

Report of the Project on:
‘Collective Action in CGIAR Capacity Development’

Project implemented by:
Capacity Development Unit
International Livestock Research Institute

In association with other CGIAR centres, partners from Eastern and Southern Africa and the Regional Plan for Collective Action in Eastern & Southern Africa

Authors

Dr. Purvi Mehta-Bhatt Head- Capacity Development ILRI p.mehta@cgiar.org	Ir. Jan Beniest Capacity Development Consultant jan.beniest@gmail.com
---	--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
INTRODUCTION	1
CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT - CONCEPTS AND PRINCIPLES	2
Towards a definition of capacity development	2
Capacity development – capacity for development	3
Levels of analysis	3
Measuring for results	4
Conclusions	5
References	6
CGIAR INTER-CENTRE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	7
Past attempts and recommendations	7
Some conclusions	15
CGIAR RESEARCH PROGRAMMES (CRPs)	17
Towards a new CGIAR	17
Capacity strengthening in context	18
CRPs and capacity strengthening	20
Conclusion	22
COLLECTIVE ACTION	23
Capacity strengthening in context	23
Ongoing research – the CGIAR research map	24
Collective action newsletters	31
Conclusion	32
THE E-CONSULTATION	33
Organization and outcomes	37
Conclusions	37
THE PARTNER WORKSHOPS	38
Nairobi - Kenya	38
Maputo - Mozambique	46
OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	52
ANNEX 1 a&b – Nairobi Workshop: Participants and Programme	54
ANNEX 2 a&b – Maputo Workshop: Participants and Programme	57

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The implementation of the project activity on 'Collective Action in CGIAR Capacity Development' has been made possible thanks to the following people whose contributions are herewith gratefully acknowledged.

Capacity development staff of the CGIAR Centres: Thomas Zschocke (World Agroforestry Centre-ICRAF), Babu Suresh and Elias Zerfu (IFPRI), Elizabeth Goldberg, Per Rudebjer, Henri Kamau and Margareta Baena (Bioversity), Rosana Mula (ICRISAT), Petr Kosina (CIMMYT), David Van Eyck (IWMI), Iman Kaffass (ICARDA), Noel Magor (IRRI), Purvi Mehta (ILRI), Simone Staiger (CIAT).

Resource persons who facilitated the planning, organization and implementation of the two national workshops in Kenya and Mozambique: Julius Nyangaga (ILRI), Siboniso Moyo (ILRI), Carlos Dominguez (PIAIT-IIAM), Saskia Hendrickx (ILRI), Gertrude Ngeleshi (ILRI), Thomas Zschocke (ICRAF).

Participants (see Annexes 1 and 2) who attended the national workshops representing various national, regional and international institutions with an interest in agricultural research for development and related capacity development.

Bruce Scott, Kate Longley and Evelyn Katingi of the 'Regional Plan for Collective Action in Eastern & Southern Africa' and ILRI.

Purvi Mehta & Jan Beniest
Project Implementers

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) in collaboration with various other CGIAR Centres, partners in eastern and southern Africa and the *'Regional Plan for Collective Action in Eastern and Southern Africa'* conducted a study on collective action in capacity development. The project provides a forum to discuss past, present and future collaboration in capacity development within the CGIAR as well as the strengths, opportunities, limitations and constraints affecting inter-Centre collaboration, which will be crucial for the implementation of the ongoing and planned CGIAR Regional Projects (CRPs).

This report provides a narrative of the project activity which was implemented by ILRI and involved 11 other CGIAR Centres as well as various other international, regional and national institutions active, or with an interest in capacity development in agricultural research for development.

The Project was carried out in three related steps:

1. Desk study
2. E-consultation with CG centres
3. Stakeholder meetings in Kenya and Mozambique

The initial phase of the project involved a desk study that aimed at establishing what evidence exists of inter-Centre collective action or collaboration in CGIAR capacity development and what lessons can be learned from this. Findings described show that CGIAR Centres have worked together in this area on several capacity development projects and activities, albeit mostly in an externally funded project context rather than as a 'core' responsibility of the Centres. In addition to this, there have been several meetings and discussions highlighting the need for enhanced collaboration. However, there has been limited action or follow-up resulting from the latter. The main reasons for this are the lack of funding and incentives for Centre staff to engage in inter-Centre collaboration.

