



Australian Government
AusAID

Quality at Entry Report and Next Steps to Complete Design for AusAID-CSIRO Partnership for Africa Food Security Initiative Pillar 1

A: AidWorks details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>			
Initiative Name:	Africa Food Security Initiative 2010-13: AusAID-CSIRO Partnership Pillar 1		
AidWorks ID:	INJ533	Total Amount:	\$30 million
Start Date:	1 October 2010	End Date:	30 June 2013

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>	
Initial ratings prepared by:	Joanne O'Sullivan
Meeting date:	17 August 2010
Chair:	Jamie Isbister
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Laurence McCulloch, Working in Partner Systems - Gillian Brown, Gender Adviser - Benjamin Davis, Disaster Risk Reduction
Independent Appraiser:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Claire Ireland, Environment Adviser - Adiel Mbabu, Senior Adviser - Agricultural Development (PNG)
Other peer review participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alwyn Chilver, Food Security and Rural Development Adviser - Sara Webb, Design consultant (via phone) - Percy Stanley, Pretoria Post - Bruce Pengelly (CSIRO) - Caroline Bruce (CSIRO) - Peter Carberry (CSIRO) - Pat Duggan, Africa Adviser - Clemency Oliphant, Program Officer, Africa and Humanitarian - Jo O'Sullivan, Graduate, Africa and Humanitarian

C: Safeguards and Commitments <i>(new!) completed by Activity Manager</i>		
<i>Answer the following questions relevant to potential impacts of the activity.</i>		
1. Environment	Have the environmental marker questions been answered and adequately addressed by the design document in line with legal requirements under the <i>Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act</i> ?	Yes
2. Child Protection	Does the design meet the requirements of AusAID's Child Protection Policy?	N/A

D: Initiative/Activity description <i>completed by Activity Manager (no more than 300 words per cell)</i>			
3. Description	<p>AusAID's partnership with CSIRO will leverage CSIRO's scientific expertise and international reputation to build capacity in agricultural research in Africa. AusAID signed an agreement with CSIRO for the inception phase of the AusAID-CSIRO Pillar One Partnership in Africa on 14 April 2010. Subsequently, CSIRO and its two African research partners, CORAF/WECARD and BecA, have worked in Africa with selected member countries to shape the research to be commissioned under each partnership.</p> <p>CORAF/WECARD is the primary agriculture research organisation in West and Central Africa. Australia's partnership with CORAF/WECARD will focus on farming systems research in sub-humid and semi-arid regions across West Africa, and on key animal health issues which affect livestock production.</p> <p>BecA is a new initiative under CAADP which supports eastern and central African countries to develop and apply bioscience research expertise. The partnership will provide fellowships and training opportunities across the region and will facilitate partnerships with Australian research institutes with significant biotechnology capacity.</p>		
4. Objectives Summary	<p>The broad goal of Pillar 1 activities under the Africa Food Security Initiative is lifting agricultural productivity through increased investments in international agricultural research and development.</p>		
E: Quality Assessment and Rating <i>(no more than 300 words per cell)</i> <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting</i>			
Criteria	Assessment	Rating (1-6) *	Required Action (if needed)
5. Relevance	<p>BecA</p> <p>The partnership objectives are embedded in the host institution's (BecA) strategic objective.</p> <p>The specific objectives of the partnership are relevant to BecA's strategic objective and to the overarching AU/NEPAD objective. However, the partnership's strategic objective focused on types of research, rather than the reason for the research, deprives the partnership a clear sense of purpose that is relevant to the development needs in Africa.</p> <p>Sound link to contribution towards long term food security (MDG1) as well as contribution towards MDG 2 (Education) and MDG 4 (Child Mortality)</p> <p>CORAF</p> <p>Clear alignment of objectives to CORAF's own Strategic Plan. Generally good consistency in use of terms between the design document and CORAF's own strategic plan however in a few places it still doesn't match.</p> <p>If there is a Delivery Strategy for the whole Africa Security Initiative this program needs to fit within it.</p>	5	<p>Review BecA overall objectives during the first year of implementation (after the BecA strategic plan is finalised) to ensure that they are properly aligned to the strategic objective of the partnership and that clearly articulates development outcome(s) to be expected from the proposed investments.</p> <p>Ensure use of the same language as CORAF e.g. Result Areas and not key objectives.</p>

