Background and summary

The 2014 the 2nd annual workshop of the CGIAR Evaluation Community of Practice was held from 24th-26th September 2014 at FAO in Rome, Italy.

The workshop was attended by more than 25 people representing 10 CGIAR Centers, 11 CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs), FAO, IEA, ISPC, SPIA and IFAD (see Annex II for list of participants).

The agenda for the workshop was developed by IEA and using the results of a survey that was deployed to capture the priorities and ideas of the evaluation community members on what the meeting should cover. The agenda (see Annex) was organised into three major sections:

- Sharing and learning across the ECOP
- Training on evaluating outcomes
- Discussions and planning on ECOP initiatives and ECOP structure and focus

The workshop involved a variety of activities including presentations, card exercises, group work and discussions to facilitate the engagement of the community in sharing, learning, planning and decision-making. This report provides an overview of the workshop sessions, focusing mainly on the key discussion topics, decisions and next steps. Most of the workshop involved break-out groups and roundtable discussions, which are not captured in detail, however, the report aims to highlight main discussions and focus of the workshop.

Resources:
ECOP site: https://sites.google.com/site/ieacgiarecop/home-1
Presentations: http://www.slideshare.net/IEA-CGIAR/
Dropbox with shared documents: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ws3cjzb06qay4tc/AADtrSceXs4FTJJ5LaDXXra?dl=0

Day 1- Sharing and learning

The theme of the first day of the workshop was based on getting a better understanding of what evaluation means for CGIAR and how it is currently being carried out. This was achieved through four main sessions focused on:

- What evaluation means in CGIAR
- Exploring various Monitoring and Evaluation systems across CRPs
- Sharing experiences with CRP-Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEEs)
- Supporting and strengthening evaluation
Session 1: Setting the stage- a look at what evaluation means in CGIAR

Introductory session for ECOP Members

The workshop was opened by Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin, Head of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA). She welcomed all ECOP participants to Rome and to FAO, where IEA is hosted. She explained the purposes of the workshop, which was to create a space for those working on evaluations in the CGIAR system to network and share lessons. Jenin Assaf, ECOP facilitator, provided a quick overview of the meeting and related logistics, followed by Nadia Manning-Thomas, meeting facilitator, who described the approaches and main objectives of the three-day meeting. The agenda and list of participants, for the workshop can be found in the Annexes of this report.

Nadia Manning-Thomas introduced the agenda and described some of the processes that would be used to achieve the objective of sharing and learning. These included:

- Meeting and networking with other evaluators/ECOP members
- Learning about evaluation across CGIAR
- Learning about experiences and support for carrying out CCEEs
- Exploring the link between evaluation and other activities and initiatives across CGIAR

As a way for all participants to get to know each other better, an interactive introductory exercise was undertaken. They were first asked to take a post-it note and write a tag for themselves on what evaluation means to them [#evaluation-is]. For example #evaluation is about LEARNING. They were asked to move around the room to meet as many people as they could, closely observing and discussing each other’s “tag”.

#evaluation-is...(some examples)

- About learning
- Means assessment of the program at regular intervals focusing on the results and take learning forward
- Progress
- Allows us a space to speak truth to power
- Understanding how to improve similar development initiatives
- Finding focus
- Evidence-based knowledge
- About self-reflection and accountability
- Understanding
- A process, not only a report
- Organization and learning
- Improving, changing, reflecting
- Bring peace and love to all stakeholders in the system
- Understanding the value of a program
- Learning, accountability and understanding
- Funny way of showing that your work makes sense
- Has a reputation to be scary but mostly a chance to explain
- Making enemies
- Learning to do what we aim to do more effectively

Participants were asked to stand together with others who shared a similar ‘tag’. The facilitator then went around the room to all the groups that had formed to interview the members on their common perspective on evaluations, and allow each member to introduce themselves.
IEA and ECOP – CGIAR Developments and context: Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin

After the introductory session, the workshop began with a presentation by Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin on the work of IEA, highlighting the importance of the evaluation community of practice, and how it aims to strengthen the capacity, networking and culture of evaluation across the system. She presented the overall objective of IEA, of which establishment of ECOP forms a part: ensuring that the evaluation function is a key and effective instrument of accountability and learning, fully contributing to the shaping and vision of the future CGIAR, as a change agent.