The outcomes of this study resulted in a series of questions on inter-CGIAR Centre collaboration in capacity development submitted to capacity development staff of 11 CGIAR Centres during an e-consultation. The response can be summarized as follows:

- CGIAR Centres confirm that there have been several actual and proposed attempts to promote inter-Centre collaboration in capacity development and provided some additional examples involving two or more Centres.
- They indicate that this is successful when capacity development collaboration is driven by partner demand, strategically integrated in research and linked to an overall results framework, based upon a real sense of community, available interest and expertise in capacity

development at the Centres and also when it provides clear and quantifiable benefits for the participating Centres. They also feel that sustained funding is required for longer-term efforts in this area and that these efforts must be well demonstrated and documented so that the cause of inter-Centre capacity development collaboration can be championed at the highest level of the CGIAR. Factors inhibiting inter-Centre collaboration can be personalities, interpersonal relations and conflict as well as having too many Centres involved when this is not really necessary and commitment/championing is lacking.

- Centres also propose several innovative or emerging trends in capacity development such as linking capacity development services to the overall agricultural innovation system and value chains, forming regional alliances on thematic subjects, participatory learning, strengthening learning institutions, mobilizing resources for partners, the use of advances in ICT/KM and e-learning in capacity development and the exchange of learning case studies and best practices between Centres.
- Most Centres are highly critical of the proposed 'dedicated informal network' approach to collective capacity development as outlined in the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) and tend to be in favour of a more formal mechanism such as a special unit that will serve as a think-tank on CGIAR capacity development and collaboration and thus adds value to all Centres and CRPs. This should also benefit from secured staffing (e.g. Chief Learning Officer) and funding to make it effective and efficient but without developing into an additional layer of CGIAR bureaucracy, hierarchy or administration. The implementation of a scoping study on the subject is strongly recommended.
- As to the use of ICT/KM and e-learning in capacity development, Centres agree that this will become increasingly important for the future but that this too would benefit from research as to assess its interest for the benefitting target institutions, the use of standards and approaches and the anticipated cost/benefit ratio. Expertise in this area is rather limited within the CGIAR and thus it would be beneficial to seek collaboration with alternative external providers in this area. The use of repositories, Web 2.0 tools for learning, mobile learning and me-learning using dedicated learning paths can contribute to capacity development and learning.

The next step in the project was to consult with a series of national, regional and international partners interested in CGIAR capacity development and this was done through two workshops – one in Nairobi, Kenya on 19 April 2011 and one in Maputo, Mozambique on 29 April 2011. These workshops looked at advantages and constraints in working with CGIAR Centres in capacity development and solicited the views of participants on new and innovative ways to interact with the Centres in this area in the future. This resulted in the following reactions:

- Participants recognize the main advantage of collaborating with CGIAR Centres for the same reasons as expressed by the Centres – the

strong track record of the CGIAR in international agricultural research for development resulting in a knowledge base on the subject that cannot be found anywhere else. As partners and collaborators, being associated with this network of excellence and its donor community also lifts the profile of national and regional institutions and allows them to participate in state-of-the-art research in their home countries. Many participants highlight the efforts of the Centres in individual learning through fellowships, attachments and thesis research, next to the other learning activities that have greatly contributed to strengthening the capacities of individuals and their employing institutions.

- However, they also point out that not all CGIAR Centres are easily accessible and that the demand for capacity development far exceeds what the Centres can offer. Centres tend to focus mostly on their own agenda, which not always reflects the needs of the partners and rural communities in developing countries, and they are considered expensive to work with when developing collaborative project proposals. National partners feel disadvantaged when it comes to working along CGIAR international and national staff in such projects. It is also felt that Centres often prefer to collaborate with stronger national partners to achieve their objectives and impact at the expense of weaker ones that are even more in need of capacity development.
- In terms of new or innovative arrangements for capacity building in the future, they suggest the development of joint research and capacity development projects that address the learning needs as well as the inequities in working conditions between partners. Such a collaborative approach will also allow better lobbying for funding at donor level but also requires all concerned to collaborate in learning needs identification and assessment, monitoring, evaluation and the development of indicators for learning impact assessment. Centres must also take a long term view of capacity development that allows for a critical mass of trained national staff which is seen as the long lasting legacy of the CGIAR beyond the research agenda and projects.

