

Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour  
la Recherche et le Développement  
Agricoles

---



West and Central African Council for  
Agricultural Research and Development

---

# **CORAF/WE CARD**

## **MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY**

February, 2010

---

7, Avenue Bourguiba, BP 48- cp18523- Dakar SENEGAL  
Tel 221 869 96 18 Fax 221 869 96 31  
[secoraf@coraf.org](mailto:secoraf@coraf.org) [www.coraf.org](http://www.coraf.org)

**CORAF/WECARD**  
**MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGY**

# Table of contents

Table of contents.....	i
List of boxes.....	ii
Abbreviations and acronyms.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
<b>I. A New M&amp;E Strategy for CORAF/WECARD .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 CORAF/WECARD Profile .....	1
1.2 Strategic Plan 2007-2016 & Operational Plan 2007-2011 .....	2
Intervention logic of the Operational Plan.....	2
1.3 The M&E framework of CORAF/WECARD .....	3
<b>II. Design of Projects and M&amp;E System.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Building the logical framework.....	5
2.2 Designing an M&E System .....	6
Definitions.....	6
Monitoring and Evaluation Manual .....	7
Results-based management framework.....	7
<b>III. CORAF/WECARD's Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Tools.....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 Planning and monitoring tools .....	9
Programme Action Plan .....	9
Annual planning.....	9
Quarterly planning .....	9
Supervision mission .....	9
Project completion report.....	10
3.2 Evaluation tools .....	10
Baseline and reference surveys .....	10
Mid-term review.....	10
Impact (ex-post) evaluation.....	11
Thematic studies .....	11
3.4 Environmental impact assessment and mitigation .....	12
3.5 Monitoring and mitigation of risks .....	12
<b>IV. Monitoring implementation progress of CORAF/WECARD's Operational Plan.....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1 Evaluation of impact of CORAF/WECARD (Strategic objective) .....	12
4.2 Monitoring progress of Operational outcomes (4 results) .....	13
Result 1: Appropriate technologies and innovations developed .....	13
Result 2: Strategic decision-making options for policy institutions and markets.....	14
Result 3: Sub-regional agricultural research system strengthened and coordinated .....	15
Result 4: Knowledge management & lessons learnt.....	15
4.3 Monitoring and evaluation of projects.....	16
4.4 Performance evaluation of CORAF/WECARD's partnerships.....	16
4.5 Evaluation of management performance of CORAF/WECARD's Executive Secretariat .....	17
<b>V. M&amp;E management and services.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>21</b>
Appendix 1: Logical framework of the Strategic Plan 2006-2016 .....	22

---

Appendix 2: Result-based management framework .....	26
Appendix 3: Format of the indicator sheet.....	27
Appendix 4: Indicator monitoring matrix .....	28
Appendix 5: Preparation process of the AWPB.....	29
Appendix 6: Format of annual progress report.....	31
Appendix 7: Evaluation matrix for project cycle.....	32
Appendix 8: Analysis of environmental impact.....	33
Appendix 9: Risk assessment form .....	34
Appendix 10: Risk mitigation form .....	35
Appendix 11: Implementation progress report of CORAF/WECARD's Strategic objective.....	36

## List of boxes

Box 1	Strategic Plan of CORAF/WECARD and need for M&E services
Box 2	Chain of results
Box 3	Logical framework matrix
Box 4	Evaluation criteria of the logical framework approach
Box 5	Design process of the M&E System
Box 6	Type and focus of monitoring
Box 7	Structure of project evaluation reports
Box 8	Outcome indicators for Result 1 (Technical research)
Box 9	Outcome indicators for Result 2 ((Policy research)
Box 10	Outcome indicators for Result 3 (Capacity building and coordination)
Box 11	Outcome indicators for Result 4 (Knowledge management)
Box 12	Mutual accountability and shared responsibility
Box 13	Management performance monitoring tools of CORAF/WECARD
Box 14	Strategic Plan 2007-2016 of CORAF/WECARD and M&E tasks

## Abbreviations and acronyms

AWPB	Annual Work Plan and Budget
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Productivity Programme
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CORAF/WECARD	<i>Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement</i> Agricoles/West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
EIA	Environmental impact assessment
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EPMR	External program and management review
FAO	United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
IAR4D	Innovating Agricultural Research for Development
IMM	Indicator monitoring matrix
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MTR	Mid-term review
NARS	National Agricultural Research Systems
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
QWP	Quarterly Work Plan
PMEIU	Planning and monitoring-Evaluation Unit
RBM	Result-base management
SIPAA	Information System on Agricultural Productivity in Africa
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bond
STC	Scientific and Technical Council
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TFP	Technical and Financial Partners
UEMOA	West African Economic and Monetary Union
WAAPP	West Africa Agricultural Productivity Programme

## **CORAF/WECARD Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy**

### **Introduction**

The aim of CORAF/WECARD is to contribute to high broad-based agricultural growth and food security in West and Central Africa. In order to assess the contribution of its Strategy Plan 2007-2016 and Operational Plan 2008-2013 to this overall goal, CORAF/WECARD has put in place a new Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Strategy and System. This document describes the new M&E Strategy of CORAF/WECARD.

The first chapter summarizes CORAF/WECARD's Strategic and Operational Plan, as well as the requirements for M&E. Chapter II presents methodologies and approaches, adopted by CORAF/WECARD to design its projects and M&E system, which are based on a Logical framework approach. Chapter III looks at the planning, monitoring and evaluation tools used the sub-regional organization and its partners. Chapter IV proposes an operational strategy for monitoring and evaluation of CORAF/WECARD's goal, strategic objective, intermediate results and outputs. In addition, the chapter presents an approach for the performance evaluation of CORAF/WECARD's Executive Secretariat, as well as for the quality of its partnership with the NARS and its technical and financial partners. Chapter V summarizes the organization of the M&E system.

### **I. A New M&E Strategy for CORAF/WECARD**

#### **1.1 CORAF/WECARD Profile**

CORAF/WECARD is a sub-regional organization, established on 15 March 1987 that brings together National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) of 22 countries in West and Central Africa, divided into 3 agro-ecological zones, namely the Sahelian zone<sup>1</sup>, the West African Coastal zone<sup>2</sup> and the Central African zone<sup>3</sup>.

CORAF/WECARD has been designed as a sub-regional instrument of cooperation in agricultural research. The organization is working through partnerships with NARS and other national partners, in close collaboration with international research organizations and technical and financial partners. The approach of CORAF/WECARD is to: (i) promote cooperation, consultation, exchange of information between member institutions and partners; (ii) define research objectives and priorities of common interest at sub-regional and regional levels; (iii) serve as a sub-regional body of consultation for all research activities carried out by regional or international organizations operating in West and Central Africa; (iv) prepare and implement cross-border research programmes to enhance regional exchanges and capacities; (v) harmonize activities of networks which are associated with agricultural research and development and facilitate the creation of new networks; (vi) contribute to financial and human resource mobilization for the implementation of regional research programmes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Burkina Faso, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, and Chad

<sup>2</sup> Benin, Cape Verde, Cote D'Ivoire, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Togo

<sup>3</sup> Cameroon, Congo, Gabon, Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of Congo

## 1.2 Strategic Plan 2007-2016 & Operational Plan 2007-2011

CORAF/WECARD adopted in 2007 a 10-year Strategic Plan (2007-2016)<sup>4</sup>, which has the ambition to make a significant contribution to agricultural growth in the sub-region. It intends doing this by achieving broad-based, sustainable improvements in agricultural productivity, competitiveness and markets of the sub-region by delivery of technologies and innovations, policy options, capacity strengthening and knowledge management appropriate to the demands of a broad base of priority clients.

The Strategic Plan 2007-2016 was accompanied by a first five-year Operational Plan 2008-2013<sup>5</sup>, which provides a fresh perspective and approach to sub-regional agricultural research. It addresses previous shortcomings through a paradigm of integrated agricultural research involving all stakeholders in the supply chain, focused on a clearly articulated and prioritized sub-regional strategy. The advantages of the new approach include: a) opportunities for inter-program linkages and planning; b) more efficient monitoring, evaluation and learning; c) simplified streams for knowledge and information; d) independence from undue non-programme influences; e) clear lines of accountability; f) strengthened corporate cohesion; g) clear focus for resource mobilization and development partners; h) coherence of work with the Strategic plan 2007-2016.

### Intervention logic of the Operational Plan

The CORAF/WECARD's Operational Plan 2008-2013 is based on a logical framework approach that allows linking a series of logical steps and processes (see: Box 1, Appendix 1).

CORAF/WECARD overarching **goal** is: “high broad-based agricultural growth and food security sustainably established in West and Central Africa”, to which the organization contributes through its interventions.

In order to contribute to this goal, CORAF/WECARD will achieve its **Strategic objective** by making a contribution to “broad-based agricultural productivity, competitiveness and markets sustainably improved for target groups in West and Central Africa”.

The Operational Plan 2008-2013 makes a clear commitment to delivering a series of four **Operational outcomes or Results**, which are the following:

**Result 1. “Appropriate technologies and innovations developed”** focuses on technology and innovation development. The Plan proposes a shift to ensure responsiveness to demand as well as an adaptive approach. Key participants are smallholders and pastoralists, although the targeting approach is broad-based and does not exclude other stakeholders, including large scale and commercial producers.