She provided a brief overview of current CGIAR system developments which influences the work of IEA and of ECOP members, including the 2nd call for CRP proposals as well as the mid-term review and partnership studies. She also presented the IEA evaluation workplan, which sees the completion of 4 CRP evaluations in 2015, and another 5 CRP evaluations in 2016, in addition to providing quality assurance support and guidance to an additional 5 CRPs who have been tasked with completing their own assessments. This would ensure that all CRPs would have final evaluation reports in time for the 2nd call for full CRP proposals. Whereas these evaluations and assessments would assist in the development of CRP proposals and the future portfolio of CRPs, Rachel reminded ECOP members that the first and foremost client of an evaluation is CRP management and governance, as the evaluation aims to inform decision-making and increase likelihood of achieving results.

She ended her presentation by talking about the role of the Evaluation Community of Practice in meeting including: (1) Strengthen the culture of evaluation across CGIAR; (2) Network and share information; (3) Build capacity and strengthen coordinated planning and cooperation, as well as (4) Strengthen the collective voice of evaluation in the system.

Rachel’s presentation can be found online at: http://www.slideshare.net/IEA-CGIAR/evaluation-community-of-practice-workshop-presentation A few key slides are shown below:
Discussion

ECOP participants followed the presentation with a discussion on accountability, and whether it should also include accountability of management, rather than only CRP deliverables. Discussion also focused on the different time-frames for CRP development, and whether systems are in place to ensure that there is progress along the impact pathways.

Participants pointed out that while the upcoming CCEEs could in theory form the building blocks of the later CRP evaluations, however, given the current work plan there is little opportunity for CCEEs to inform these higher level evaluations. Reference was also made to the Midterm Review of the CGIAR reform process (to be discussed at FC meeting in Nov 2014), and to the current revision of the Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) for which the IEA can help define a learning and accountability framework to support SRF implementation. There was further discussion regarding how CRP evaluations could guide the SRF sharpening. ECOP could also be instrumental in: strengthening a CGIAR-wide culture of evaluation in the system, networking, building evaluation capacity and strengthening its own collective voice.

Session 2: A look at monitoring and evaluation systems

The focus of the second session of the workshop was based on expressed need by participants through a pre-workshop survey in which many indicated the inter-related relationship between evaluation and monitoring and the necessity to look at these two aspects together. In preparation for the meeting, some participants had shared Monitoring and Evaluation snapshots of their respective CRPs, which formed the basis of many of the discussions. These can be found online at: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ws3cjzb06qay4tc/AAAVKrDpAX-Twzs-jB7hl6Sa/M%26E%20Snapshots?dl=0

In order to explore the relationship between monitoring and evaluation a world café was used to allow participants to choose particular topics to have discussions. Participants were invited to visit two tables of their choice during the World Café, and asking each table to select a host to report back during the plenary session.
### Table 1 discussion: Challenges
- Getting right information at right time
- Structural challenges/policy/restructuring
- Getting harmonized information
- Management issues
- Agreement between CRPs
- Setting up M&E system
- Cultural change needed as move to M&E
- Fear for trial and error
- Integration in large projects

### Table 1 discussion: Benefits:
- Overlapping of projects and program logically
- Framework
- Bring in scientists for design
- Strengthens planning
- Makes it easier for partners
- Influencing opportunity for CRPs

### World Café- TABLE 2

Share experiences and identify good approaches, tools and methods in monitoring and evaluation

- CCAFS use a ToC/Impact pathway based system with a P+R system online for all projects/regions/flagships to use for planning and reporting with guiding M&E strategy
- Humidtropics are piloting a grant in relation to RBM model based on proposal by R4D platforms
- Africa Rice have an MLax application to collect automatically the information with all partners based on RGM system
- GRISP has a monitoring system with tools such as an area based farm household survey and tracking national level indicators and tracking global rice indicators
- SPIA are working on a LSMS-ISA surveys in 8 countries in SSA with nationally representative data from approx. 4-5,000 households

### World Café- TABLE 3

Share experiences and identify (1) good systems and (2) challenges for how monitoring and evaluation is organised/handled in CRPs

- FTA links design of project to impact assessment
Discussion

Following the world café discussion focused on how the monitoring systems did not, for the most part, include science, which is rapidly changing. It was also noted that there is less monitoring and evaluation focus within program components, and the need to acknowledge or address that. Participants also indicated the need to capture internal systemic changes, which can have an impact on the CRP as a whole.

