

Chapter 3 Evaluation of Programme Performance

3.1 Programme Logframes

- 3.1.1 The RNRRS is structured around “nested” Logframes. There is an overall Logframe for the strategy, and within this there are Logframes for each of the programmes. All programmes were established with production system Logframes, but in a number of programmes these have evolved over time into Logframes at cluster, or geographic level. These programmes, in turn, consist of projects which are required to develop their own logframe. The outputs of projects contribute towards project purpose, which in turn contributes towards output at programme level.
- 3.1.2 The Yellow Brick had an overarching Logframe that is unusual in that it had three Goals, one Purpose and three Outputs. Under this, each Programme had multiple Logframes. Table 4 shows the number of Purposes and Outputs given to each Programme in the Yellow Book. Over the ensuing 10-year period, these have been simplified to the position shown in Table 5. The simplification has occurred as part of evolving programme management and was made by PMs in consultation with PACs. It is not clear to what extent the original central control, to create “nested” Logframes, has been applied during this evolution nor whether the original “nesting” has simply become broadly hierarchical.
- 3.1.3 Table 3, below, shows the purpose statement and the Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) of achievement by the programme. Logframes of most programmes changed, with DFID agreement, around 1999, when programme management contracts were renewed, and some programmes have continued to modify Logframes in accordance with changes in approach.
- 3.1.4 The table shows that there is considerable variation in approaches to indicators of achieving purpose. For some programmes, the indicators of purpose are very specifically identified, for example, AFGP identifies an increase in income by 20% for half a million people in SE and S Asia by 2005. For others they are very general, and would be difficult not to achieve, such as the wide range of benefits identified by LPP.
- 3.1.5 In analysis of the “Assumptions columns” within the logframes from the 1995 “Yellow Brick”, the assumptions at programme purpose and output levels generally related to the need for an “enabling environment” and for “investment in uptake pathways” respectively. Over the 10 year period of the strategy, the assumptions have gained a little in detail but have not in essence changed. The assumptions stated within the latest programme logframes all highlight the policy environment for poverty reduction, with more emphasis being directed toward poor people themselves having opportunity to utilise programme outputs. All of the programmes have had to start to build in activities to support the “enabling environment”. The issue is highlighted as programmes have moved from managing outputs from the programmes to attaining impacts on poverty.

3.2 Reporting against Programme Purpose and Outputs

- 3.2.1 PMs do not, for the most part, report against logframe purpose, but focus on the output level. There are exceptions to this; NRSP has assessed progress at the Programme Purpose level since 2000-2001, and CPP reports on achievement of OVIs against sub-programme purpose. These are generally set out in terms of adoption of poor farmers (number unspecified) in a given number of target countries. Other PMs report against programme outputs, either in narrative or on progress against indicators. In general, programmes report high levels of achievement against output, and, based on the comments lead advisors have made on the annual reports of their programmes, this seems to have been accepted by DFID. The reports of the science specialist review team also support the view that the programmes have delivered at output level.
- 3.2.2 PMs also identify and report against appropriate milestones, agreed with DFID on an annual basis, to enable the tracking of progress towards the programme’s strategic objectives.

- 3.2.3 One concern that was voiced by a number of PMs during the meetings with the evaluation team was where the responsibility lay for reporting against programme purpose. The PMs are responsible, as laid out in the programme management performance indicators contained in the guidelines for PMs, for uptake promotion. PMs are not, however, contractually responsible for delivering against programme purpose, as this may depend on factors beyond the PMs' control, but they are responsible for delivering research outputs which could be expected to deliver the developmental impacts identified at the programme purpose level, for identifying uptake pathways and initiating action with target institutions to promote uptake of research outputs.
- 3.2.4 As will be discussed below, there have been different interpretations as to how far PMs should go in promoting uptake, and in assessing likely impact of their programmes. Examination of the logframes show that the means of measuring OVIs is generally through use of surveys and national statistics, which would require considerable investment of resources to undertake. Yet it is precisely this kind of analysis and assessment that is required to show impact, and identify the ultimate success of the RNRRS in producing benefits for poor people. There has been no overall strategy to address this, and PMs have addressed this gap on an individual basis.
- 3.2.5 PMs maintained during interviews with the Evaluation Team that the great majority of projects funded by the RNRRS achieved the outputs they intended. This is consistent with the information provided in their annual reports. Some projects were aborted because of poor implementation, some came up against institutional constraints that they had not anticipated (for example, the project to train those selling animal medication in village dukas in Kenya) and some simply could not find an effective technology to address the problem identified (storage of yams in Ghana). The Lead advisor reviews of annual reports, and the specialist reports confirm that the vast majority of RNRRS projects have developed technologies and methods which have the potential for increasing productivity and/or reducing poverty, dependent on level of adoption, an enabling policy environment and their accessibility to the poor.