When it comes to capacity development and the new CGIAR Research Programmes, there is still a lot of confusion and many questions remain about how the CRPs will be dealing with capacity development, at the individual and collaborative levels, in the future. Capacity development staff of many of the Centres have been involved in the capacity development strategies of specific CRPs but there has been little or no thought about inter-CRP (and Centre) collaboration in this area. Since the 'new' CGIAR is relatively young and many CRPs still need to be refined prior to implementation, there is still time to consider this and be pro-active as to find ways to effectively and efficiently work together. This is unlikely to be achieved through an informal, albeit dedicated, network and it is recommended to implement the scoping study on [collaborative] CGIAR capacity development as previously suggested by the CGIAR Consortium Office. Such study is best implemented by a high level capacity development specialist in close collaboration with the capacity development staff of the CGIAR Centres and the CRP Leaders.

INTRODUCTION

Capacity development has always been an integral and important part of the CGIAR agricultural research for development agenda. The majority of the CGIAR Centres conduct their capacity development and learning activities mostly in isolation even though they often address and collaborate with the same partners in most of the developing countries in the tropics. There is some evidence of collective action or collaboration in this area but more will be needed since under the 'new' CGIAR, inter-Centre collaboration in research and capacity development are expected to take centre stage in the future.

The IFAD and European Union funded '*Regional Plan for Collective Action in Eastern & Southern Africa*' provided opportunities for inter-Centre collaboration in agricultural and natural resources management research for development. This regional plan can be seen as a precursor of the newly established CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs) since it also aims at strengthening CGIAR inter-Centres collaboration along certain thematic areas and seeks to link research to action to impact through the alignment of CGIAR Centres and several regional partners (ASARECA, SADC-FANR, FARA).

One of the outputs related to capacity strengthening in the context of '*Institutional arrangements and frameworks*' of the Regional Plan is the support to the 'Inter-Centre Capacity Strengthening Group' and this has been addressed by a project activity involving the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF). The following activities have been undertaken to achieve this output:

1. A desk study of past, present and planned collective action and collaboration in CGIAR capacity development based on available documentation and discussions with CGIAR capacity development staff.
2. An e-consultation and discussion on the outcomes of the desk study involving CGIAR capacity development staff.
3. Two workshops with selected national, regional and international institutions active in capacity development in Kenya and Mozambique.

This report provides a narrative of these activities and formulates a series of conclusions and recommendations that will hopefully assist in fostering future collaboration in CGIAR capacity development, especially for the newly proposed CGIAR Research Programmes. The views expressed are those of the authors based on the discussions with their capacity development colleagues and selected national, regional and international partners interested and active in agricultural and natural resources management capacity development. They do not necessarily reflect those of the Centres involved.

Capacity development — concepts and principles¹

Towards a definition of capacity development

A recent book titled '*Capacity Development in Practice*'² provides the perspective of development practitioners about the many different conceptualizations of capacity development. The working definition of capacity used in the book is “the ability of a human system to perform, sustain itself and self-renew.” This implies that capacity is not a static state or quality. Rather, it is seen as creating some form of value added for the members of a community and the external environment for achieving sustainable development and adjusting to change processes over time caused by external pressures and internal drivers. Hence, capacity refers to an ability, that is, in having the capacity. It is the degree to which an individual is able to understand the information relevant to making a decision about and recognize the reasonable foreseeable consequences of a decision or the lack thereof. Capacity is linked to performance. It refers to changes in capacity over time. It is seen as an endogenous and continuous/spontaneous process, where capacity evolves through interaction with the environment. According to the definition of the OECD (2006), capacity development is “the process whereby people, organizations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time.” Thus, capacity development in practice is actually the deliberate effort to “stimulate, guide, strengthen, unleash, nurture and grow capacities beyond the existing condition”, which is called capacity development support or the promotion of capacity development by external agents. The general consensus is that capacity development involves change over time, contributes to sustainable social and economic development, and is based on demand. Phrased differently, capacity development is a locally driven process of learning by change agents, who bring about “changes in socio-political, policy-related, and organizational factors to enhance local ownership for and the effectiveness and efficiency of efforts to achieve a development goal” (Otto et al., 2009). A number of critical themes are considered important when engaging in capacity development, including:

