projects.

A major conclusion of the workshop was that an Evaluation Community of Practice (ECOP) is needed to strengthen and support the increased focus and expectations for evaluation in CGIAR. Expected benefits and activities include capacity building, information and experience-sharing, harmonization, and learning.

The principal next step for the ECOP is to identify possible activities for the next year (2014 – 2015), and providing next steps for ECOP stewards and ECOP members.

Five people have volunteered as ECOP Stewards for the coming year (2013-2014), who will start their work in November 2013. IEA will have an important role in supporting learning and capacity building in evaluation throughout the CGIAR.

An evaluation of the workshop indicated that it mostly reached the objectives it set out, and was well organized. Most feedback indicated that more work would be needed to clearly define the scope and activities of the ECOP. See Annex 3 for more information on participant feedback on workshop.



## BACKGROUND TO THE ECOP

The concept of the CGIAR Evaluation Community of Practice originated in the CGIAR Evaluation Policy (Feb 2012) and draft Guidance Note on the ECOP (March 2012).

The Evaluation Policy marks a major shift in the approach to evaluation in the CGIAR. Instead of being an activity instigated by outsiders the Policy promotes evaluation as being an integral part of managerial and research activity right across the CGIAR and throughout the CRPs. The vision of the Policy is to construct a strong set of 'building blocks', with evaluations at research project and theme level feeding into evaluations of CRPs and of the CGIAR system as a whole.

In this context, the main purpose of the ECOP is to strengthen and support evaluation and evaluators throughout the CGIAR through trainings, information sharing and networking. In the Policy, IEA was given an important role in guiding and supporting the ECOP, while at the same time encouraging members to identify key issues and challenges, to give peer-to-peer support, and to feed back problems and suggestions to IEA.

The first ECOP workshop was held in October 2013. Below is a summary of the sessions and discussions<sup>1</sup>.

## SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP SESSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

### SESSION 1: INTRODUCTION TO EVALUATION IN CGIAR (1.5 HRS)

**Objective:** Help all participants get up to speed with the vision of evaluation in the reformed CGIAR, the role of central bodies (IEA, SPIA and the Consortium Office), and also to identify where more clarity is needed.

**Presentations:** Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin (IEA) and Anne-Marie-Izac (CO), and panel Q&A session with them and Tim Kelley (SPIA).

The session provided an overview of the current structure in the CGIAR for monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. It was explained that in the new CGIAR structure, system level monitoring is the responsibility of the Consortium Office, while IEA is responsible for evaluation in CGIAR, and SPIA's focus is on Impact Assessment.

Anne-Marie Izac (CO) presented the role the Consortium Office has in this new system, and explained that the CO is responsible for monitoring the progress and development of CRPs towards their goals. Through contracts

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: Presentations made during the workshop are accessible online:

<https://sites.google.com/site/ieacgiarECOP/workshop/workshop-materials> If you are not able to



signed between the Fund Council and the Consortium for each CRP, there is a legally binding obligation requiring the CO to monitor programmatic and financial performance of CRPs.

Rachel Bedouin (IEA) presented the work and role of IEA, which fall under two main areas: commissioning quality system level evaluations, and developing a mutually reinforcing and harmonized evaluation system in the CGIAR. She explained the new system is set up in response to the reform, strengthening independence of the evaluation function in support of greater accountability, learning and decision-making. In addition, the new system calls for the CRP Commissioned External Evaluations, which are foreseen to form the building blocks of the CRP evaluations commissioned by IEA.

Tim Kelley of ISPC-SPIA provided a background on the focus and role of SPIA, and explained that SPIA continues to support Centres in providing a strategic look on impact assessment across CGIAR, such as new methods for measuring adoption of CGIAR research. He explained that the work of SPIA was not to replace that of the Centers in impact assessment, as most ex-post impact assessments (90%) are done by Centers.

**Key discussion points:** Participants noted that there might be some overlap/lack of clarity on the boundaries between the CO, SPIA and IEA in terms of monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment in the CRPs and Centers. IEA is currently preparing position papers on this with SPIA and the CO. Participants also called for the need of harmonization (not standardization). There was also a concern on how to address the lack of resources (both financial and time) for scientists to be involved in evaluations. Another important issue raised was financing for evaluations commissioned by CRPs themselves. The CO's position is that this falls within the research budget and should not be counted as part of administrative overheads.