3.3 Logframe Evolution

- 3.3.1 There is no doubt that the major policy and administrative structure changes within DFID since 1997 required modification of the RNRRS Logframes. Although all changes were approved by DFID, such as when programme management contracts were renewed, it is not clear to what extent the changes were guided proactively from the centre.
- 3.3.2 To our knowledge - as with the original design of RNRRS - the changes in logframes have not involved developing country scientists to any significant extent. In the Specialists' reviews of all programmes, it has been specifically noted that all programmes have adhered strictly to their (current) Logframes. The Logframes have played important roles in the guidance of programmes, both by PMs and PACs, and also DFID. Within programmes projects have had their own (simpler) Logframes. Interviews the Core Team has had in Asia and Africa have revealed general satisfaction with the practice of project Logframes, and – after training provided by RNRRS – little difficulty in constructing and report according to these.
- 3.3.3 A more general issue remains, much beyond the RNRRS, on the wisdom and scientific incentive inherent in logframe based research. Science rarely works in straight lines and to manage a research programme only against outputs and indicators laid down at the start of projects may result simply in self-fulfilling prophecies (6.4). Systems such as the logframe are most useful when dealing with highly applied research or experimental development and least useful for basic or strategic research, in which the progress is never in the straight lines demanded by such a system. This results in wasteful revisions of objectives and may actually hinder the progress of a long-term study. In terms of the good science assessment most Specialists said that “objectives” and “milestones” are the biggest hindrance to research progress. Some large corporations are now reverting to “inspirational” research rather than object-oriented research. (see CPHP specialists report)

3.4 Impact Measures

- 3.4.1 In order for OVIs in Logframes to measure impact, considerable expenditure is required on information and data gathering. Brown (1997) concluded that the cost of this was too high to be justified on a general basis. Flint and Underwood (2002) drew attention to the difficulty of assessing impact without such an information base and the PARC work was commissioned in 2003 to remedy the situation prior to this evaluation. The difficulty the Team has faced in securing objective information on impact suggests that steps might usefully have been taken earlier to ensure that it was available.
- 3.4.2 It is not clear that the fundamental shift away from the situation pertaining in 1994, when the “Yellow Brick” was promulgated, has always been fully internalised within DFID. In 1994, RNRRS was primarily a programme envisaged to support field RNR projects and programmes being undertaken by DFID. The policy changes that have occurred since then (5.6 and 7.2) mean that this natural DFID constituency, through which uptake, capacity building and other impacts could be achieved, no longer exists. Research cannot be expected to provide mainstream development impacts other than at a very localised scale.
- 3.4.3 It appears that a more fundamental and analytical internal consideration by DFID of the need to balance a Logframe based management approach with formal systems of gathering data on impacts could have been helpful. The Team is fully aware of the complexity of such work, especially for those programmes such as livestock, forestry and fisheries where impacts may take well over a decade to materialise.
- 3.4.4 Had well-conceived OVIs been developed and resources for information collection been made available, it would have been more straightforward for the evaluation to draw conclusions on the contribution of each programme to RNRRS as a whole. Without this, greater reliance has to be placed on professional judgement and comparison with similar initiatives.
- 3.4.5 Programmes have become increasingly focused by the attainment of impact on poverty in their respective research realms. In analysis of the “assumptions column” of the programme logframes over the period of the RNRRS, it becomes apparent that all programmes have needed to initiate strategies to resource the enabling environment, within which the outputs of their research are framed. Programmes and projects are now building in support to the enabling environment including institutional support, and capacity building, and direct support into market led uptake of research findings. It is a challenge for programmes to balance this since the resourcing, for these built in inputs, is insufficient to be able to generate a sustainable enabling environment. There is a need for any impact assessment to ensure that the assumptions column is utilised fully. It is a key aspect to monitoring progress for longer term requirements to support research uptake and its overall impact on poverty reduction and eradication.

3.5 Key Points on Programme Performance

- 3.5.1 The evolution of Logframes from the overly complex structure in the “Yellow Brick” has been helpful for clarity in seeing individual programme achievements. There would appear to be greater scope for stronger linkages across programmes, which may have been useful in securing greater collaboration.
- 3.5.2 The lack of earlier objective data collection makes evaluation of impact problematic, especially when looking at the contribution of projects to programmes and programmes to RNRRS as a whole.
- 3.5.3 All aspects of the Logframe, purposes, outputs, activities and assumptions, need to be monitored to determine impact from projects and programmes. The Logframe should be able to frame impact assessment for programmes that, in turn, could be utilised as a management tool for strategic management of the research, its outputs and its uptake and impact on the poor.