E: Quality Assessment and Rating <i>(no more than 300 words per cell)</i> <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting</i>			
6. Analysis and Learning	<p>Beca</p> <p>Adequate information provided to explain the challenges and opportunities facing African agriculture.</p> <p>There are a number of statements which aren't referenced which could be clarified. For example pg 38 '<i>more specifically, climate change will challenge agriculture across Africa with the likelihood of cropping becoming far more risky and farmers being forced to move to greater dependence on livestock for their livelihoods</i>'</p> <p>Community based animal health care has been an approach to animal veterinary services in this region in Africa for about a decade, however it is not referred to in the context and analysis of the design. Could be a useful analysis for pathways to adoption.</p> <p>CORAF</p> <p>The paragraph on climate change is weaker than expected. What does not come through clearly is the analysis relating to the context of the participating countries, yet, this is where the actual delivery of the planned activities will take place.</p> <p>The climate change context for West and Central Africa is markedly different to the whole of Africa and so statements such as '<i>By 2050, higher temperatures and lower rainfall might reduce crop yields by 10-20%</i>' are misleading. Climate change issues of importance for West Africa will include sea level rise over the next 50 years which will impact on salinisation of fresh water lagoons and aquifers, as well as a projected increase in malaria and dengue fever which will affect people's ability to work on their farms. Half of Africa's major water basins are located in West and Central Africa and these – and their irrigation potential – will be affected. The other main issue for West and Central Africa is the issue of carbon fertilisation effect – recent research has shown that whilst normally when there are increased carbon concentrations in the atmosphere you would expect increased yields, that unless water efficiency is combined with increased fertiliser use these benefits will not actually be realised. This has implications for projecting future yields.</p>	5	<p>Ensure learning from other initiatives such as community based animal health delivery are part of the annual review and work-planning.</p> <p>Try to be clearer on the prevailing contexts of the respective agricultural sectors and associated actors in the participating countries. This will most likely determine the nature and extent of involvement in the proposed partnership.</p> <p>Stronger links to existing climate change research in West and Central Africa are needed to ensure the right adaptation responses. This should happen during the first year of implementation.</p>

E: Quality Assessment and Rating *(no more than 300 words per cell)**completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting*

7. Effectiveness	<p>BecA</p> <p>The specific objectives are likely to be achieved. However, without a clear sense of the overall expected outcome it will be difficult to derive synergy from the respective specific objectives; and consequently undermine the potential for driving the initiative towards desired development goals.</p> <p>The management structure appears focused on delivering project objectives, but is rather silent on the delivery of the overall program objectives</p> <p>The proposed partnerships are well conceived and should deliver quality research and development outcomes if adequately managed.</p> <p>It is particularly useful that the partnership sets aside a significant proportion of funds to support adoption processes.</p> <p>Does the design show an understanding of what community based initiatives are already happening and where synergies might come from?</p> <p>A missing risk is the risk of lack of demand for the research outputs – main lesson from agricultural research over the last decade has been the need to ensure there is demand led research.</p> <p>CORAF</p> <p>The objectives of the program are now visibly linked to the CORAF Result Areas with expected results of the partnership are clearly articulated and generally look specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and clearly time bound.</p> <p>Thought has clearly gone in to how the partnership is going to ensure effective development outcomes which is good to see. Slightly unclear though how the list of strategies will be used to guide the program delivery.</p>	5	<p>As in 1. above: Overall program goal and purpose for BecA – could be clearer (expected outcome (purpose) and impact (goal)). Suggested words to be discussed with Adiel and CSIRO..</p> <p>Clarify management structure to show who is responsible for ensuring synergy among projects at a point in time and sequentially over time in relation to achieving program outcomes and impact.</p> <p>Add risk around lack of demand for research by poor farmers.</p> <p>Considering that one of the key guiding principles in IAR4D is managing for results, it is necessary for CSIRO-CORAF /WECARD partnership to further specify objectives indicating the scale at which success will be determined. This will be clarified during implementation and planning for monitoring and evaluation, and will determine the type of projects to fund and the sequencing necessary to achieve the expected outcome</p>
------------------	---	---	--