## **SESSION 2: CRP EVALUATIONS – EXPECTATIONS AND EXPERIENCE TO DATE (1.5 HRS)**

**Objective:** Clarify and discuss the objectives, process and preparation needed for CRP evaluations, and get some very early feedback.

**Presentations:** Sirkka Immonen (IEA) with verbal presentations by Markus Palenburg (independent consultant, FTA evaluation Team Leader) and Brian Belcher (FTA)

Sirkka Immonen (IEA) gave a presentation on the IEA commissioned CRP evaluations - their process, preparation and approaches. She explained that Evaluation Policy has set common practices and systematic approach through guidelines and standards for evaluations. The new evaluation system in CGIAR places particular emphasis on learning through including peer exchange, and engagement of stakeholders as well as emphasis on consultative processes through the CRP evaluation.

Markus Palenburg discussed with participants his experience as Team Leader of the IEA commissioned evaluation on the CRP on Forests Trees and Agroforestry. The main challenge identified so far has been with the operating environment of CRP, especially with the different reporting lines by researchers and the incentives for collaboration among research programs and for data management. He explained that the evaluation would include recommendations for the CRP, and stated that the "reference group" (which brings together representatives from programme management and stakeholders) helped create a positive environment to share findings.

Brian Belcher provided his input as representative of CRP-FTA on his experiences with the CRP evaluation. He explained that some may have originally thought that the evaluation came too soon, but in some ways the evaluation may have come too late as it will need to feed into the second call for CRP proposals. He stated that the experience with the CRP evaluation has been good, in that there is clear communications, transparency,



sharing of information and field visits. He noted that the evaluation has two different objectives, accountability and learning, and that those engaged were very interested in learning.

**Key discussion points:** Some participants felt reassured by the presentation from FTA, which is the first CRP to be evaluated by IEA, saying that the process (still underway) has been positive and ‘painless’ to date. A new (to the CGIAR) approach being used is an “evaluation reference group” that brings together the management of the program being evaluated and key stakeholders to plan and discuss the evaluation; and early experience with this is positive. However some participants are still concerned about the burden of preparing for and managing IEA evaluations, and many CRPs have only recently started serious operation and feel it is too early for them to be evaluated. It was explained that early CRP evaluations are likely to focus on processes, structures and institutions rather than outcomes.

### Session 3: **EVALUATION CHALLENGES AND INNOVATIONS (3 HRS)**

**Objectives:** (a) Discuss some common evaluation challenges, and share some options and innovations (b) Stimulate interest in possible topics for the ECOP to follow up in more depth (c) to identify areas of interest and experience within the ECOP.

**Presentation** by Irene Guijt on the use of innovative *Sensemaker* software for qualitative data which can be used as a tool to systematically interview partners, boundary users, next users of the Programs

This was followed by breakout groups on four main challenges identified by participants in their work (1) Evaluating the contribution of CGIAR research on policy changes at national and global levels; (2) Theories of change and their use in evaluation; (3) Links between monitoring and evaluation in the CGIAR; and (3) Managing CRP-level evaluations under real-world conditions.:

**Breakout groups discussed main challenges and possible solutions, these included:**

Evaluation and Policy Related Research: On the issue of evaluation of policy-related research, it was pointed out that IFPRI and A4NH are sponsoring a workshop on approaches and methods for policy process research. Such workshops could help develop a toolkit and some methodological guidance

Theories of Change (ToC) and their use in evaluation: Participants noted that there is significant diversity in approach and terminology which perhaps should be better aligned, and asked whether there should be any Quality Assurance process for testing ToC. In addition, participants noted the need for guidance notes and policy to support TOC development, in addition to the need to link TOC to both monitoring and evaluation.

Links between monitoring and evaluation in the CGIAR: Participants noted the need for capacity building. They also highlighted the challenge of evaluating, and monitoring multiple projects within CRPs, and the need to feed lessons from evaluations (and monitoring) into adaptations of the program. Participants also inquired as to when outcomes were defined, and which ones to monitor and what would be the best indicators to use for evaluation.

Evaluation under real world constraints: Participants noted challenges of measuring capacity to innovate and adapt, as well as alternatives to baselines; and how to embed learning processes into ToC. Recommendations included a CRP-wide survey on resourcing evaluation (and monitoring), a roster of evaluation experts who know the system, as well as capacity development.