**Result 2. “Strategic decision-making options for policy, institutions and markets developed”** encompasses policy, marketing, institutions and socio-economics and is a broadening of perspective to ensure increased impact and more appropriate responses to demand.

**Result 3. “Sub-regional agricultural research system strengthened and coordinated”** covers all aspects of capacity strengthening in the sub-regional agricultural research system including the various and diverse agro-ecological systems and zones, public and private sector organisations and institutes and input and output markets, policy and decision making bodies.

<sup>4</sup> CORAF/WECARD. *Strategic Plan 2007-2016. Producers and end-users at the centre of Research*. November 2007.

<sup>5</sup> CORAF/WECARD. *Operational Plan 2008-2013. Developing Innovation Systems in West and Central African Agriculture*. November 2008.

**Result 4. “Demand for agricultural knowledge from target clients facilitated and met”** is an undertaking to increase efforts at developing and activating the linkages with uptake networks that are essential to delivery. It is about creating platforms to ensure information on technologies, and the information that makes the technologies happen, is combined to create the knowledge necessary for innovation.

These Results are to be delivered through eight **Outputs** or Programmes, each consisting of a portfolio of projects and services. The Programmes, identified as sub-regional priorities, are the following: 1. Livestock, fisheries and aquaculture; 2. Staple crops; 3. Non-staple crops; 4. Natural resource management; 5. Biotechnology and biosafety; 6. Policy, markets and trade; 7. Knowledge management; 8. Capacity strengthening and coordination.

The Programme managers are responsible for designing, planning and implementing high quality programmes comprised of a number of regional **projects**, and of delivering Outputs in order to make a contribution to CORAF/WECARD’s Strategic objective. The projects are implemented at NARS level with organizations that have a comparative technical advantage taking the lead. The projects always have a sub-regional dimension as they intervene at least in three countries.

CORAF/WECARD is governed by four **core principles**: (i) subsidiarity in delegating responsibility to the lowest appropriate level; (ii) delivery of the required results and impact through effective and efficient use of resources; (iii) accountability to stakeholders; and (iv) participation of all stakeholders in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation activities, results and objectives.

**Cross-cutting issues** considered throughout the Programmes are: (i) promotion of pro-poor or at least scale-neutral innovations; (ii) integration of gender considerations at all levels; (iii) HIV/AIDS awareness in agricultural strategies and interventions; and (iv) contribution to ensuring environmental sustainability.

### 1.3 The M&E framework of CORAF/WECARD

The M&E System will support the successful implementation of the Strategy Plan 2006-2016 and Operational Plan 2008-2013 and help translate the CORAF/WECARD vision into tangible results. Box 1 summarizes the intervention logic, as well as required M&E tools and outputs at each level. These **outputs** include:

- a) Information to monitor accountability of CORAF/WECARD with respect to its strategic impact on agricultural productivity, competitiveness and markets in West and Central Africa, in line with its Strategic Objective.
- b) Information to monitor regularly and evaluate progress realized in achieving its 4 Operational Outcomes (4 Results).
- c) Reliable and up-to-date information on progress of projects, implemented in close collaboration with partners.
- d) An assessment and monitoring of management efficiency and performance of CORAF/WECARD Executive Secretariat in line with its core principles of good governance, accountability and subsidiarity.
- e) An assessment and monitoring of the quality and effectiveness of partnerships and networks between CORAF/WECARD, the NARS and other partners at the national and sub-regional level.
- f) Capacity building services of staff of CORAF/WECARD, its partners and its project teams.
- g) Technical backstopping of CORAF/WECARD Programmes and projects.
- h) Managing information flows and contributing to knowledge management and dissemination among partners.



**Key characteristics** of the CORAF/WECARD M&E System are the following:

- a) The M&E System has adopted the Logical framework approach (LFA), which is a management tool used to improve the design of development interventions. It involves identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure. This tool thus facilitates planning, execution, monitoring and evaluation of a development intervention.
- b) Result-based management approaches are used.
- c) The M&E System allows monitoring the organization's cross-cutting issues (scale-neutral innovations, gender, HIV/AIDS, environmental sustainability) and core principles: good governance and accountability practices, participation, as well as its subsidiarity.
- d) The M&E System will enhance learning and knowledge management.
- e) In order to ensure international quality standards, the M&E System has adopted the OECD-DAC monitoring and evaluation terminology and concepts.
- f) In order to monitor the quality of its partnerships, the M&E System has adopted new concepts of shared responsibility and mutual accountability in its relations with the NARS and other partners.

**Box 1: Strategic Plan of CORAF/WECARD and Need for M&E services**

Intervention logic of CORAF/WECARD		Need for M&E services
Goal	“High broad based agricultural growth and food security sustainably established in West and Central Africa”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coherence of CORAF/WECARD with regional priorities</li> </ul>
Strategic objective	Contribution to “Broad-based agricultural productivity, competitiveness and markets sustainably improved for target groups in West and Central Africa”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of progress in achieving the CORAF/WECARD Strategic objective</li> </ul>
Operational outcomes (results)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Appropriate technologies and innovations developed</li> <li>2. Strategic decision-making options for policy, institutions and markets developed</li> <li>3. Sub-regional agricultural research system strengthened and coordinated</li> <li>4. Demand for agricultural information from target groups facilitated and met</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring progress made in achieving the Operational outcomes</li> <li>• Monitoring management performance of CORAF/WECARD</li> <li>• Monitoring quality of partnerships CORAF/WECARD – donors – NARS – other partners</li> </ul>
Outputs (programmes)	<p><u>Technical research</u>: Programmes 1. Livestock, fisheries and aquaculture; 2. Staple crops; 3. Non-staple crops; 4. Natural resource management; 5. Biotechnology and biosafety</p> <p><u>Policy research</u>: Programme 6. Policy, markets and trade</p> <p><u>Knowledge management</u>: Programme 7. Knowledge management</p> <p><u>Capacity strengthening and coordination</u>: Programme 8. Capacity strengthening and coordination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support project and M&amp;E system design</li> <li>• Monitoring of outputs (programmes and projects)</li> <li>• Management of information flows</li> <li>• Support knowledge management</li> <li>• Capacity building of partners and staff</li> </ul>
(projects)	<p>Research projects through the Regional Competitive Fund</p> <p>Priority research projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support M&amp;E</li> <li>• Periodic audit and evaluations</li> <li>• Management of information flows</li> </ul>

## II. Design of Projects and M&E System

CORAF/WECARD has adopted the Logical framework methodology, which determines to a large extent its tools and processes for designing, planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating its projects and Programmes, as well as for monitoring implementation progress of its Strategic Plan 2007-2016 and Operational Plan 2008-2013. The required steps for setting up a project and an M&E system are the following: i) design of the logical framework on the basis of a problem identification and needs assessment; ii) design of an M&E system, including the definition of indicators and result-based framework and preparation of the M&E manual that describes the tools and processes.

### 2.1 Building the logical framework

The first step of a project design comprises a problem analysis and needs assessment of stakeholders, for which several participatory planning methods can be used. The problem analysis starts with the identification of the core problem of a target group, followed by an analysis of direct and underlying-causes. Added to these are analyses of negative implications & constraints as well as opportunities, which constitute a priority in the eyes of the target group. After defining the causal relationships between problems and underlying causes, solutions are proposed to the core problem and for each of the basic underlying problems.

Consequently, an analysis of key stakeholders (beneficiaries, clients, institutional partners and other relevant stakeholders) allows identifying their detailed needs, willingness to contribute, and potential roles and responsibilities in implementation, which enhances ownership and commitment. Questions might arise with respect to their capacity and willingness to implement the identified solutions, the existence of obstacles, opportunities and risks. These questions help to define the context and validity of the project.

The causal relationship between problems, underlying causes and proposed solutions is the basis for a chain of results that links the following levels: inputs, activities, outputs (intermediate results), Outcome and impact. The chain indicates the course from a current situation towards a vision of change to be attained by a project (see: box 2).

**Box 2: Chain of results**

<b>Inputs</b>	Financial, human and material resources used to produce the intended outputs of a project.
<b>Activities</b>	Actions taken or work performed in a project to realize an output by using inputs, such as funds, technical assistance, human and other resources
<b>Output</b>	Outputs or tangible immediate results that are produced through the implementation of project activities. In the CORAF/WECARD Operational Plan, the output level is the equivalent of Programmes, which consists of a portfolio of projects.
<b>Outcome</b>	Operational outcomes are short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs (Specific objective level). They are the equivalent of CORAF/WECARD's four strategic results (technology research, policy research, capacity building and coordination, knowledge management)
<b>Impact</b>	The impact are the long term positive and negative effects produced by a development, and refer to the strategic objective level.

The next step is the design of the logical framework, which is essential for structuring a project in a clear and standardized way. The logical framework has the form of a matrix which offers the advantage of enabling a rapid evaluation of the consistency and coherence of the causality or logic of the intervention (see: box 3). The matrix is generally the result of a participatory process bringing together all stakeholders. As such, even before the project takes off, the logical framework establishes a flow of communication and cooperation between all players. The first column of the logical framework matrix presents the chain of results or project strategy, as well as the causal relations between levels (vertical logic).