Session 3: Moving towards CCEEs- Sharing some experiences

The third session of the day was focused on learning about CRP-commissioned external evaluations (CCEEs) and aimed to specifically learn from ECOP members who have completed or are currently undertaking CCEEs.

To start off the sharing on CCEEs a panel of three people representing CRPs who are currently involved in various stages of CCEEs were invited to share experiences, including:

- **Nancy Johnson**, CRP on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health
- **Keith Child**, CRP on Livestock and Fish
- **GG Koppa**, CRP on Grain Legumes and CRP on Dryland Cereals

Panel members were first asked to describe at what stage of a CCEE the CRP is at and what activities have been carried out to date. They were asked what lessons they had learnt so far which would be useful for others. And there was also an opportunity given to the participants to ask questions. A few key responses by the panelists included:

Nancy described that A4NH is actually carrying two CCEEs: one CCEE on the food safety work being carried out by A4NH; as well as one CCEE on the program as a whole. She explained that they have identified consultants and developed terms of reference, which were shared with IEA, and a reference group was formed. Nancy indicated that a key lesson for A4NH has been to develop the terms of reference together with the team leader.

Keith described Livestock and Fish carrying out a CCEE on its value chain work and that the CCEE is at the stage of fieldwork having just been finished and the first draft report to be ready by October.
Koppa described that Grain legumes and Dryland Cereals are carrying out CCEEs but in the context of being one of the five CRPs that are undertaking IEA-supported CRP evaluations.

Some of the key points that came out from the panel and the discussions were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
<th>Main points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of the evaluations</td>
<td>Initial consideration for evaluator costs were, at times, too low, which led them to disqualify what was originally considered “too expensive” evaluators. This was later adjusted, but may have had an impact on who was finally considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Initial timeline and expectations for the timing needed to complete the evaluation were unrealistic, and also needed adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding and selecting appropriate evaluators</td>
<td>A particular issue for all evaluations is the difficulty in identifying qualified evaluators with the appropriate background to evaluate CGIAR programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of topic for evaluations</td>
<td>Panel members discussed the need to set a particular focus for an evaluation topic, and avoid being too broad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation cycle</td>
<td>What is a realistic cycle for evaluations? How often can they/should they be carried out? While there is no magical number, panel members indicated that there were plans to complete 3 CCEEs every 2 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation efficiency</td>
<td>As evaluation managers, the organization of evaluation and how it proceeds is critical, especially with the need to ensure evaluators’ time being efficiently managed, and that they are fully employed. The cost of a CCEE should reflect the scope of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The workshop participants were asked if there were other CRPs that have or are undertaking CCEEs and if they had any experiences and lessons to share. Christine Jost described that CCAFS has carried out two CCEEs.

As an important point of clarification, there was a lot of initial confusion about the different types of evaluations being carried out. The image to the left reflects the current types of independent evaluations being carried out: (a) IEA evaluations of CRP evaluations (10 evaluations to be carried out by 2016); (b) CRP commissioned CRP evaluations/assessments with quality assurance support by IEA (5 to be completed by 2016); and (c) CRP commissioned CRP evaluations which are developed and managed independently by the CRP.

ECOP participants inquired of panel members what they considered would be the biggest benefit of their respective evaluations. Panel members indicated that they expected a significant amount of evaluative information on science and partnerships; while as well as helpful input for management decisions.
ECOP participants discussed the relationship between CCEEs and the IEA evaluations on CRPs. It was explained that while the ideal situation would be for CCEEs to feed into IEA commissioned evaluation of the same CRP and provide inputs to IEA evaluations, the current work plan, and lack a significant number of CRP commissioned evaluations, this has yet to materialize. It was also mentioned that there is a need to consider how other evaluations and reviews, such as Center-commissioned evaluations are integrated into or made use of in the IEA evaluations of CRPs. Participants also noted that it would be useful to have CCEEs on thematic areas across CRPs to create blocks of information of work on a range of thematic areas, which can be aggregated to look at the overall system. It would also be of interest if there was a mechanism for CCEEs to inform management decisions for other CRPs.