- 3.5.4 The recently commissioned studies of impact will ultimately be very helpful but could not assist this evaluation. All the internal and external evaluations and assessments and data collation studies are leading toward the recommendations made by the Surr report in 2002. It recommends that DFID should be required to report more regularly and effectively on the impact of its research programmes. The evaluation team endorses this, and feels that for future research programmes, DFID should develop an impact assessment strategy, and an appropriately timed programme of impact assessments, commissioned centrally. This should be linked to the logframes and it's OVI's and to management of the programmes through their logframes.
- 3.5.5 If the value of the logframe approach is to be fully captured, their use has to be linked into a strategy wide, coordinated monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment system; this is currently lacking. (4.4)
- 3.5.6 To embody the research strategy in demand-led research and in order to open all available channels for uptake and promotion of research outcomes project cycle management needs to become much more participatory and to engage with all stakeholders at all stages of PCM.

Table 3. Programme Purpose Statement, and Objectively Verifiable (OVIs) of Achievement Performance

Programme	Purpose statement	OVIs
Animal Health (AHP)	Benefits for poor people generated by application of improved management of livestock disease	<p>By 2005, in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Africa, Bangladesh or India, evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Increased sustainable production of livestock by the resource poor 1.2 Decreased production costs for resource-poor livestock keepers 1.3 More reliable supply of safe livestock products to the poor
Aquaculture and Fish Genetics (AFGP)	Productive benefits of aquatic resources for poor people generated and sustained through improved knowledge of aquatic stocks and their selection, enhancement and culture	<p>By 2005, knowledge gains allow 500,000 poor people in S & SE Asia to improve food supply by 20% and income by 20%, based on yield increases related to better aquatic stocks, sustainable aquaculture and enhancement practices, and at least 100,000 people positively impacted by development activities incorporating programme outputs</p>
Crop Post Harvest (CPHP)	National and international crop-post harvest innovation systems respond more effectively to the needs of the poor	<p>By 2005, a replicable range of different institutional arrangements which effectively and sustainably improve access to post-harvest knowledge and/or stimulate post-harvest innovation to benefit the poor have been validated in four regions</p>
Crop Protection (CPP)	Benefits for poor people generated by application of new knowledge on crop protection to:	<p><i>Indicators are identified at the production systems level, rather than for the programme as a whole.</i></p>
Fisheries Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High potential production systems. • Peri-urban production systems. • Coconut based systems at the land / water interface. • Rice based systems at the land / water interface. • Annual and herbaceous crops in forest agriculture production systems. • Tree crops in forest agriculture production systems. • Cultivation of herbaceous crops in hillside production systems. • Cereal based semi-arid cropping systems. • Migrant pests in semi-arid systems. <p>Benefits for poor people generated by application</p>	<p>By 2005, evidence of application of research products, in S Asia and SE Asia for inland</p>

⁵ This is the logframe for 2002- 2005, but the purpose indicator statements are currently under review with CRD and the CPHP M&E advisors

Programme	Purpose statement	OVIs
<p>Science (FMSP)</p>	<p>of new knowledge to fisheries management systems.</p>	<p>fisheries, and East Africa Indian Ocean and East Africa for marine fisheries by at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor people • Institutions supplying services to the poor • Employers of the poor • Policy makers <p>to benefit target communities by achieving, for at least one EFZ, coastal or inland capture fishery, and for two enhanced fisheries, one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less variable capture fisheries production, and yield stabilised at sustainable level - Fisheries productivity increase / improvement for enhanced fisheries leading to increased livelihoods benefit - Improved access by poor people to fisheries knowledge generated by the Programme
<p>Forestry Research (FRP)</p>	<p>New knowledge applied to problems in forest and tree resource management, the resolution of which benefits forest and tree-dependent poor people within the Forest/Agriculture Interface and the Peri-urban Interface.</p>	<p>By 2005, increased financial capital for poor households through expanded tree-based employment opportunities; increased biological and technical productivity.; higher producer prices through added value in processing and marketing; reduced production costs through greater efficiency and effectiveness in the application of labour resources; and improved availability of subsistence items in land-use systems involving the management of forests and trees.</p> <p>By 2005, increased sustainable natural capital for poor households through: reduced variability and risk in production; and the development of new tree-based production alternatives.</p> <p>By 2005, increased physical capital for poor households through: improved information pathways and the production equipment and means by which poor people earn their living.</p> <p>By 2005, increased social capital for poor people through: adequate control of access to relevant forest resources; increased institutional capacity; and an enabling policy environment.</p> <p>By 2005, increased human capital for poor households through: enhanced forest management skills; less destructive tree-product harvesting and improved processing, packaging and marketing capability; and healthier nutritional use of indigenous tree products.</p>