The Objectively Verifiable Indicators (2<sup>nd</sup> column) are the core of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. These qualitative or quantitative indicators are identified at design stage and monitored during implementation and ex-post in order to assess how the project is performing with respect to expected impact, outcome and outputs. Several indicators may be required to assess whether a result has been achieved. The means of verification or sources of information are presented in the 3<sup>rd</sup> column for each indicator.

Assumptions (4<sup>th</sup> column) specify the necessary conditions outside direct control of the project that must exist for the project to achieve its full objectives. They describe conditions that may jeopardize the project's success and are therefore fundamental to project success.

**Box 3: Logical framework matrix**

Narrative description	Objectively Verifiable Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
Impact (overall objective)	Impact indicators	Reference surveys, studies, secondary sources	
Outcome (specific objective)	Outcome indicators	Reference surveys or studies, M&E monitoring reports, secondary sources	
Outputs (intermediate results)	Output indicators	M&E supervision & monitoring reports (technical, financial, administrative), reports prepared by partners	
Activities	Activities realized	M&E supervision & monitoring reports, reports prepared by partners	
Inputs	Inputs & financial means	M&E supervision & monitoring reports, reports prepared by partners	

## 2.2 Designing an M&E System

### Definitions

An M&E system must assess how a project is performing at all levels of its logical framework, namely with respect to activities, outputs, outcomes and impact. The CORAF/WECARD M&E System makes use of the international **evaluation criteria** (see: box 4), as defined by OECD-DAC<sup>6</sup>, that are directly derived from the logical framework. The purpose of the use of these criteria is i) to ensure that essential viewpoints are not forgotten in M&E exercises; ii) to guide the preparation of reviews and evaluations., by using the 7 evaluation criteria; iii) to adopt internationally recognized definitions and ensure quality.

**Monitoring** is defined as a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing (development) intervention

<sup>6</sup> Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds (source: OECD-DAC).

**Evaluation** is defined as the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program. It is the assessment as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, on-going, or completed intervention.

#### Box 4: Evaluation criteria

Evaluation criteria	Definition
Coherence	Coherence of interventions with sub-regional and national priorities.
Relevance	Extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements and country needs. Retrospectively, relevance becomes a question as to whether the objectives or design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. Efficiency, thus, means comparing outputs to inputs.
Effectiveness	Extent to which the intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved.
Impact	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects on beneficiaries, produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
Sustainability	Continuation of benefits from an intervention after external support has been completed, the probability of continued long-term benefits, including impact on natural resources.
Partnerships	Comparative advantage of CORAF/WECARD (subsidiarity principle): the extent to which CORAF/WECARD support adds benefits to what would have resulted from NARS interventions only. In addition, quality of partnerships, for example between CORAF/WECARD, NARS, governments and international stakeholders.

### Monitoring and Evaluation Manual

The M&E system consists of a set of key interrelated processes and tools. It is basically an information system that includes implementation monitoring and impact evaluation activities, as well as a learning and feedback mechanism. The Monitoring and Evaluation Manual details the design process of M&E as well as all activities, processes, tools, timing and budget for data collection, processing, analysis and use.

### Results-based management framework

Good indicators are said to be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bond). They are particularly effective as M&E tools if they are directly linked to the activity, output, outcome or impact being their focus, easy to measure. In addition, they should be ease to measure, at a reasonable cost and within an acceptable time-frame.

Following categories of indicators are used:

- Output indicators correspond to project outputs and refer generally to efficiency. These outputs are generally planned and implemented on an annual basis. Project outputs can be measured through simple quantitative indicators. For example, the indicator "Number of people trained in seed

production” provides the necessary information for assessing the output of a training programme during a given period: namely how many people have been trained, but not if they produce seeds.

- Outcome indicators correspond to project outcome and refer generally to effectiveness. They monitor short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s output. This level of results, which often requires that quantitative information be complemented by qualitative assessments, is difficult to aggregate. In addition to information provided by monitoring, various methods can be used for measuring these changes, including specific studies, participatory approaches, questionnaire-based surveys and focus group discussions.
- Impact indicators monitor long-term progress made in achieving the project’s overall or strategic objective. Often, but not necessarily, reference surveys or thematic surveys are used to monitor impact. In addition,

#### Box 5: Design of the M&E system

Steps	Process
Project design	Design structure of logical framework, project activities and budget
Design of indicators	Definition of indicators (indicator information sheet), Result framework and targets, data collection system (Indicator matrix)
M&E manual	Redaction of M&E manual that describes the M&E system
Definition of processes and tools	Definition of M&E data bases and information flows Procedures and tools for monitoring (AWPB, quarterly reports, financial reports), for supervision (periodic audits) and for evaluations (Baseline studies, mid-term review, impact studies)
Define M&E Plan	Preparation of action plan and budgeting for M&E
Data collection	Establishing reference situation (if necessary organization of reference surveys) Monitoring of implementation Monitoring of impact (if necessary surveys)
Data processing and analysis	Analysis of information and assessment whether results have been achieved Formulate recommendations for adjustments
communication & knowledge management	Communication of results to stakeholders concerned in various ways: written reports, audio-visual techniques, workshops, brochures.

The Result-based management (RBM) framework is a matrix with annual targets for each of the indicators. Appendix 2 presents the format of a Result-based management framework. In order to define baseline values, CORAF/WECARD will make use of studies that are based on secondary information sources (existing statistics and information) and/or primary sources (own reference surveys).

Once selected, each indicator is defined and documented in the Indicator sheet. The absence of data on a given indicator will be the most obvious sign of weakness of the M&E mechanism, especially for impact monitoring. Appendix 3 presents a format and details of an indicator sheet. The Indicator Monitoring Matrix (IMM) or M&E matrix presents in a synoptic tool for the use of indicators. This M&E matrix is preferably developed during the design or initial phase of a project, but there is a need to revise and improve it periodically. The IMM contains following information in its columns: a) indicators, b) necessary variables/information; c) collection methods; d) frequency of collection; e) agents responsible for data collection; f) agents responsible for analysis; g) other tools. Appendix 4 presents a format of the Indicator Monitoring Matrix.

### **III. CORAF/WECARD's Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Tools**

#### **3.1 Planning and monitoring tools**

The planning & monitoring tools used by CORAF/WECARD are: i) the Programme Action Plan (5 years), which allows a strategic orienting of a portfolio of projects in the medium and long-term; ii) the Annual Work Plan and Budget, which is elaborated at the level of each project and consolidated at Programme level; iii) the Quarterly Work Plan; iv) the supervision report; v) the project completion report. The format of the Annual Progress Report is presented in Appendix 6.

As defined, monitoring is an ongoing process that provides project coordinators and CORAF/WECARD Programme managers and other stakeholders with a regular information feedback that allows determining whether project progress is in accordance with schedule. Box 6 presents 4 types of monitoring.

#### **Programme Action Plan**

Each of the eight Programmes has a Programme Action Plan for a period of five years. The action plan proposes a portfolio of project themes that are considered as sub-regional priorities in line with the CORAF/WECARD Strategic Plan 2007-2016 and Operational Plan 2008-2013, for which the Programme manager prepares concept notes, mobilizes financial resources and mobilizes partnerships.

#### **Annual planning**

The Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) is derived from the logical framework. The AWPB is the most important operational and planning tool and guides daily implementation. It includes: i) a work plan, which has the format of a logframe-based description of each activity/output/indicator per component; ii) a schedule or time plan; iii) a budget, identifying the cost of each output and activity per component; iv) a personnel plan, identifying responsibilities, staff needs and training needs of staff and partner organizations; v) materials and equipment required for implementation. The preparation of the AWPB is the joint responsibility of project coordinators and CORAF/WECARD Programme managers, and is submitted to the Steering Committee of Programmes for approval. The procedure is applied at all the competitive projects and special projects submitted for financing to CORAF/WECARD. Appendix 5 presents the format of the AWPB chart, and describes its preparation and approval process.

#### **Quarterly planning**

A Quarterly Work Plan (QWP) allows reviewing the activities carried out during the ongoing quarter and to plan activities for the next quarter. In order to prepare the QWP, project coordinators organize a planning workshop with the involvement of all stakeholders a week before the end of the quarter in order to prepare the QWP. It is submitted to the Programme manager for approval. The format of the QWP is presented in Appendix 5.

#### **Supervision mission**

The objective of a supervision mission is to perform a technical, financial, administrative and institutional monitoring of a project, and to formulate recommendations to the project manager and technical and financial partner in order to improve implementation (see: Box 6). Supervisions missions focus on: (i) adoption of project design and inception plan; (ii) verification of implementation progress; (iii) compliance with time schedule and plan of operations and annual work plan; (iv) verification of intermediate results. The supervision mission is organized by the CORAF/WECARD Program manager in close collaboration with the M&E Unit. Specific expertise might be required in the team (e.g. financial & and human resources management, project procedures & procurement, technical expertise)

## Project completion report

The project completion report aims at: i) measuring the level of realization of set goals, ii) verifying the use of financial resources in line with expected results; iii) assessing satisfaction of beneficiaries; iv) review of the relevance and coherence; and v) formulating recommendations for the future. The process is managed by the Head of the M&E Unit.