ECOP members discussed the difficulty of identifying qualified evaluators, and means the ECOP can provide support. It was decided that a central roster would be difficult to manage and keep relevant, but that through the ECOP community there would be a sharing of experts and information. ECOP participants the high opportunity costs for bringing an evaluator up-to-date on CGIAR, Center and CRP developments. They also noted the need to better coordinate between internal and external mechanisms and provide information already publically available.

**Session 4: CCEEs- Supporting and strengthening the process**

The session focus was on the ways in which CCEEs can be supported and strengthened, with IEA guidance. One of the ways in which the process is being supported is through a Guidance Notes which have been developed by IEA.

The first part of the session involved a presentation by Sirkka Immonen, IEA Senior Evaluation Manager, on ‘Introduction to the Guidance Note for CRP commissioned external evaluations (CCEEs)’. The presentation is available at: [http://www.slideshare.net/MTT_Agrifood_Research_Finland/food-and-nutrition-secucity-in-africa-agricultural-research-for-food-and-nutrition-security](http://www.slideshare.net/MTT_Agrifood_Research_Finland/food-and-nutrition-secucity-in-africa-agricultural-research-for-food-and-nutrition-security)

The Guidance Note included:

1. Policy principles
2. Standards- interprets and elaborates on principles
3. Detailed Guidance notes

In order to get feedback on the Guidance Note and to get other ideas from the participants on ways in which CCEEs could be supported and strengthened, a bus-stop activity was introduced. This activity included four stations based on key parts of the Guidance Note:

- Station 1: Roles and responsibilities in CCEEs;
- Station 2: Designing an evaluation;
- Station 3: Selecting and contracting consultants; and Station 4:
Managing the process of CCEE. Participants were invited to move around to visit each ‘station’ within the 45 minute time period to provide experiences, challenges, feedback and ideas for support.
Some points that came up in discussions at the four stations which are detailed below:

**Station 1: Roles and responsibilities in CCEEs**
- How to reflect knowledge based networks
- Recognize CRPs are not organizations
- Care needed in ‘CRP management’ – e.g. for CRP X there are 11 different management systems
- How to add partners
- Bing responsibility down to who delivers
- Evaluate on level of each partner
- CRP level= aggregator of information
- Need to revisit who is delivering what
- PPAs- only for performance?
- Higher levels of evaluation? Depends on level of partners

**Station 2: Designing an evaluation**
- Scope and questions/issue need to be based on priorities, pressure, burning questions and money
- Research manager should be involved in design and implementation and learning from
- Good idea to have a workshop fro designing this with stakeholders
- Allow enough lead time+ 6 months
- Theory of Change
- Participatory process helps capture a lot

**Station 3: Selecting and contracting consultants**
- Clear and transparent process internally
- Diversity
- Demonstrate ability to contribute
- Lead time, time requirement
- Managing potential conflict of interest, sharing examples among ECOP

**Station 4: Managing the process of CCEE**
- Demand-driven? Need evaluation culture
- Depends on CRP structure and monitoring
- Standardized guidelines/guidance (IEA) helps
- IEA should at least know when CCEEs are happening-to provide any needed interaction
- CCEE results should go to IEA CRP evaluation and CRP decision making process
- Where do CCERs fit?