E: Quality Assessment and Rating (no more than 300 words per cell)

completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

8. Efficiency	<p>BecA</p> <p>The proposed management structure between CSIRO and BecA (with ILRI backstopping) appears adequate for effective implementation of research. However, it is less clear how the adoption of related activities will be delivered.</p> <p>Unclear how demand for research from poor farmers will feed into decision making of the current management structure.</p> <p>CORAF</p> <p>While the operational modalities between CSIRO and CORAF/WECARD are well articulated, it is not clear how the actual research for development activities will be managed by the participating NARS organizations.</p> <p>It would be beneficial to have some of the meetings for the Partnership Management Committee in Australia. The benefits from coming to Australia by senior CORAF management and learning directly from field visits here, could add value to the whole partnership.</p> <p>Good to see that CSIRO aim to engage in the donor group working with CORAF. This will ensure a mechanism for coherency, collaboration and lesson learning between donors supporting CORAF. A key priority for AusAID is to compliment CSIRO's efforts to build coordination with other donors.</p> <p>Good to see a discussion around possible funding mechanisms and whilst the decision has been taken not to use the multi donor trust fund at this moment in time, flexibility remains in the design to review this down the line. This would obviously reduce transaction costs for CORAF down the line.</p>	5	<p>Clarify the delivery mechanisms of the adoption related activities.</p> <p>While satisfied that CORAF/WECARD is well aligned to IAR4D thinking, it may be necessary to ensure that participating NARS organizations are themselves equally aligned. After all, this is where actual delivery of the planned activities will take place. In these circumstances, it may be necessary for CSIRO/CORAF-WECARD partnership to commit to development of this capacity in the participating NARS, which will be an ongoing process throughout the first year of implementation.</p> <p>Ensure the TAG becomes operational by the end of the first year of the program and includes a gender specialist and climate change specialist.</p> <p>Make clear how the governance arrangements will link to existing donor working groups to ensure lessons are shared and open and transparent decision making.</p>
---------------	--	---	---

E: Quality Assessment and Rating <i>(no more than 300 words per cell)</i> <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting</i>		
9. Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Beca</p> <p>The six outputs to be delivered and the indicators of success are quite well developed. This forms a good basis to develop a monitoring and evaluation plan. However, as stated above, the program strategic objective (purpose) needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Given the partnership description highlighted that all research activities will have defined pathways for adoption and uptake it would be good to include this in the monitoring section – at the moment this section just says that research impacts will be after the life of the program, however one assumes you could review how relevant the pathway for adoption still is at the end of the research to give you some idea of likely adoption.</p> <p>CORAF</p> <p>The partnership aligns itself well with the results framework of the host organization. This helps to identify an appropriate niche for the partnership to add value to the achievement of the host organization's strategic objective. Within this context, the design identifies a reasonable set of objectives to contribute to the overall organizational objective. However, these objectives are not adequately specified with clear indicators of success.</p> <p>The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) will be an important component of the management and governance arrangements for the program. It's clear already that there is demand from both CSIRO and CORAF to ensure gender and climate change are both effectively addressed.</p> <p>In the spirit of IAR4D, long-term objectives ought to drive the determination of shorter term objectives; and not the other way around. While it is understood that the M&E plan will be developed in consultation with the key stakeholders, it is important to adhere to key guiding principles.</p> <p>It will be important to ensure that the annual review maintains its brevity, in order for the partnership not to add a burden to existing CORAF processes.</p> <p>Good to see DAC criteria for evaluation being used. Important to use DAC definition of sustainability where priority is given to the environmental sustainability of programs as well as the financial and longevity of impacts.</p>	<p>5</p> <p>The performance framework for this partnership will be finalised during the upcoming mission in October and will be informed by the OECD/DAC definition of sustainability.</p> <p>Ensure M&E looks at the practicalities of pathways for adoption during and at the end of the research (to be finalising during October mission).</p> <p>It is important to distinguish between the expected results of the overall programme of support in the partnership arrangement from the specific project results. In this case, the overall programme support commits to 6 objectives with high level outcomes. This should determine the types of projects necessary to deliver expected overall results, and how such projects ought to be sequenced to meet that objective.</p>