#### **SESSION 4: THE IEA'S ROLLING EVALUATION WORK PLAN (REWP) (45 MIN)**

**Objective:** Discuss and propose the process for revising the REWP in 2014, including CRPs' own evaluation plans.

**Presentations** by Rachel Bedouin (IEA)

Rachel Bedouin presented the Rolling Evaluation Work Plan (REWP), which provides the approach and plan for IEA over the next four years, with plans to complete up to 10 CRP evaluations by 2016.

She also explained that an effort was made by IEA to collect and review past evaluative studies across the CGIAR, which identified limited monitoring information and the lack of evaluations studies of significant coverage since 2009. As such, IEA will focus on increased collaboration with CRPs for future evaluations, as CRP commissioned evaluations can form an important piece and building block for IEA commissioned CRP evaluations.

**Brief presentation on IEA database of evaluative studies:** Sophie Zimm (IEA)

Sophie Zimm (IEA) presented participants with some information on the evaluation database being developed by IEA. The current format is in Excel, and is accessible on ECOP page. The information contained now includes type of evaluations, reports from donors and evaluative studies sent in by centers and CRPs. She asked ECOP members to please provide feedback on improvements and recommendations.

**Key discussions:** Participants explained there may be a challenge in responding to the needs of IEA, Consortium Office, the CRP and researchers themselves. They also explained that there would be a methodological challenge to evaluate programs composed of several projects. With regards to the database it was mentioned that there is a need for coordination with SPIA, since they have a database of impact evaluations, and that the scope and objective of the database need to be clear to ensure effective development and maintenance.

#### **SESSION 5: ROLE OF CRP-COMMISSIONED EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS (CCEES) (1.5 HRS)**

**Objective:** Present information on CCEEs; to collect views on challenges, responses and needs for support.

**Presentation** by Julia Compton (for IEA), followed by breakout groups

Julia Compton explained that CCEEs are an important building block in the new CGIAR evaluation system. CCEEs should be commissioned by the independent governance bodies of CRPs, in principle replacing Center Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs). CCEEs should gradually move towards following CGIAR evaluation standards, for example using international evaluation criteria and improving consultation with stakeholders. The main audience for a CCEE is the CRP itself, but CCEEs are also important inputs to IEA-commissioned CRP evaluations.

**Key discussion points:** While some CRPs feel comfortable with CCEEs and are already starting to plan them, others feel very concerned by what they see as an additional burden on researchers and partners, and are unclear as to the benefits of commissioning CCEEs. Challenges raised included whether it is too early to start evaluations, how to prioritize areas to evaluate, the lack of human and financial resources to manage evaluations, and finding suitable consultants. Some participants were also concerned about making the envisaged switch from Center Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs) to CCEEs, as Center Boards are still seen as the major locus for demand of evaluations.

**SESSION 6: SPIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO CRP EVALUATIONS (30 MIN)**

**Objective:** to discuss a proposal for how SPIA might usefully contribute to IEA commissioned CRP evaluations by reviewing and assessing CRP claims of adoption and impact.

**Presentation** by Tim Kelley, SPIA

**Key discussion points:** Should SPIA take into account past research before CRPs started? Answer yes, for example the current study on Fusarium in chickpeas, where work started in 1978.

**SESSION 7: PROGRESS ON CRP EVALUATION PLANS (3 HRS)**

**Objectives:** Selected participants presented their M&E plans for feedback and discussion, with an objective of (a) obtaining constructive and friendly feedback from peers on evaluation/M&E plans (b) being inspired by hearing other people's plans and (c) discussing common challenges, including harmonization across CRPs, and how these might be addressed.

**Presentations from CRP M&E plans were made by:** (GRiSP) Sam Mohanty and Aliou Diagne, (WHEAT/MAIZE) Lone Badstue, (RTB) Dagmar Wittine, (A4NH) Nancy Johnson, (FTA) Jules Colomer and (AAS) Charlie Crissman.

**Key discussion points:** Participants noted a "mixed bag" of approaches and methods, and noted most CRPs were at an early stage of M&E and have focused on Theories of Change and monitoring indicators for reporting upwards. There was noticeable very little evaluation being conducted, and most is project/donor driven perhaps due to incentives for evaluation not being strong in the reformed CGIAR, and the incomplete nature of the reform causing structural tensions. Furthermore, most CRPs have not yet started to strategically plan for external evaluations to cover most important aspects and components of the CRPs. Harmonization in a number of areas (terminology) would be helpful but there are transaction costs to harmonization, so practical solutions should be found, for example setting minimum requirements for MIS systems.