---

**Day 2-and morning of Day 3: Professional Training**

"Assessing Outcomes in CGIAR: Practical Approaches and Methods"

**Trainer: Burt Perrin**

On Day 2 and the morning of Day 3 the participants were engaged in a professional training on evaluating outcomes. The training focused on approaches, and methods, with respect to the evaluation outcomes for complex programs. Breaking into working groups, participants discussed and worked on evaluability assessments, and Theories of Change outcome trajectories, as well as focus on evaluation use, designs and methods, analysis and interpretation. In preparation for the
training, 3 CRP case studies were asked to provide background information for their CRPs to focus the discussions and working groups. GRiSP, Humidtropics and FTA all led discussion focusing on their respective CRPs:  
(https://www.dropbox.com/sh/83oyxye4af9hc8z/AAD1DhA_TqSMKCNh9QFPZbhQa?dl=0)

Presentation slides from the training can be found online at: http://www.slideshare.net/IEA-CGIAR/assessing-outcomes-in-cgiar-practical-approaches-and-methods

**Day 3- Developing the Community of Practice**

**Session 5: ECOP initiatives and way forward**

On the afternoon of the last day of the workshop there were two sessions dedicated to looking at the ECOP itself.

Jenin Assaf outlined the history of the ECOP from being conceptualized in the Policy and subsequently launched at the ECOP meeting in 2013. She described the various activities that have been part of the ECOP including the virtual site, email group, and annual workshop. Whereas the meeting in 2013 produced some initial initiatives for ECOP members, very few have gained any momentum or interest following the 2013 meeting. She indicated that it was therefore important to better understand the needs and interest of ECOP members, especially on any potential initiatives beyond the annual workshop.

Nadia Manning-Thomas, the facilitator for this session, indicated that there were three major areas of activity and benefit that have been found in Communities of Practice across CGIAR, these include:

- Sharing and learning
- Carrying out tasks and initiatives
- Linking with bigger system (CGIAR)

Participants indicated that of the three areas above, they felt, to date, the ECOP offered an opportunity for sharing and learning.

Discussion then focused on the future of the ECOP. Participants were encouraged to put forward ideas for possible collective initiatives that the ECOP could undertake that would be valuable for the members. Ideas suggested by participants were discussed and for some a way forward was planned.
Potential initiatives included:
- CRP Clinics
- Webinars on topics
- Roster of consultants (names, possible confidential reviews)
- Sharing experiences and information on the Google group and Google site-
  Participants committed to doing more sharing through this mechanism
- Trainings on managing evaluations
- Monitoring and Evaluation CoP concept (A letter to go to CO, CRPs, DGs and IEA)
- Mentoring and coaching of others
- Invite other evaluation managers in evaluation processes
- Calendar of missions and meetings with interest to ECOP members

Follow up discussion among ECOP participants included the need to ensure that the focus of ECOP was not lost, and that the real power of the group is the potential for it to influence and feed into system-level strategic thinking, and therefore could act as a change agent. Participants also noted the need to provide more support and training for evaluation managers, and not necessarily focus on initiatives at this time.

A few topics that were discussed included:
- Online ECOP platform- who is in it? Change to evaluation focal points? Decision: keep original list. Action: Participants to invite others to the group
- 2015 Annual meeting- to be organized by IEA. Timing to take into account evaluations going on and other meetings. Possible locations could be Rome, Montpellier, a geography with many common CRPs. Format could be based on piggybacking on a SPIA meeting