- Working with multiple actors within and across public, private and civil sectors
- Combining a strong results-orientation with flexibility and learning
- Building connections between local realities and macro policies or programmes
- Having the necessary professional knowledge, attitudes and skills for doing effective capacity development

¹ Contributed by Dr. Thomas Zschocke, Training Specialist, World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) in the context of the stakeholder workshops in Nairobi and Maputo.

² '*Capacity Development in Practice*' (2010). Edited by Jan Ubels, Naa-Aku Acquaye-Baddoo and Alan Fowler. Earthscan, London-Washington, DC.

- Recognizing the emerging market and service environment for capacity development support

Competencies and capabilities are two additional terms that are often used in the context of capacity development. Competence refers to the property or characteristics that an individual possesses, that is, being competent; (collective) capabilities apply to the properties or characteristics of an organizational (sub-) system. Competencies combine those cognitive, motivational, moral, and social skills available to (or possibly learnable by) an individual or a community that are needed to successfully master a range of problems and tasks through the appropriate understanding and actions.

Capacity development—capacity for development

As noted earlier, capacity is referred to as an ability. Activities that signify this ability include, among others, the anticipation and influence of change; the making of decisions to develop and implement policies; the acquisition and management of resources; and the evaluation of current affairs to guide decisions about future action. These are general qualities that also apply to strengthening the capacity in science, technology, and innovation in terms of developing the technical, vocational, engineering, entrepreneurial, managerial, and scientific capacity as indispensable for sustainable development. In the agricultural sector, this is about, e.g., increasing food security and adding value to natural resources so that smallholder communities can increase incomes for their families. In developing the capacity in science, technology, and innovation of the agricultural sector societies are enabled to exploit opportunities to produce higher-productivity and value-added crops. This requires targeting investments in agricultural education and training, improving agricultural research and development, and fostering policies for an enabling environment to create and apply knowledge. As such capacity development is a locally driven process of learning by change agents that brings about changes in sociopolitical, policy-related, and organizational factors to enhance local ownership for and the effectiveness and efficiency of efforts to achieve a development goal, that is, the capacity for development. In fact what is needed are resources (human, financial, technical) and the efficiency and effectiveness with which communities can acquire and use these resources to identify and pursue their goals for sustainable development. It is important to ensure that the results and performance are locally owned and can be replicated and scaled up by other local actors in order to achieve sustainable social and economic development.

Levels of analysis

As a complex intervention, capacity development encompasses multiple levels and actors, power relationships and linkages. Promoting capacity development implies to address change requirements at different levels, ranging from the

individual or group (team) to community or organizational (networks of organizations) and institutional (regulatory, policy or legal framework) or society level. An approach for capacity development requires an all-inclusive strategy that considers all contextual elements as well as the linkages between them. Such a strategy would involve national, regional and municipal levels, local organizations and institutions, as well as people organized by the state, by private or public organizations, and in their civil roles. The capacity of individuals is commonly strengthened through human resource development to improve knowledge, skills and attitudes. Organizations as processing systems that change individual and system capacities into organizational results, are supported through restructuring of management systems to improve the performance of specific tasks and functions. Institutional reforms address changes in institutions (policy instruments) and the macro-structure of the enabling environment.

Measuring for results

One of the capabilities identified in the context of capacity development is the ability to generate development results. However, it is difficult to readily identify or report results generated by capacity development in the short term because capacity outcomes tend to emerge only over the medium and long term. Although techniques such as results-based management (RBM), or its successor Managing for Development Results (MfDR), focus on short-term products rather than longer-term processes, they can be helpful in tracking immediate outcomes of capacity development. They help to simplify planning and ensure that the focus remains on the achievement of impact and outcome, rather than production of output or amount of input. In general, capacity development is usually part of the larger process of development. Frameworks for measuring the results of capacity development from the World Bank (Otto et al., 2009) or the UNDP (2010) assist in measuring the changes in capacity between an existing state and a higher state (the outcomes expected), exploring the programmatic responses for developing capacity (the outputs expected), and how to indicate for these changes.