Programme	Purpose statement	OVIs
Livestock Production: (LPP)	Benefits for discreet groups of landed and landless livestock keepers generated by the application of new knowledge on the sustainable management of livestock in semi-arid, agro-pastoral, forest-agriculture, high potential and peri-urban production	<p>By 2007, in response to primary demand from poor farmers engaged in crop/ livestock farming, from landless livestock keepers and from pastoralists/ agropastoralists in Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, and South Asia, evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable increases in production/ productivity/ survival of livestock with special relevance of the poor • More, cheaper, safer livestock products consumed • Increased contribution of livestock to crop production • Reduced drudgery, particularly for women and children • Improved employment opportunities • Stabilized balance between people and domestic livestock • Sustainable resource base • Increased contribution of livestock to social development
Natural Resources Systems (NRSP)	To deliver new knowledge that enables poor people who are largely dependent on the NR base to improve their livelihoods	<p>By March 2005, new knowledge from NRSP's research can benefit the poor in use at the levels specified by at least two of the following target groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor people themselves • Institutions supplying services to the poor • Employers of the poor • Relevant policy makers <p>By March 2006, products from at least 20% of NRSP projects, and the programme as a whole, used in the international research and development system, including DFID country desks and institutions in non-target countries</p> <p>By March 2006, lessons from NRSP's research internalised by NRSP's constituents, providing a resource for continued attainment of DFID's objectives.</p> <p>By 2005,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of post harvest losses identified and reduced by 50% in two target fisheries • The net incomes of poor producers sustainably increased in two target fisheries • Food security amongst poor consumers maintained or improved through the availability of affordable fish on local markets. <p>Real benefits (in terms of yield, farmer income, consumer prices, resilience etc) from improved crop production in Plant Sciences Programme target area by 2005.</p>
Post Harvest Fisheries Research (PHFRP)	To produce benefits for poor producers, processors, traders and consumers through the application of new knowledge to the improved utilisation of fish from fisheries in South Asia and East and West Africa.	
Plant Sciences Research (PSP)	Benefits for poor people generated by application of new knowledge on selection and genetic enhancement of cultivars, and improved agronomic practices, to crop production in Semiarid, High-potential, Hillside and Forest Agriculture-interface	

Table 4 Analysis of 1994 Logframes from the Yellow Brick

Showing number of Purposes and (Outputs) by programme.

System	Land Water Interface	Tropical Moist Forest	Socio-economic methods	Semi Arid	Hillside	Forest Agric. Interface	Peri Urban	High Potential	Total Purposes	Total Outputs
<u>Programme</u>										
FRP		3(4,3,3)		2(4,1)	3(2,3,2)	3(4,3,3)			11	32
AHP ⁶				2(6,3)		1(7)		1(6)	4	22
LPP				2(6,3)		1(6)	1(2)	1(4)	5	21
NRSP	2(4,4)		1(7)	3(5,6,3)	2(3,2)	3(2,4,5)	3(3,4,3)	2(6,3)	16	64
PSP				2(3,4)	2(2,2)				4	11
CPP	2(7,6)			4(4,5,3,2)	2(7,4)	2(7,9)	1(4)	1(15)	12	73
CPHP ⁷				2(6)		2(6)	2(6)	2(6)	8	24
FMSP	2(5,3)								2	8
Aquaculture	2(4,5)								2	9
FGRP	2(2,4)								2	6
FPHP	2(3,4)								2	7

⁶ AHP Links High Potential and Peri Urban systems.

⁷ CPHP uses Crop based structure linking Semi Arid and Hillside, FAI and Hillside systems

Table 5 Analysis of Latest (2004) Logframes by Programme.

System	Land Water Interface	Semi Arid	Hillside	Forest Agric Interface	Peri Urban	High Potential	Total Purposes	Total Outputs
<u>Programme</u>								
FRP							1	4
AHP							1	2
LPP							1	4
NRSP							1	5
PSP							1	5
CPP	2(4)	3(6)	1(2)	2(4)	1(2)	1(2)	10	20 ⁸
CPHP							1	2
AFGRP							1	6
FMSP							1	1
FPHP							1	2

⁸ Only CPP continues to formulate separate Logframes for the different production systems