### Box 6: Type and focus of monitoring / supervision

Type	Focus	Expertise
Technical monitoring	Technical monitoring looks at: a) the physical implementation rate of outputs (and activities), compared to targets; b) the factors impacting on implementation progress; c) the identification of measures (what, who, how, when) to solve problems.	M&E Technical experts
Financial monitoring	Financial monitoring looks at: a) compliance of activities with allocated unit costs and budgets; b) coherence of disbursements with progress of activities and planning; c) efficiency criteria of recurrent cost and financial performance ratios; d) quality of financial project management; e) costs by expenditure category and financier; f) required resources quantities, mainly human and material resources. Financial monitoring uses as main indicator the disbursement rate.  Input data are provided by the financial management system.	Financial and management experts
Administrative monitoring	Administrative monitoring looks at administrative processes, including a) human resources management; b) administrative management practices of project staff and organizations, involved in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; c) procurement procedures and administrative management of contracts with operators and procurement; d) difficulties encountered and corrective measures taken (ability to manage challenges); e) factors explaining gaps between planning and implementation.	Management expert Procurement expert
Institutional monitoring	Institutional monitoring looks at institutional capacity strengthening processes, for example of capacity building of national project teams, partner organizations involved in project implementation, or target organizations.	M&E expert Institutional expert

## 3.2 Evaluation tools

### Baseline and reference surveys

Baseline study or reference surveys can be defined as an analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made (DAC). Baseline surveys are organized by the Programme manager in close collaboration with the M&E unit.

### Mid-term review

The Mid-term review (MTR) is an evaluation performed towards the middle of the period of implementation of the project, whose principal goal is to measure progress, learn lessons and draw conclusions for reorienting the project strategy. The MTR is organized under the responsibility of the Head of the Monitoring & Evaluation, assisted by the Head of Planning Unit. The MTR mission has following tasks: a) analysis of project documents, logical framework and monitoring and evaluation reports; b) verification of progress on the basis of the result-based framework; c) analysis of relevance of planned activities to achieve expected results; d) report on the use of resources and analysis of the adequacy between used resources and the level of results achieved; e) analysis of the level of involvement and of satisfaction of

beneficiaries; f) identification of difficulties encountered in implementing the project; g) formulation of recommendations for project reorienting.

### Impact (ex-post) evaluation

The ex-post evaluation is initiated by the Head of M&E Unit on the basis of the project document or the logical framework of the intervention, the various monitoring and audit reports produced and previously identified indicators. Impact monitoring deals with four main areas likely to undergo long-term changes attributable to the project and which constitute the 'pillars' for the success of the project: a) the institutional framework (creation of a conducive and favourable environment); b) capacity strengthening of involved institutions, as well as human resources; c) improvement of socio-economic conditions; d) productive capital and goods, including natural resources (restoration, preservation). A format of the evaluation matrix is presented in Appendix 7.

### Thematic studies

Thematic studies provide facts, experiences, ideas and impressions on specific themes in the context of the CORAF/WECARD interventions. Thematic evaluations often have a transversal or sub-regional character. Thematic evaluations are initiated by the Directorate of Programmes and managed by the M&E Unit.

#### Box 7: Structure of project evaluation reports

Executive summary	The executive summary includes the main findings and recommendations
I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and processes	Main evaluation objectives are defined, as well as the evaluation framework. An overview of information sources and data collection instruments is presented, as well as the evaluation process.
II. Country and sector background	Only background information that is relevant for the project.
III. Project background	Information on: i) project objectives, goals, and components; ii) project data; iii) planning and monitoring, implementation support, supervisions; iv) quality enhancement by CORAF/WECARD
IV. Implementation results	Assessment of project performance in terms of (i) outputs; (ii) budget use; (iii) compliance with schedules and deadlines
V. Project performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Relevance and coherence: alignment with CORAF/WECARD objectives, project design features</li> <li>b) Effectiveness: the quality of physical and financial outputs</li> <li>c) Efficiency: financial and administrative monitoring</li> <li>d) Overall assessment of performance</li> </ul>
VI. Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Impact on agricultural productivity and food security</li> <li>b) Impact on the target group</li> <li>c) Impact on capacity building of individuals and institutions</li> <li>d) Impact on policies</li> </ul>
VII. Sustainability and innovations	
VIII. Performance of partners	
IX. Conclusions and recommendations	



### **3.4 Environmental impact assessment and mitigation**

Environmental impact assessment and mitigation are an essential part of project design and are part of the baseline and impact studies. An environmental impact assessment (EIA) is an assessment of the possible impact—positive or negative—that a proposed project may have on the environment, together consisting of the natural, social and economic aspects. Its purpose is to ensure that decision makers consider the ensuing environmental impacts to decide whether to proceed with the project, and to propose mitigating activities for environmental risks. A format of an environmental impact assessment sheet is presented in Appendix 8. The required studies and structure of the environmental impact assessment report are often donor-specific. The EIA is organized by the Head of M&E Unit.

### **3.5 Monitoring and mitigation of risks**

Risks are an integral part of a project and are defined at design stage. Managing risks involves the identification and analysis of risks, as well as the elaboration and implementation of mitigation measures. Potential negative impacts of agricultural research projects include for example health risks related to the use of pesticides, deforestation and erosion through the use of mechanized labour, loss of soil fertility, selective grazing by livestock, etc.. The framework for risk monitoring and mitigation includes a risk assessment form and a risk mitigation form (format to be found in Appendix 9 and 10).

## **IV. Monitoring implementation progress of CORAF/WECARD's Operational Plan**

Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 of Chapter IV present an operational approach for measuring implementation progress of the Operational Plan 2008-2013 at the level of impact, operational outcomes and output (project and programme level). Section 4.4 looks at the evaluation of CORAF/WECARD's partnerships. Section 4.5 presents a methodology to evaluate the management performance of CORAF/WECARD as an institution.

### **4.1 Evaluation of impact of CORAF/WECARD (Strategic objective)**

With respect to overall goal of “high broad-based agricultural growth and food security sustainably established in West and Central Africa”, CORAF/WECARD refers to reference and monitoring studies prepared by CAAPD, FARA and other regional research institutes and international organizations.

Box 8 presents the structure and themes of impact studies that will be organized in 2010 and 2014, mainly on the basis of internal data, available at the level of CORAF/WECARD and its national partners (NARS) through project monitoring and evaluation reports and the analysis of CORAF/WECARD's management performance. Some in-depth thematic impact and transversal studies might be required. The structure of the impact report is presented in Appendix 11.

In order to be able to contribute to the overall regional goal of agricultural growth and food security, and to demonstrate a clear comparative advantage and added value as a sub-regional institution, CORAF/WECARD has to:

- a) ensure technology generation and dissemination;
- b) propose policy solutions in specific fields where it has a comparative advantage;
- c) contribute to capacity building of agricultural research centres in the region, while providing leadership in coordinating agricultural research and mobilize financial support for cross-border research initiatives; and

d) deliver knowledge products in its field of expertise.

## 4.2 Monitoring progress of Operational outcomes (4 results)

### Result 1: Appropriate technologies and innovations developed

With respect to Result 1, CORAF/WECARD's main contribution would be in working with partners in order to develop, test and mainstream innovative technologies, methodologies and institutional arrangements that contribute to broad-based growth of agricultural productivity, competitiveness and trade through its technical research programmes. The concept of "agricultural productivity" and process of innovation and upscaling through the research partnerships is central and needs to be captured by the M&E system.

Box 8 summarizes the key Output indicators at Programme and project level and Operational outcome indicators.

Output indicators 111, 112 and 113 summarize results of ongoing project implementation (efficiency, effectiveness, cross-cutting issues, environmental impact). The Operational outcome indicator 11 summarizes basically the impact of a portfolio of technologies on productivity at the level of the target group. Output indicators 121 and 122 refer to the innovation platforms and partnerships that are being installed as a vehicle for delivery of research, in line with the promoted research approach (output indicator 131).

The Output indicators can be mainly extracted from the monitoring, baseline and evaluation reports prepared by CORAF/WECARD projects and the Programme manager. The Operational outcome indicators are based on information that can be extracted from project review and impact evaluation report. Some thematic reviews of concepts (e.g. innovation platform, IAR4D) might be required.

#### Box 8: Outcome Indicators for Result 1 (technical research)

Key themes of Output indicators at the level of Programme / projects	Operational outcome indicators at the level of results
111. Number of Technologies tested that contribute to productivity increase (%)	11. A CORAF/WECARD portfolio of technologies with proven productivity and competitiveness characteristics is available for crops, animal husbandry and sustainable production systems (Programmes 1, 2, 3, 4)
112. Assessment of innovative aspects of technologies (impact on revenues, competitiveness, ) and potential for upscaling	
113. Technologies coherent with cross-cutting issues: a) technologies are scale-neutral, b) gender sensitive, c) HIV/AIDS appropriate; d) environmental sustainability.	
121. Number and quality of innovation platform installed	12. Partnerships for the new CORAF/WECARD approach have been mainstreamed.
122. Research partnerships have been put in place	
131. IAR4D approach tested and implementation capacities developed in projects	13. Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D) process adopted by all CORAF/WECARD initiatives

## Result 2: Strategic decision-making options for policy institutions and markets

Result 2 contributes to the promotion of the sub-regional market and integration of West and Central African agriculture into the regional and global market. In this new thematic area, CORAF/WECARD will identify specific fields where it can intervene through its projects and where it has a comparative advantage as a sub-regional agricultural research network<sup>7</sup>.