For instance, the UNDP views capacity development as consisting of four core issues, that is, institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and accountability. It measures the results of capacity development interventions on three levels:

1. Impact as the change in people's well-being
2. Outcome as the change in institutional performance, stability and adaptability
3. Output as the product created or service provided.

The Capacity Development Results Framework (CDRF) of the World Bank provides a standard set of indicators of capacity factors that can be enhanced through learning to favor the achievement of development goals that are

customized to a particular situation. The basic assumption in using these indicators as part of the CDRF is that through the acquisition of new knowledge and information—that is, through learning—change agents can enhance the conduciveness of the socio-political environment, the efficiency of policy instruments, and the effectiveness of organizational arrangements and so contribute to the achievement of development goals. The CDRF focuses on six learning outcomes in a capacity development effort:

1. Raised awareness
2. Enhanced skills
3. Improved consensus / teamwork
4. Fostered coalitions / networks
5. Formulated policy / strategy
6. Implemented strategy / plan

In a capacity development intervention, a practitioner would move from learning outcomes to learning activities through the articulation of learning objectives: “The immediate objective of any specific learning activity or event is determined based on the expected contribution of that activity to the targeted learning outcome” (Otto et al., 2009). When applied in a concrete capacity development program a practitioner would need to articulate the logical links between the capacity factors and their indicators, the change agents and the learning outcomes designed for them, and the instruments of the intervention as well as the flow of information from one element to the next.

Conclusions

With the lack of a common definition or rather a broad conceptualization of capacity development and the issue that many efforts at capacity development remain fragmented, it is still a challenge for practitioners to capture cross-sectoral influences and to draw general conclusions of such interventions. Often capacity development activities are not based on needs assessments and do not include appropriate sequencing of measures aimed at initiating change process and individual skill building. However, noticing the importance of embedding capacity development in overall programmatic interventions, frameworks such as the CDRF allow to better show how capacity development contributes to achieving development goals and to track, monitor, and evaluate these efforts.

References

- Baser, H., & Morgan, P. (2008, April). Capacity, change and performance. Study report (Discussion Paper No 59B). Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM). <http://www.ecdpm.org/dp59b>
- Boesen, N., & Therkildsen, O. (2005, February). A results-oriented approach to capacity change. Copenhagen, Denmark: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida. <http://www.um.dk/NR/rdonlyres/780914AD-A4C4-42C2-8039-8115F4CA0DDB/0/KortCDbriefintro.pdf>
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Morgan, P. J. (2010). Capacity and capacity development: Coping with complexity. *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 2-10. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pad.559/abstract>
- CGIAR (2008, February). A strategy and results framework for the CGIAR. Montpellier, France: CGIAR Consortium Board. http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/strategy_results_framework
- de Grauwe, A. (2009). Without capacity, there is no development. Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001870/187066e.pdf>
- European Commission (2009, March). Toolkit for capacity development. Final draft (Tools and Methods Series, Reference Document No. 6). Brussels, Belgium: European Commission, EuropeAid. http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/infopoint/publications/europeaid/documents/174a_cdtoolkit_march09.pdf
- Lusthaus, C., Adrien, M.-H., & Morgan, P. (2000, December). Integrating capacity development into project design and evaluation. Approach and frameworks (Monitoring and Evaluation Paper 5). Washington, D.C.: Global Environment Facility (GEF). http://207.190.239.148/Outreach/outreachPublications/M_E_WP_5.pdf
- OECD (2006). The challenge of capacity development. Working towards good practice. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). http://www.oecd.org/document/7/0,3746,en_2649_33721_38549470_1_1_1_1,00.html
- Otto, S., Agapitova, N., & Behrens, J. (2009, June). The Capacity Development Results Framework. A strategic and results-oriented approach to learning for capacity development. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank. <http://wbi.worldbank.org/wbi/Data/wbi/wbicms/files/drupal-acquia/wbi/CDRF.pdf>
- Ubels, J., Acquaye-Baddoo, N.-A., & Fowler, A. (eds.) (2010). Capacity development in practice. London, UK: Earthscan. <http://www.snvworld.org/en/Pages/CapacityDevelopment.aspx>
- UNDP (1997). Capacity development (Technical Advisory Paper 2). New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). <http://mirror.undp.org/magnet/Docs/cap/Capdeven.pdf>
- UNDP (2010). Measuring capacity. New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). <http://content.undp.org/go/cms-service/download/publication/?version=live&id=2679640>
- Watkins, A., & Ehts, M. (eds.) (2008). Science, technology, and innovation. Capacity building for sustainable growth and poverty reduction. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079975330/DID_STI_Capacity_Building.pdf
- World Bank (2007). Cultivating knowledge and skills to grow African agriculture. A synthesis of an institutional, regional, and international review. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank. <http://www.fao.org/sd/erp/documents2009/cultivatingknowledge.pdf>