E: Quality Assessment and Rating *(no more than 300 words per cell)*

completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

<p>10. Sustainability</p>	<p>BecA</p> <p>The partnership objectives are aligned with those of the host institution and more broadly to those of partner organizations.</p> <p>Partnership with African based and African led organizations ensures long term institutional sustainability.</p> <p>Strong support to capacity building – individual African scientists and their host organizations lays a solid basis for continuation of the benefits.</p> <p>Commitment to adoption of the new products and services reinforces sustainability of the initiative.</p> <p>Need to consider potential negative impacts of the research process and products on the environment.</p> <p>CORAF</p> <p>The design document addresses sustainability issues quite systematically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partnering a credible research for development organization in West and Central Africa 2. Aligning partnership objectives to the strategic objective of the host organization 3. Joining other donors in collective action towards a shared objective 4. Requiring participating actors to commit to environmental integrity <p>Need to address how to integrate national implementation processes in the partnership committed at sub-regional level.</p> <p>If it was possible to move towards one single financing mechanism this would further position the program to ensuring durability of its impacts.</p> <p>The program will need to ensure environmental and therefore climate change considerations are integrated into research programs if outcomes are to be truly sustainable in the agricultural sector.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Develop risk management strategy for potential negative impact of the research process and products on the environment.</p> <p>During the first year of implementation, need to develop a comprehensive strategy to ensure strong pathways to effective ownership, results dissemination and implementation at the national level.</p>
---------------------------	---	----------	--

E: Quality Assessment and Rating (no more than 300 words per cell)

completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

11. Gender Equality	BecA and CORAF	5	Develop a strategy to mainstream gender in the participating organizations in coordination with the work which is already underway by CORAF and BecA.
	The design addresses gender issues very comprehensively, and some indicators are included in the M&E which is good.		
	The design commits to gender equity, albeit at the project level: Women and men participate in the research projects and share its benefits equitably		
	Considering the cultural nature of this objective, it may be useful to elevate the commitment towards mainstreaming gender in the participating organizations; at the very least to the organizational entities involved in the proposed partnership.		

*** Definitions of the Rating Scale:**

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6)		Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3)	
6	Very high quality; needs ongoing management & monitoring only	3	Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
5	Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas	2	Poor quality; needs major work to improve
4	Adequate quality; needs some work to improve	1	Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

E: Next Steps completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

Provide information on all steps required to finalise the design based on <i>Required Actions</i> in "C" above, and additional actions identified in the peer review meeting	Who is responsible	Date to be done
Try to be clearer on the prevailing contexts of the respective agricultural sectors and associated actors in the participating countries.	CSIRO	31 October, 2010
Ensure consistency of language with CORAF and BecA.	CSIRO	31 October, 2010
Clarify the overall program goal and purpose for BecA – to be clear on the expected outcome (purpose) and impact (goal).	CSIRO	31 October, 2010
Add risk assessment around lack of demand for research by poor farmers.	CSIRO	31 October, 2010
Clarify the delivery mechanisms of adoption.	CSIRO	ongoing
Ensure TAG becomes operational, including a gender and climate change specialist.	AusAID	ongoing
Link governance arrangements to existing donor working groups.	CSIRO	ongoing
Develop risk management strategy for potential negative impact of the research on the environment.	CSIRO	31 October, 2010

F: Other comments or issues *completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the APR meeting*

- Further clarity is required on the budget, which will be addressed by CSIRO and AusAID in following meetings.
- Monitoring and Evaluation to be addressed during and following the mission in October.

F: Approval *completed by ADG or Minister-Counsellor who chaired the peer review meeting*

On the basis of the final agreed Quality Rating assessment (C) and Next Steps (D) above:

- QAE REPORT IS APPROVED**, and authorization given to proceed to:
- FINALISE** the design incorporating actions above, and proceed to implementation
 - or: **REDESIGN** and resubmit for appraisal peer review

- NOT APPROVED** for the following reason(s):
- _____
- _____
- _____

Jamie Isbister
ADG
Africa and Humanitarian

Signed:



Date:

9/9/2010