Output indicators 211, 212 and 213 summarize results of ongoing project implementation (efficiency, effectiveness, cross-cutting issues), which results in Operational outcome 21. Information with respect to Operational outcome 21 will be based on Project monitoring and evaluation reports. It might also be provided by national governments and regional institutions.

Output indicators 221, 222 and 223 contribute to the development of an action plan for CORAF/WECARD (outcome 22), as well as to the required capacity development at the level of CORAF/WECARD. The lessons learned will feed directly into national and regional policy and strategy development processes, partially through knowledge management initiatives.

The key to influence will be long-term and strategic partnerships with regional stakeholders (ECOWAS, MRU, UEMOA) (Outcome indicator 23). Operational outcome 22 and 23 might be monitored through self-assessment process at the level of CORAF/WECARD, in close collaboration with regional institutions.

### Box 9: Output and Outcome Indicators for Result 2 (Policy research)

Key themes of Output indicators at the level of Programme / projects	Operational outcome indicators at the level of results
211. Number and type of approaches that have been tested in ongoing projects.	21. Contribution to regional market integration has been made through a portfolio of projects (e.g. cross-border trade of seeds, genetic materials)
212. Number and type of tools and knowledge products has been developed, and are documented (e.g. harmonization of common regulations)	
213. Policy options are coherent with cross-cutting issues (sufficient technologies are scale-neutral, gender sensitive, HIV/AIDS appropriate)	
221. Relevant policy fields where CORAF/WECARD has a comparative advantage have been identified	22. An action plan with clear priorities for CORAF/WECARD Policy Research exists and capacity has been developed (tools, knowledge products, experts) at the level of CORAF/WECARD.
222. Expertise at the level of CORAF/WECARD has been developed.	
231. Projects / programmes developed joint initiatives with regional actors and national governments.	23. Partnerships with key players (ECOWAS, MRU, UEMOA, FAO) have been established

<sup>7</sup> Evident options are for example: a) common regulations related to genetic materials and plant protection products; b) harmonization of certification and registration procedures of genetic materials and inputs; c) policies and interventions related to sub-regional and regional market integration and trade (import and export) of agricultural products (e.g. rice in MRU countries); d) harmonization and mainstreaming of trade standards, as well as capacity development; e) policy advice with respect to sub-regional agricultural research policies.

### Result 3: Sub-regional agricultural research system strengthened and coordinated

The strengthening of the NARS is the basis for creating strong sub-regional capacity and networks. Outcome indicator 31 monitors the role of the Regional centres of excellence and networks, which are an important tool of CORAF/WECARD's intervention strategy. CORAF/WECARD has no direct responsibility for the strengthening of capacity of national systems of member countries where there is no sub-regional dimension. However, members with reduced capacity are supported through the Capacity Strengthening Programme until such time as they are in a position to contribute to sub-regional research initiatives.

The aim of the coordinating role of CORAF/WECARD is to ensure that the focus is on the functioning of the sub-regional agricultural research system as a whole. The role of CORAF/WECARD and its leadership as regional coordinating institution is monitored (Outcome 32). It is important to provide the analyses to improve sub-regional agricultural research systems, based on lessons learned in line with the changing political, market and climatic environments.

Outcome indicator 33 looks at the growing importance of sub-regional research through financial volumes that are available, as well as the role and achievements of the regional comparative grant system.

The information to monitor these indicators is to be found in the monitoring and evaluation reports of CORAF/WECARD and its projects. Additional information with respect to the capacity of research centres might be available at the level of the CGIAR centres and NARS. Recognition of the leading role might also be derived from an analysis of perception amongst stakeholders.

#### Box 10: Output and Outcome Indicators for Result 3 (Capacity building and coordination)

Key themes of Output indicators at the level of Programme / projects	Operational outcome indicators at the level of results
311 Number of partners that benefit from the Capacity Strengthening Program	31. Regional Centres of Excellence and networks are playing a growing role
312. Regional Centres of Excellence established and strengthened	
321. Number and level of sub-regional research events (conferences, seminars, ...) organized by CORAF/WECARD	32. CORAF/WECARD provides regional leadership in coordinating the sub-regional research agenda.
322. Executive Secretariat of CORAF/WECARD fulfils its coordinating role (demonstrate through ...)	
331. Funds mobilized for regional research (evolution of portfolio under management of CORAF)	33. Financing for sub-regional research initiatives is available (evolution of funds managed by CORAF/WECARD).
332. Sub-regional grant system operational and delivering	

### Result 4: Knowledge management & lessons learnt

For broader impact and CORAF/WECARD's interventions, it is critical that innovation at project level becomes a lever for change on a larger sub-regional scale. This requires enhanced learning systems within projects/programmes, better management of in-house knowledge, and explicit mechanisms to feed the lessons learned to the higher level.

Operational outcome indicator 41 looks at the performance of the knowledge management and communication unit.

Operational outcome indicator 42 monitors demand for CORAF/WECARD knowledge products. CORAF/WECARD also includes knowledge products among its outputs. These will include research papers, policy papers, books, broadcasts and website entries; all will be aimed at disseminating the knowledge that CORAF and its partners have accumulated both within the organization. The M&E system play a key role in knowledge products.

#### **Box 11: Output and Outcome Indicators for Result 4 (Knowledge management)**

<b>Key themes of Output indicators at the level of Programme / projects</b>	<b>Operational outcome indicators at the level of results</b>
411. Operational platform to ensure knowledge management at CORAF/WECARD is established	41. Knowledge management system of CORAF/WECARD is operational
412. Communication strategy of CORAF/WECARD is being developed	
421. Knowledge products have been prepared.	42. Clients make use of CORAF/WECARD knowledge products.
422. CORAF/WECARD Programmes provide inputs.	
423. Capacity building and training in the field of knowledge management	

### **4.3 Monitoring and evaluation of projects**

The organization of planning, monitoring and evaluation exercises is presented in Chapter III. Key sources of information will be:

- Monitoring reports (quarterly reports, annual progress reports, supervision reports/periodic audit, project completion reports).
- Evaluation reports, including baseline studies, mid-term reviews, environmental impact studies and end-of-project evaluations of all CORAF/WECARD projects.

These exercises of CORAF/WECARD projects are the main source of information for the M&E System, to be used to monitor progress implementation of the Operational Plan 2008-2013. The M&E System will collate and synthesize information generated by at the level of project and extract key indicators and essential information which would allow monitoring progress realized CORAF/WECARD's outputs (programmes), operational outcomes and strategic objective. It is therefore of crucial importance to ensure quality enhancement and assurance processes of M&E at the level of partners and NARS, through capacity building, technical backstopping, harmonization of M&E tools.

### **4.4 Performance evaluation of CORAF/WECARD's partnerships**

Partnerships and linkages with NARS, CGIAR centres, regional and international organizations, technical and financial partners, NGOs, civil society organization, the private sector as a mechanism for ensuring sub-regional collaboration is of critical importance for the CORAF/WECARD Operational Plan 2008-2013. In addition, research within the operational model is done by those members of CORAF/WECARD that are best placed to deliver. The responsibilities between CORAF/WECARD and its contractual partners are defined in performance agreements.

The CORAF/WECARD M&E Strategy will adopt two new concepts to monitor the quality of its partnerships & networks: a) mutual accountability<sup>8</sup> for outputs; b) shared responsibility for strategic objective and operational outcomes<sup>9</sup>. Responsibilities and accountability is summarized in box 12.

### Box 12: Mutual accountability and shared responsibility

<b>Shared responsibility for CORAF/WECARD's Strategic objective</b>	
CORAF/WECARD NARS regional organizations donor community	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. creating an enabling environment for sub-regional agricultural research by working on policy dialogue</li> <li>2. supporting regional market integration initiatives in order to induce long-term improvements of livelihoods in West and Central Africa</li> </ol>
<b>Shared responsibility for CORAF/WECARD's Operational outcomes</b>	
CORAF/WECARD NARS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. accountable for engaging with partners</li> <li>2. aligning the research agenda with national and sub-regional priorities</li> <li>3. advocating research needs and achievements</li> <li>4. monitoring project outcomes based on agreed indicators and quality targets</li> </ol>
<b>Mutual accountability: CORAF/WECARD – NARS (including national M&amp;E systems)</b>	
CORAF/WECARD	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ensure project management and good governance at sub-regional regional level;</li> <li>2. ensure technical backstopping to support the development of research outputs and M&amp;E services;</li> <li>3. monitor sub-regional trends in the field of agricultural productivity, competitiveness and market development (together with FARA).</li> <li>4. provide capacity building and training services at the national level;</li> <li>5. provide coordination and networking in the field of regional research initiatives and mobilize funding</li> </ol>
NARS & national M&E systems	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. respect the performance agreements</li> <li>2. ensure good quality of technical research</li> <li>3. ensure respect of annual targets</li> <li>4. ensure quality of financial management of projects and respect for procedures (good governance)</li> <li>5. guarantee accuracy and regularity of reporting</li> <li>6. provide data on M&amp;E through their national systems</li> </ol>
<b>Mutual accountability: CORAF/WECARD – Technical and financial partners</b>	
CORAF/WECARD	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. respect for donor-specific procedures and quality requirements</li> <li>2. respect the performance agreements</li> </ol>
Technical and financial partners	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ensure an aligned provision of funds to support research as agreed in the performance agreements</li> <li>2. are responsible for harmonizing and aligning their policies.</li> </ol>

## 4.5 Evaluation of management performance of CORAF/WECARD's Executive Secretariat

Strengthening CORAF/WECARD's effectiveness and efficiency through improved internal performance management is critical to delivering improved sub-regional development results. Measurement of

<sup>8</sup> Mutual accountability can be defined as a process between partners holding one another to account for mutual commitments. It is a partnership in which both sides have to work to maintain commitment. It involves developing shared agendas, monitoring performance and engaging in dialogue and debate.