The good ideas which were observed in the presentations included:

- The introduction of a management information system (MIS) to cover also the numerous bilateral projects (CIMMYT)
- Moving away from attribution to contribution and having several Theories of Change to describe the impact pathways of the CRP interventions (AAS)
- Building on the past, on the previous challenge programmes (A4NH)
- Working on mapping bilateral projects to the CRP themes and subthemes on the top (FTA)

Some of the "bumpy stuff" which was noted included:

- The increased amount of time needed from researchers during an evaluation and the risk of overburdening them
- The challenge of encouraging boundary partners in the monitoring and evaluation processes
- Although people talk about M&E systems, there is a clear lack of E (evaluation) within CRPs and a lack of monitoring as a foundation for E
- Risk of duplication within the CGIAR in case each CRP uses their own information system (CIMMYT)

**SESSION 8: NEXT STEPS FOR THE EVALUATION COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE (3.5 HOURS)**

**Objective:** to agree the way forward for the ECOP.

Presentations: Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin – The evaluation policy, IEA and the ECOP; Brian Belcher – Main issues arising from workshop that could be taken forward by ECOP; Julia Compton: Responsibilities of ECOP stewards: preliminary ideas; Jenin Assaf: IEA and ECOP websites (ECOP website at <https://sites.google.com/site/ieacgiarECOP/home-1>)

Rachel Bedouin explained the main focus of the ECOP, mainly as an opportunity for capacity building, to discuss important issues, and for feedback on the evaluation policy and guidelines.

She noted that while there has been an interest in including Monitoring in the ECOP, it is important to note that IEA does not have the capacity to lead monitoring (M). Monitoring is an important component, and has its own set of issues and focus – including reporting, data management, and learning. We will need to find a way to work closely with M group, but not have the ECOP focus change.

Brian Belcher presented a recap of issues that emerged from the workshop in relation to ECOP needs. He stated that there was a need to share experiences with evaluation planning, learn about TOC, information, methodologies, alternatives to baseline data collection, and evaluation priority setting. He stated there were opportunities for training, and development of common terminology, resource sharing (references and consultants), and publicized evaluation lessons. He also stated that while there is a need to tap into external knowledge we should also look at maximizing internal knowledge, which is an excellent place for the ECOP.

The last session of the ECOP workshop included breakout group discussions around 4 themes: (1) training and capacity development, (2) learning and resource sharing, (3) methods, and stewards of the ECOP.

The groups provided possible ideas for the ECOP them, these included:

- Scope and Membership of ECOP
- ECOP roster of potential evaluators
- Database of evaluative studies in the CGIAR
- Harmonization of some key evaluation terms
- Training events on priority evaluation topics
- Needs assessment for evaluation capacity building
- Information sharing
- ECOP feedback to IEA on issues affecting evaluation in the CGIAR

**Next Steps:** Workshop ended with a collection of possible ECOP activities emerging from the breakout sessions. These ideas will be reviewed and further developed by ECOP stewards and IEA, and will share with ECOP members for information and to provide plans and next steps for implementation.



## ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1: WORKSHOP TIMETABLE

#### **Oct 28 – Arrival and informal introductions**

16:30 Stewards meeting, 18:00-19:00 Registration and drinks, 20:30 Introductory exercise

#### **Oct 29 – Day 1**

Registration of latecomers on arrival

#### **09:00 Welcome**

#### **09:30-11:00 Session 1: Introduction to evaluation in CGIAR**

Chair: Aliou Diagne Presenters: Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin (IEA), Anne-Marie Izac (Consortium Office), Tim Kelly (SPIA). Panel Q&A

#### **11:30 – 13:00 Session 2: CRP evaluations – expectations and experience to date**

Chair Ruth Meinzen-Dick Presenters: Sirkka Immonen (IEA), Markus Palenberg (FTA evaluation team leader) and Brian Belcher (FTA MEIA team)

#### **14:00 – 17:00 Session 3: Evaluation challenges and innovations**

Presenter: Irene Guijt

**Discussion groups on challenges and solutions:** a) Evaluating the contribution of CGIAR research on policy changes at national and global levels b) Theories of change and their use in evaluation, including for outcomes and impacts outside CG control c) Links between monitoring and evaluation in the CGIAR d) Managing CRP-level evaluations under real-world conditions

#### **Oct 30 - Day 2**

**08:30 Recap on previous day:** Anita Regmi and Amanda Wyatt

#### **09:00 Session 4: The IEA's Rolling Evaluation Work Plan (REWP)**

Chair: Eric Koper Presenter: Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin

#### **9:45 Short briefing: The IEA evaluation database**

Chair: Eric Koper Presenter: Sophie Zimm

#### **10:00 Session 5: Evaluations at CRP level, and the role of CRP-Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEEs)**

Chair: Thomas Wobill Presenter: Julia Compton

#### **12:15-13:00 Session 6: SPIA's contribution to CRP evaluations**

Chair: Aden Aw-Hassan Presenter: Tim Kelley

#### **14:00 – 17:00 Session 7: Progress on CRP Evaluation plans**



Chair: Irene Guijt Session organizer: Julia Compton with Irene Guijt and Vincent Johnson

Presenters: GRiSP: Sam Mohanty, WHEAT/MAIZE: Lone Badstue, RTB: Dagmar Wittine, A4NH: Nancy Johnson, FTA: Jules Colomer, AAS : Charlie Crissman

**17:15 Stewards meeting**

**Oct 31 - Day 3**

**08:30 Recap on previous day:** Bill Payne and Chris Jost

**09:00 Feedback from Session 7**

Chair: Vincent Johnson

**10:00- 13:30 Session 8: Next steps for the Evaluation Community of Practice**

10:00 Introduction to session: *Facilitators Sophie Alvarez/Vincent Johnson*)

10:10- 11:00 Short presentations in plenary (*Facilitator: Jenin Assaf*)

Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin – The evaluation policy, IEA and the ECOP

Brian Belcher - Recap of main issues arising from workshop that might influence ECOP activities, and organization to achieve these

Julia Compton: Responsibilities of ECOP stewards: preliminary ideas for discussion

Jenin Assaf: Brief presentation of new IEA website and ECOP website

**11:30 Breakout groups to discuss priority activities for ECOP**

**12:00 Plenary to agree on priority activities** *Chairs: Vincent Johnson/Sophie Alvarez* Report back from groups. The session finished earlier than planned, with a decision that ideas will be put on the ECOP website for further community discussion.

13:15 Evaluation of workshop

13:30 Roundup, final words, thanks and CLOSE

13:45 Final meeting of Workshop Stewards

**ANNEX 2: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS**

CRP	Centre	Name
Dryland Systems	ICARDA	Bill Payne
		Aden Aw-Hassan
Humidtropics	IITA	Eric Koper (+ <i>Keith Child – see below</i> )
Aquatic Agricultural Systems (AAS)	WorldFish	Charles Crissman
Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM)	IFPRI	Karen Brooks
		Ruth Meinzen-Dick
		Peter Hazell
CRP Wheat and CRP on Maize	CIMMYT	Lone Badstue
GRISP	IRRI	Sam Mohanty
	Africa Rice	Aliou Diagne
RTB	CIP	Dagmar Wittine
		Vincent Johnson (Workshop steward)
Grain Legumes and Dryland Cereals	ICRISAT	Jupiter Ndjeunga
		Albert Gierend
Livestock & Fish	ILRI	Pat Rainey
		Keith Child (also   Humid Tropics CRP)
Nutrition and Health	IFPRI	Nancy Johnson (Workshop steward)
		Amanda Wyatt
Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE)	IWMI	Elizabeth Weight
		Daniel Kobb
Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA)	ICRAF	Frank Plac
	CIFOR	Jules Colomer
		Brian Belcher (Workshop steward)
	Bioversity	Daniel Suryardama
Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS)	CIAT	Christine Jost
		Sophie Alvarez (Workshop steward)
<b>Centers and projects</b>		
<b>Center staff not linked to a specific CRP</b>	IITA	Thomas Wobill
		Issaka Amadou
	Bioversity	Robert Chapman
<b>Other CGIAR Institutions</b>		
Consortium		Anne Marie Izac
		Anita Regmi
ISPC/SPIA		Tim Kelley
		Lakshmi Krishnan
ILAC		Javier Ekboir
		Cristina Sette
<b>IEA/Workshop organizers</b>		
Facilitator	Independent Consultant	Julia Compton
Presenter	Better Evaluation /Consultant	Irene Guijt
	Head	Rachel Sauvinet Bedouin
	Senior Officer	Sirkka Immonen
	Evaluation Analyst	Federica Coccia
	Evaluation Analyst	Sophie Zimm
	Consultant	Jenin Assaf

## ANNEX 3: EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP – FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS

### DID THE WORKSHOP ATTAIN ITS OBJECTIVES?

The workshop set itself ambitious objectives and listed seven specific outcomes for ECOP members and four for the IEA. Most objectives were attained (**TABLE 1**), although more work is needed to finalize the scope and activities of the ECOP. Below is the assessment by participants of the planned outcomes for ECOP members. A majority thought that most outcomes were mostly or fully achieved (**TABLE 2**), and thought that the workshop was well organized (~90% scored it good or excellent on most indicators).