**Session 6: Workshop summary**

Participants were asked to formulate a summary of the workshop by sharing key highlights of the workshop. They were invited to shout out a word or phrase that described a highlight from the workshop and these were captured in a ‘word cloud’ by the facilitator which can be seen below.
At the end of the workshop, the facilitator led the group in an evaluation exercise where participants had to share on an A4 piece four key items. An example of each is provided below and the full results of the evaluation are available on the ECOP site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aha! moment</th>
<th>What you liked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ “IEA evaluations cover W1/W2 AND bilaterals”</td>
<td>○ “Dynamic exchange and mix of presentations, discussion exercises, case study and training”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What you will do as a result of the meeting</th>
<th>Things to change for the next meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ “Reconsider and adjust several aspects in my own evaluation management”</td>
<td>○ “Perhaps allow more than the CRPs ECOP member to attend, if there are others who would benefit from content, training etc”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop was closed by Rachel Bedouin who thanked everyone for their commitment and participation and wished all a safe journey.
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<table>
<thead>
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<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist</td>
<td>AfricaRice</td>
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</tr>
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<td>IRRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nancy Johnson</td>
<td>Agricultural economist and Senior Research Fellow</td>
<td>IFPRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. GG Koppa</td>
<td>Senior Program Manager</td>
<td>ICRISAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Enrico Bonaiuti</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist</td>
<td>ICARDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chris Crissman</td>
<td>Division Director – Policy, Economics and Social Science</td>
<td>WorldFish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dagmar Wittine</td>
<td>Program Management Officer</td>
<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Michelle Guertin</td>
<td>Monitoring, Evaluation &amp; Learning Senior Specialist</td>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cristina Sette</td>
<td>Knowledge Sharing and Learning Specialist</td>
<td>ILAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Javier Ekboir</td>
<td>Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Coordinator</td>
<td>ILAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. James Stevenson</td>
<td>Agricultural Research Officer</td>
<td>ISPC/SPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lakshmi Krishnan</td>
<td>Agricultural Research Officer</td>
<td>ISPC/SPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>IFAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Masahiro Igarashi</td>
<td>Director, Evaluation (attended training sessions)</td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Evaluation Expert, TRAINER</td>
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## Annex II: Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1 Sharing and Learning</th>
<th>Day 2 Training workshop</th>
<th>Day 3 Part 1: Training continued; Part 2: ECOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:00 - 10:30</strong>&lt;br&gt;Setting the stage: A look at what evaluation means in CGIAR&lt;br&gt;Welcome and intro to meeting&lt;br&gt;Participants describing skills and experiences&lt;br&gt;evaluation in CGIAR and IEA info on where things stand, and open discussion</td>
<td><strong>TRAINING</strong>: “Assessing Outcomes in Complex Programs”&lt;br&gt;Setting Stage: Characteristics of evaluation and how it differs for research. What is complexity and implications for evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Training Cont’d</strong>: Developing plans for methodology, data gathering and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Break</strong>&lt;br&gt;Coffee/tea break organized by IEA</td>
<td><strong>Coffee/tea break organized by IEA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coffee/tea break organized by IEA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:00 - 12:30</strong>&lt;br&gt;Looking at the bigger picture: Discussion on monitoring and evaluation systems&lt;br&gt;World Cafés: participant discussions on challenges and good approaches for monitoring and evaluation systems. What are the main outputs of the systems, what are they used for?</td>
<td><strong>Caste studies from CRPs: looking at Theories of Change/evaluability assessment/nature of outcome.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identifying implications, discussion, and wrap up of training session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong>&lt;br&gt;Buffet Lunch organized by IEA on 8th floor</td>
<td><strong>Buffet Lunch organized by IEA on 8th floor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Buffet Lunch organized by IEA on 8th floor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:45 - 3:15</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sharing experiences of CCEC Learning from examples&lt;br&gt;Examples and focused discussion from CRPs undergoing CCEC – what has worked, what are lessons learned, challenges, discussion; QA</td>
<td><strong>Caste studies discussion on evaluation design, initial considerations regarding methodology, sources of evidence and nature of outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>FOCUS ON ECOP COMMUNITY</strong>&lt;br&gt;What can we do together to strengthen evaluation across CGIAR?&lt;br&gt;Discuss ECOP operational modality, communications, meetings and workshops, and planning way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Break</strong>&lt;br&gt;Coffee/tea break organized by IEA</td>
<td><strong>Coffee/tea break organized by IEA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coffee/tea break organized by IEA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4:00 - 5:30</strong>&lt;br&gt;How can evaluation work better?: Strengthening the evaluation process&lt;br&gt;Presenting Guidance Note 2 for CCEC&lt;br&gt;Participants visit “Evaluation Stations” (roles and responsibilities; evaluation design; selecting and contracting consultants; and managing evaluation process) to discuss approaches, methodology, challenges and opportunities, and feedback on clarity and accuracy of Guidance Note</td>
<td><strong>Follow up on discussion</strong></td>
<td><strong>How can ECOP best support evaluation and evaluators across CGIAR?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Discussion on future of ECOP, and provide ‘proposals’ for possible, valuable ‘collective’ initiatives, planning collective initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL</strong>&lt;br&gt;Drinks and aperitivo at FAO (at end of meeting)</td>
<td><strong>Dinner at Taverna Cestia restaurant</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>