<sup>9</sup> CGIAR. M&E Framework for the New CGIAR.

CORAF/WECARD's overall performance at the corporate, programme and organizational levels will be undertaken within a coherent results measurement framework. Box 14 summarizes the management performance monitoring tools, used by CORAF/WECARD.

At the corporate level, the external program and management review (EPMR) is an essential tool a) that looks at CORAF/WECARD's mission and comparative advantage as a sub-regional network of research institute; b) that monitors institutional development issues, programme and thematic developments and trends, governance and financial management. It will also formulate recommendations for future scenarios. In the short term (annual), other tools used at the corporate level are: (i) financial audits; (ii) self assessment techniques (e.g. SWOT analysis, internal monitoring of management performance indicators. Management plans tracking how well internal resources are being used to deliver quality products at the most economical cost. Targets and information sources will be defined for all key indicators and, where appropriate, performance will be benchmarked against that of comparable organizations.

### Box 13: Management performance monitoring tools of CORAF/WECARD

Level	Tool	Frequency
<b>CORAF/WECARD Executive secretariat</b>		
1.	Independent external evaluation, monitoring overall progress,	Independent External evaluation (3-5 years)
2.	Internal assessments of management performance of Departments (Programmes, Finance and administration, Information and communication)	Annual
3.	Financial audit	Annual
<b>Programmes</b>		
1.	Resource mobilization and efficacy of fund allocation	Annual
2.	Project progress evaluation (PPE)	Annual
3.	SWOT analysis <sup>10</sup>	Annual
<b>Human resources</b>		
1.	performance-based evaluation: self-assessments, joint assessments, agreements of performance and individual development needs	Annual

## V. M&E management and services

The CORAF/WECARD M&E Unit will provide technical assistance to Programmes and projects in order to ensure high-quality monitoring and evaluation on the basis of a logical framework approach at all stages of the project cycle (design, planning, implementation, monitoring, review and evaluation).

The M&E Unit will provide assistance to the eight programmes in following fields: a) technical backstopping of Programme managers and partners; b) capacity building and training of partner organizations in the field of M&E, design of M&E systems of projects, of reference surveys, etc.; c) knowledge management.

<sup>10</sup> SWOT is an abbreviation for **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats**. SWOT analysis is an important tool for auditing the overall strategic position of an institution and its environment.

At the level of the Executive Secretariat of CORAF/WECARD, the implementation of the M&E System is assured by the Planning and Monitoring-Evaluation Unit (PMEIU), which is based in the Directorate of Programmes. The M&E officer is working in close collaboration with the Programme managers that are responsible for daily management of the CORAF/WECARD portfolio of interventions.

#### Box 14: Strategic Plan of CORAF/WECARD and M&E tasks

	Role of M&E	M&E output
Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall evaluation of vision, mission and mandate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External program and management review</li> </ul>
Strategic objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Evaluation of impact, coherence, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, partnerships, sustainability</b> of CORAF/WECARD intervention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact report (2010)</li> <li>Impact report (2014)</li> </ul>
Operational outcomes (results)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of progress made by CORAF/WECARD in achieving its four operational outcomes</li> <li>Monitor management performance (<b>efficiency</b>) of CORAF/WECARD</li> <li>Monitor partnership relations and linkages: CORAF/WECARD – donors – NARS – other partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual progress reports</li> <li>Thematic evaluations</li> <li>Management performance report of CORAF</li> <li>Analysis of partnerships</li> </ul>
Outputs (programmes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Backstopping of Programme managers in the field of M&amp;E</li> <li>Contribute to knowledge management</li> <li>Capacity building of partners in the field of M&amp;E</li> <li>Validation of quarterly and annual progress reports of projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic evaluation</li> <li>Knowledge products</li> <li>M&amp;E tools for partners</li> </ul>
(projects)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of key progress indicators on the basis of quarterly and annual reports</li> <li>Support to design of M&amp;E of projects.</li> <li>Training of partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly reports by donor</li> <li>Annual reports by donor</li> <li>Supervision reports,</li> <li>Project completion reports</li> <li>Baseline surveys, mid-term review, impact evaluation reports</li> </ul>



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bamberger, M. & Hewitt, E. (1986). 'Monitoring and evaluating urban development programs: a Handbook for program managers and researchers' World Bank technical paper N°53 Washington D.C. 112p.
- Commission Européenne (2004). Méthodes de l'aide : lignes directrices de gestion du cycle de projet. 151p.
- DFID (2006). Monitoring and evaluation. A guide for DFID-contracted research programmes. Central Research Department. 59p.
- Direction du Développement et de la Coopération (1996). Manuel de l'auto-évaluation : cahier de la série de planification, de suivi-évaluation et de réalisation. ISBN: 3- 905398-61-3. 46p.
- Guéneau, M.C. et al. 1996. *L'évaluation, un outil au service de l'action*. Paris: F3E. Peut être commandé à l'adresse suivante: <http://www.f3e.assoc.fr/>
- Heemskerk, W. ; Lema, N. ; Guido, D. ; Schouten, C.; Semgalawe, Z.; Verkuil, H. ; de Steenhuijsen, B.; Penninkhoff, P. (2003). Un guide pour la recherche agricole régie par la demande. Institut Royal des Tropiques, Institut d'Economie Rurale, Division of research and Development, Tanzania. Kit publishers Amsterdam. 122pp
- Lema, N.; Schouten, C. and Schrader (eds.) (2003). Managing research for agricultural development. Proceedings of the National Workshop on Client oriented research, 27-28 May 2003, Moshi, Tanzania. DRD/MAFS, Tanzania and Royal Tropical Institute, The Netherlands. 206pp.
- Margoluis, R. et Salafsky, N. 1998. *Measures of Success: Designing, Managing, and Monitoring Conservation and Development Projects*. Washington, DC: Island Press. Peut être commandé à l'adresse suivante: <http://www.islandpress.org/books/>
- OECD-DAC (2002). Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results. Paris
- Prennushi, G.; Rubio, G. & Subbarao, K. (2002). Suivi-évaluation: techniques fondamentales et questions transversales. Monitoring\_je\_4.doc. 30p.

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix 1: Logical framework of the Strategic Plan 2006-2016

Hierarchy of objectives	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Hypothesis
<p><b>General Objective</b></p> <p>High broad-based agricultural growth and food security sustainably established in WCA.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 6% average annual increase in GDP from agricultural sector between 2010 and 2015<sup>11</sup></li> <li>2. Farm income of rural farmers and other small farmers has increased by, at least, 6% between 2010 and 2015</li> <li>3. The needed resources to buy staple food items for families of deprived and vulnerable groups have been reduced by, at least, 50% between 2010 and 2015<sup>12</sup></li> <li>4. 10% inversion of the reduction of basic natural resources -- biodiversity, forest cover, land and water - towards 2015</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference studies made by FARA, CAADP, World Bank, ECOWAS, CGIAR system</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Specific objective</b></p> <p>Sustainable increase in productivity, competitiveness and agricultural markets driven by the involvement of all the stakeholders is improved in WCA</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CORAF/WECARD ensures technology generation and dissemination;</li> <li>2. CORAF/WECARD proposes policy solutions in specific fields where it has a comparative advantage;</li> <li>3. CORAF/WECARD plays an active role in enhancing a number of regional research centres, while providing leadership and ensuring financing;</li> <li>4. CORAF/WECARD delivers knowledge products in its field of expertise.</li> <li>5. CORAF/WECARD developed a strong network of partners;</li> <li>6. CORAF/WECARD has a performing management.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual progress reports</li> <li>• CORAF/WECARD monitoring and evaluation reports</li> <li>• Thematic studies</li> <li>• Selected reports and publications of CGIAR</li> <li>• CORAF/WECARD management evaluation</li> <li>• External evaluation and impact assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of areas under sustainable water and soil management systems has been conducted as a priority [Pillar I]</li> <li>• Contribution of improved rural infrastructure and access to markets conducted as a priority [Pillar II]</li> <li>• Response to famine and food supply have been undertaken as a matter of priority [Pillar III]</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> Main target of the programme detailed for agricultural productivity in Africa

<sup>12</sup> Specific objectives of the MDG to reduce the number of persons considered to be facing food insecurity and those living below the poverty line by half.