**Table 1 Attainment of main workshop objectives**

Objective	Attained?
1. To introduce the IEA and members of the network	Yes. Members rated networking and meeting other people facing similar challenges as one of the most valuable parts of the workshop.
2. To propose the scope, principles, activities and next steps for the Evaluation Community of Practice	Partially. The scope of the ECOP however was not finally decided in the workshop. There is considerable interest in expanding it to cover monitoring which will need to be discussed and decided on.
3. To introduce and discuss some key elements of CGIAR evaluation guidance	Yes. Participants appreciated the presentations and the opportunity to interact with the IEA, Consortium and SPIA, and to feed back initial concerns and challenges. More work remains to be done in the ECOP to further explain, test and get feedback on the guidance.
4. To introduce the Four-Year Rolling Evaluation Work Plan (REWP) of the IEA 2014-2017 and discuss a process for updating it to include CRPs' own evaluation plans (CCEEs)	Mostly. The REWP was introduced, but not really discussed in detail. There was considerable discussion on CCEEs, but it focused on other issues, not their integration into the REWP.
5. To provide a first opportunity for ECOP members to share - and be exposed to new - experiences, approaches and methods	Yes. Members said that the opportunity to learn from each other was one of the most valuable parts of the workshop. Six CRPs presented their M&E plans. A presentation on the use of <i>Sensemaker</i> for qualitative data also raised interest.

**Table 2 Attainment of specific workshop outcomes: assessment by ECOP members**

For you personally, how well was this met? (n=29)	Not at all ..... Completely				Don't know/ N/A	% mostly to completely *
	1	2	3	4		
a) Improved clarity about how evaluation fits into the wider systems of the CGIAR, and the roles of IEA, SPIA, and the Consortium Office.		4	15	10		86%
b) Improved clarity about the IEA expectations for evaluations of CRPs and CCEEs, and your own potential role		3	21	5		90%
c) Useful peer feedback on your own evaluation plans (for those engaged in developing these)	2	8	5	2	12	41%



<b>d) Increased understanding of the scope and purpose of the ECOP</b>		3	15	11		90%
<b>e) A strengthened network of evaluation-related contacts across the CGIAR**</b>	1	4	15	8	1	82%
<b>f) Some new ideas about evaluation challenges and innovations</b>		4	16	8	1	86%
<b>g) Renewed enthusiasm for evaluation and the ECOP</b>		8	12	8	1	71%

\* percent excludes don't know/n/a answers \*\* This question was not very clearly worded and some people interpreted it as meaning the strength of the network overall. Most people said that personal networking was a strength of the workshop.

#### **AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT IDENTIFIED BY PARTICIPANTS INCLUDED:**

- The mix of jobs represented among participants, which had some benefits but meant that it was difficult to discuss some evaluation issues in detail. Some participants may not continue as ECOP members.
- More time would have been useful to discuss some presentations
- Session 8 had objectives which were probably too ambitious (proposing future scope and activities of the ECOP) and the plenary roundup "fizzled out a bit", as one participant put it. Despite this, the breakout groups were lively and successful in proposing a variety of activities and these will be followed up with online discussions; this will also allow ECOP members who were not able to attend the workshop to be involved.



IEA

Independent Evaluation Arrangement

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Nearly half the people attending the workshop took on some formal responsibility for its success, for example by acting as presenters, chairs, helpers, or volunteers giving feedback. Their names are listed on the final workshop programme in Annex 2. Particular thanks are due to the four workshop stewards: Brian Belcher, Nancy Johnson, Sophie Alvarez and Vincent Johnson, who helped shape the workshop from the planning stage as well as taking on innumerable tasks during the workshop. IEA staff and consultants, Julia Compton, Deborah Basilici, Federica Coccia, Sophie Zimm and Jenin Assaf also made invaluable contributions to the preparation, logistics and management of the workshop. Thanks are also due to Sophie Alvarez and Cristina Sette, who reported regularly on social media (in particular CGIAR's Yammer network) throughout the workshop. Finally, Irene Guijt's participation in the workshop was kindly funded by ILAC, as part of the BetterEvaluation project <http://betterevaluation.org/>.