Hierarchy of objectives	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Hypothesis
<b>Result 1:</b> Appropriate technologies and innovations have been developed	11. Portfolio of technologies with proven productivity characteristics is available for crops, animal husbandry and sustainable production systems (Programmes 1, 2, 3, 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NARS annual reports</li> <li>• CORAF/WECARD monitoring and evaluation reports</li> <li>• Thematic studies</li> <li>• Selected reports and publications of CGIAR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Integrated Agriculture for Development paradigm is an effective approach to making the less known businesses thrive</li> </ul>
	12. Partnerships for the new CORAF/WECARD approach have been mainstreamed.		
	13. Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D) process adopted by all CORAF/WECARD initiatives		
<b>Result 2:</b> Strategic decision-making options for policy, institutions and markets developed.	21. Contribution to regional market integration has been made through a portfolio of projects (e.g. cross-border trade of seeds, genetic materials)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NARS annual reports</li> <li>• CORAF/WECARD monitoring and evaluation reports</li> <li>• Thematic studies</li> <li>• Selected reports and publications of CGIAR</li> <li>• Internal SWOT exercise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political goodwill at national and regional levels exists</li> </ul>
	22. An action plan with clear priorities for CORAF/WECARD Policy Research exists and capacity has been developed (tools, knowledge products, experts) at the level of CORAF/WECARD.		
	23. Partnerships with key players (ECOWAS, MRU, UEMOA, FAO) have been established		
<b>Result 3:</b> Sub-regional agricultural research system is strengthened and coordinated	31. Regional Centres of Excellence and networks are playing a growing role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NARS reports</li> <li>• Thematic studies</li> <li>• Selected reports and publications of CGIAR</li> <li>• Internal SWOT exercise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political goodwill at national and regional levels exists</li> </ul>
	32. CORAF/WECARD provides regional leadership in coordinating the sub-regional research agenda.		
	33. Financing for sub-regional research initiatives is available (evolution of funds managed by CORAF/WECARD).		
<b>Result 4:</b> Demand for agricultural information from target group facilitated and met	41. Knowledge management system of CORAF/WECARD is operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NARS annual reports</li> <li>• CORAF/WECARD monitoring and evaluation reports</li> </ul>	
	42. Clients make use of CORAF/WECARD knowledge products		

Hierarchy of objectives	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Hypothesis
<p><b>Activities</b></p> <p><b>Outputs required to reach outcome 1: Appropriate technologies and innovations developed for the ----- programme</b></p> <p>1.1 Identify and quantify the needs and opportunities for research at country/sub-regional level</p> <p>1.2 Develop and strengthen partnerships for the ----- programme</p> <p>1.3 Develop appropriate technologies and innovations that are coherent with the Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D) paradigm</p> <p><b>Outputs required to reach outcome 2: Strategic decision - making options for policies, institutions and markets are developed for the programme</b></p> <p>2.1 Constraints and opportunities, including an analysis of an existing agricultural policy</p> <p>2.2 Develop mechanisms for the improvement of trade at regional and international levels.</p> <p>2.3 Promote the information systems on the market</p> <p>2.4 Identify the institutional constraints accompanied by an analysis of the main agricultural institutions of the sub-region</p> <p>2.5 Develop mechanisms for the improvement of institutional response to the continuum of production, consumption and market</p> <p>2.6 Harmonise processes for priority products [policies]</p> <p>2.7 Harmonise and operationalise the framework and procedures for quality control</p> <p>2.8 Develop strategies for advocacy</p> <p><b>Outputs required to reach outcome 3: The sub-regional agricultural research System for the ----- programme strengthened and coordinated</b></p> <p>3.1 Identify the capacity and coordination needs and the constraints of the NARS in WCA</p> <p>3.2 Develop mechanisms to strengthen collaboration and partnership among the NARS and endow them with a good communication system.</p> <p>3.3 Strengthen the operational units of CORAF/WECARD (networks, regional programmes, the grassroots, bases – centres and centres of excellence)</p> <p>3.4 Strengthen competitive funds for agricultural research and development</p> <p>3.5 Develop and promote agricultural knowledge management systems</p> <p>3.6 Promote existing capacity building initiatives</p> <p>3.7 Strengthen the capacity of stakeholders for analysing the value chain of priority crops and trade policies of the agricultural sector</p> <p><b>Outputs required to reach outcome 4 : Request for agricultural innovation from target groups are met and fulfilled for the ----- programme</b></p> <p>4.1 Identify the constraints, needs and opportunities for developing the sub-region's agricultural information and</p>		<p><b>Prerequisites:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is motivation for good researchers</li> <li>• Availability of adequate financial resources</li> <li>• Agricultural research is a high priority at national level</li> <li>• Availability of human and physical resources in member organisations</li> <li>• Good level of ownership, involvement and commitment of all NARS stakeholders</li> <li>• Existence of measures to mitigate the effects of natural disasters</li> <li>• The development partners are contributing financially to sub-regional organisations Bonne gouvernance dans les NARS</li> <li>• Need for strong and vibrant coordination structures</li> <li>• Existence of strong organisational stability within the SROs</li> <li>• Sound understanding of point A (current situation) and with the clear vision for attaining the MDGs by 2015</li> <li>• Existence of an enabling legal environment</li> </ul>	

Hierarchy of objectives	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Hypothesis
<p>communication system for the ----- programme</p> <p>4.2 Build relations with regional and sub-regional knowledge management systems and define operational mechanisms for the ----- programme</p> <p>4.3 Develop a sub-regional communication and advocacy</p> <p>4.4 Develop a regional data base of agricultural research and development findings</p> <p>4.5 Support the NARS and partners in the gathering and exchange of agricultural information</p> <p>4.6 Develop national and sub-regional market information systems for priority products</p> <p>4.7 Support the dissemination and exchange of technological innovations for the ----- programme.</p> <p>4.8 Diversify the framework for the spread and dissemination of information for the ----- programme</p> <p>4.9 Carry out a diversified selection of mechanisms and media for promotion of products from activities of stakeholders of the « integrated agricultural research for development (IAR4D) » in WCA, including the following :</p> <p>    4.9.1 Technology and innovations</p> <p>    4.9.2 Products of a commercial value, such as business opportunities</p> <p>    4.9.3 Decision-making tools</p> <p>    4.9.4 Policy options</p> <p>4.9.5 Information systems</p>			

## **Appendix 2: Result-based management framework**

### Appendix 3: Format of the indicator sheet

<b>Title of the project:</b>		<b>Responsible:</b>	
<b>Objective (of the indicator) :</b>		<b>Level (of the logical framework) :</b>	
Name of the indicator:		Definition (scope, specificity, etc)	
Values measured (compared):		Origin of data (source):	
Users of results (and of data collected) of the monitoring:		Frequency of collection of information and of monitoring:	
•		Costs inherent in monitoring the indicator:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Type of representation (graph or others) suggested:</b></li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Use, analysis, interpretation, recommendations, decisions, actions:</b></li> </ul>			
What does the graph represent?		-	
What is the possible interpretation?		-	
What can be recommended following these observations?		-	
What decision should be taken?		-	
What necessary action should be taken?		-	
Remarks on the monitoring:		-	



## **Appendix 4: Indicator monitoring matrix**

## Appendix 5: Preparation process of the AWPB

### Example of an AWPB chart

N°	Activity and sub-activity	Indicator	Program	Budget	Source of funding	Officer in charge	Technical support	Schedule	Observations

### Outline of the Quarterly Work Plan

N°	Activities	Officer in charge	Partner	Schedule	Observations

### Preparation process of the AWPB

- **Preparation of AWPB by Host Institution**

During the month of September of year N the Host Institution prepare its AWPB for the year N + 1 made up of following documents:

- the technical and budgetary situation of the first 3 quarters of year N;
- the work program for year N + 1;
- the timetable for implementation of activities in year N + 1;
- the budget for year N + 1.

The AWPB are transmitted to the Programme Manager by 15 September of year N.

- **Technical and financial validation of AWPB**

The Programme Manager summarizes the AWPB. This summary is sent latest by 20 September to the Planning officer at the PMEIU, who verifies the compliance and coherence of the AWPB with:

- the Strategic Plan and the Operational Plan of CORAF/WECARD;
- the Project proposal submitted for financing and approved by CORAF/WECARD;
- the contract or agreement linking the Host Institution with CORAF/WECARD.

The AWPB is then sent:

- to the Director of Programmes for technical validation in contact with the authorities of the host institution latest by 25 September;
- then to the Director of Administration and Finance for the validation of the budget latest by 27 September.

The Director of Programmes organizes an internal validation workshop on the AWPBs of his directorate with the participation of the Director of Finance on 1<sup>st</sup> October. After the workshop, the Programme Managers include their observations and forward them to the Director of Programmes latest by 5 October. The Director of Programmes forwards the consolidated AWPBs to the Executive Director on 10 October at the latest.

- **Procedures for other directorates and departments of the Executive Secretariat**

At the central level, each unit and / or technical service of the other directorates and departments prepares its AWPB on 30 September at the latest. The Directors and authorities of these directorates and departments, on the basis of a broad internal consultation, prepare their consolidated AWPB that includes the needs of their services and submits them to the Executive Director, latest by 10 October.

- **Validation of AWPBs**

Upon reception of the AWPBs, the Executive Director convenes the Departmental Council (DC), organizes an arbitrage meeting on the budget latest by 15 October and makes the required corrections. The AWPBs, which include the observations and amendments of the Departmental Council, are consolidated by the PMEU, and submitted to the Scientific and Technical Committee for validation latest by 30 October.

- **Approval of consolidated AWPBs**

The AWPBs will be forwarded to the financial partners for non-objection advice latest by 15 December. The financial partners will convey their non-objection advice latest by 31 December.

- **Initialization and establishment of the AWPBs consolidated per programme**

The AWPBs consolidated per Programme validated by the DC, PPC and the STC, approved by the GB and the donors are then sent to the Director of Administration and Finance for data entry, initialization and establishment latest by 5 January.

### Process for preparation of AWPBs

<b>At the level of the projects</b>	
1st September	Consultative meeting to prepare the AWPB
15 September	Forwarding of AWPB from projects to the Program Manager and the Officer in charge of Planning
20 September	Forwarding of AWPB from the Program Manager to the Officer in charge of Planning
25 September	Forwarding of AWPB to the Director of Programmes
30 September	Forwarding of AWPB to the Director of Finance and Administration to agree on the financial aspects
1st October	Consultation at the level of the PD and the Validation of the AWPB of the programmes
10 October	Forwarding of the consolidated AWPBs to the Executive Director
<b>At the level of CORAF/WECARD</b>	
1st September	Starting the AWPB process at the level of the services of each department/directorate
15 September	First internal consultation on the AWPB by directorate/department
30 September	Consolidation of the AWPB for each Directorate/Department
10 October	Transmission of the consolidated AWPBs to the ED
15 October	Arbitrage Meeting on the budget
30 October	Validation of AWPBs by STC
30 November	AWPB submitted to the GB
05 December	Approval of AWPB by the GB
15 December	Forwarding to the partners for non objection
02 January	Implementation of the AWPB

## Appendix 6: Format of annual progress report

Chapter		Content
	Executive summary (1-2 pages)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Political, institutional, climatic changes that affected progress of the project.</li> <li>▪ Synthesis/ global appraisal of progress of the project in achieving each of the set objectives/outcomes</li> <li>▪ Budgetary implementation/major deviations</li> <li>▪ Major challenges encountered/to be resolved (by who?)</li> <li>▪ Major recommendations (to whom?) and proposed solutions (by who?)</li> </ul>
	Acronyms Table of content	
1	Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Aspects dealt with during the period (semester or year)</li> <li>▪ How did the period end in terms of the achieving the initial forecasts?</li> </ul>
2	Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Outcomes of the project and an appraisal of the general progress made toward realizing such outcomes</li> <li>▪ State whether the objectives are attainable before the end of the period</li> </ul>
3	Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Outcomes of the project and an appraisal of the general progress made toward realizing such outcomes</li> <li>▪ Discuss the relevance of the strategies put in place per outcome (or set of outcomes), if necessary (see also 5)</li> </ul>
4	Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Annual operation plan: mention the organization of major or upcoming activities and their levels achieved.</li> <li>▪ Discuss the major challenges dealt with in the operation plan to justify the rapid progress/delay of work as compared to the previous year.</li> </ul>
5	Implementation strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discuss the strategies put in place (gender, communication, involvement of partners, empowerment, local ownership, transfer of knowledge etc) for the proper realization of activities and outcomes.</li> <li>▪ Propose relevant changes and evaluate if there will be any further commitment (human resource, budgetary)</li> </ul>
6	Budgetary implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyze the level of implementation (in connection with the annual budget) for each budget heading : explanation of shortfalls (under or over implementation, comments made on possible deviations and their effect on budget equilibrium at the end of the year</li> <li>▪ General budgetary assessment as compared to the physical implementation report.</li> </ul> <p>➤ Table I / Budget implementation for the period, by budget heading: annual budget, actual expenditure for the period reported, % of annual cumulated implementation, % of involvement, budget</p> <p>➤ Table II / Budget implementation from commencement of the component, by budget heading total budget, annual implementation, cumulative, balance available</p>
7	Challenges encountered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In terms of the progress of the component (while expecting an objective/outcome/ group of activities/ a partner, available funds, coordination among stakeholders, strategic approach of the activities, administrative aspects etc) state the challenges encountered that could stall the progress of the component.</li> <li>▪ Constraints.</li> </ul>
8	Key suggestions/ recommendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding the challenged encountered (or expected), make comprehensive recommendations to one /several specific partners (if possible to the structure that is responsible for such area. ....)</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Total number of pages per semester/ not indicated in appendix: 15-18</li> <li>➤ Total number of pages in the annual report/ except annexes: 18- 20 pages</li> </ul>
	APPENDICES:  Number of pages: 10 - 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Chart of working plan / annual activities</li> <li>▪ Balance score sheet for the M+E indicators</li> <li>▪ List of documents produced during the period</li> </ul>

### Appendix 7: Evaluation matrix for project cycle

Results chain	Indicators	Evaluation focus (tick)					Evaluation questions
		Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Effect	Impact	
Impact							
Effect / outcome							
Outputs							
Activities							
Inputs							

## Appendix 8: Analysis of environmental impact

Relevant dimensions /areas	How is the project involved?	Stakeholders involved
<b>1 Physical:</b>		
1.1 Geographical, Land, Topo., ...	- Construction	
1.2 Climate, seasons, ...	- Uneven land	
<b>2 Infrastructure:</b>		
2.1 Communications, Transport, ...	- Isolated/landlocked community	
2.2 Equipment, logistics, ...	- Difficult access by road	
<b>3 Economic</b>		
3.1 Jobs, Unemployment, ...	- Job creation	- WHO
3.2 Currency (exchange),...	- Low-income communities	- Target communities
3.3 Funding, budget,...		
<b>4 Political-legal:</b>		
4.1 Laws, Regulations, Tax,	- Titles of disputed property	- Owner declared
4.2 Policies and implementation,		
<b>5 Organizational:</b>		
5.1 Hierarchy, Authority	-	- Target communities
5.2 Departments, Units, Feedback		
5.3 Private enterprises, ...		
<b>6 Socio-cultural:</b>		
6.1 Compatibility with the community	- .	- Beneficiaries
6.2 Resistance to change,		- Target communities
6.3 Values, beliefs, ...		
<b>7 Education / Training :</b>		
7.1 .	-	- Civil Service (Ministry)
7.2 .		
<b>8 Health:</b>		
.	- Level of concern shown by the communities	-
.	- Level of concern shown by the FARs	
<b>9 Technological:</b>		
9.1 Usefulness, knowledge, involvement,		
9.2 New, transferred,		
9.3 Availability, capacity, ...		

## Appendix 9: Risk assessment form

Project risk assessment sheet										
Project :		Work batch			Code :					
Identification of risks:										
Risk owner:										
Description of risk and its causes		Impact on :			1	2	3	4	5	
		Objectives								
		Quality								
		Calendar								
		Cost								
		Org.								
Identified measures	Officer in Charge	Time of implementation	Risk classification.							
			Probability			Impact				
						1	2	3	4	5
			Very High							
			High							
			Average							
Low										
Very low										

**Appendix 10: Risk mitigation form**

Critical events <i>(risk)</i>	Planned measures <i>(prevention)</i>	Evaluation of planned measures			Monitoring Officer
		Major benefit/impact	Payment schedule	Cost	
1.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	-
2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	-
3.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	-
4.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	-
5.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	-
6.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	-
7.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	-
8.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	-



## Appendix 11: Implementation progress report of CORAF/WECARD's Strategic objective

Structure	Themes
1. Context of agricultural productivity	Productivity of agriculture in a regional context
2. Key developments of CORAF/WECARD since 2007	Institutional, governance, programmatic developments, financial management, human resources and capacities, communication and public awareness
3. CORAF/WECARDS Program	<p>Progress achieved with respect to the 4 Results or Operational Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology generation and dissemination (focus on innovation, adoption &amp; mainstreaming, and impact)</li> <li>• Policy research (focus on comparative advantage and capacity of CORAF/WECARD in specific fields)</li> <li>• Capacity development (focus on institutional innovations, Centers of excellence and financing of regional research initiatives)</li> <li>• Coordination (focus on CORAF/WECARD's leadership)</li> <li>• Knowledge management</li> </ul>
4. Relevance and coherence with regional objectives	<p>Relevance of CORAF/WECARD's Program</p> <p>Coherence with regional CAAPD and FARA initiatives.</p>
5. Partnerships and linkages	Links with NARS and networking, CGIAR centres, centres of excellence, NGOs, civil society, private sector,
6. Governance / management	Management structure and capacity, corporate services, ..
7. Strategic implications and recommendations	With respect to CORAF/WECARD's comparative advantage, research programme approach, partnership model, policy environment, training and capacity building, policy environment,