CGIAR INTER-CENTRE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Some past attempts and recommendations

There have been several attempts at promoting collaboration between CGIAR Centres in the area of capacity strengthening, especially focusing on the African Region. Without this being an exhaustive listing, the following paragraphs highlight some of these efforts with the purpose of identifying some drivers of success or failure that can guide CGIAR inter-Centre collaboration in capacity development in the future.

An early attempt to **survey inter-Centre collaboration in capacity strengthening in Africa** was undertaken by the World Agroforestry Centre, then the International Council for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF). Agroforestry, being a multi- and inter-disciplinary field of research for development required collaboration in several areas and with a multitude of national, regional and international partners. In order to establish its agroforestry networks in several regions in Africa, the Council surveyed the capacity strengthening programmes and activities of ILCA, ILRAD, ICRISAT Sahelian Centre, IITA, ICIPE, CIAT and CIP as potential International Agricultural Research Centres (IARC) partners. The survey concluded that there was a strong interest for the IARCs to work together in the area of capacity building since they all increasingly networked and collaborated with the same regional and national institutions involved in agriculture and natural resources management research, development and learning. Areas identified for potential collaboration, also in capacity strengthening, related to on-farm research, germplasm, research station management, experimental design, data collection, management and analysis, agricultural and forestry trees pests, weeds and diseases. It was also suggested that Centres work together in training through the joint implementation of short courses, workshops and seminars, sharing of training calendars and individual Centre training policies, the development and distribution of learning resources and other related learning events. It was also felt that constraints to inter-Centre collaboration in capacity strengthening consisted in the availability of human (scientists contributing as resource persons) and financial resources leading to effective and efficient inter-Centre collaboration. This survey resulted in the creation of the IARCs Training Group in Africa.

The **IARCs Training Group** brought together those working in capacity strengthening at the different CGIAR Centres active in the Africa region. Once a year, they used to meet at one of the Centres' locations, mostly in Africa, to discuss issues of common interest affecting their capacity strengthening efforts in the region. Some of the outputs were a database of learning resources developed by the Centres, the exchange of Centre training calendars and policies. At one stage it was decided to develop an inter-Centre training project that would show how Centres can collaborate in capacity strengthening. Unfortunately, this was not accepted for funding since the donor targeted felt

that it was too CGIAR centred and driven and as such did not focus sufficiently on partners' learning needs, opportunities and constraints. As a result, it was decided to expand the IARCs Training Group to include representatives of other regional and sub-regional organizations active in agricultural research, development and learning. This became the IARCs/NARIs Training Group or INTG. This group met a few more times but was eventually discontinued when organizational aspects of the meetings were handed over to some national partners. Meanwhile, the INTG had created a DGroups forum (www site) that allowed the continuation of electronic discussions on important issues affecting CGIAR capacity strengthening, both internally and externally involving partners who expressed an interest in CGIAR capacity strengthening. When DGroups was discontinued in 2011 for some communities because it required funding, the group switched to CGXchange and Google communities to continue the collaboration and discussions. In recent times, one of these focused on a common understanding of categories of individual learners at the CGIAR Centres initiated by CIAT. Advances in ICT/KM have certainly contributed to allow the existence of a virtual CGIAR capacity strengthening community and it can be expected that this will grow in the future.

The screenshot shows the CGIAR On-line Learning Resources (OLR) website. The page features a navigation menu on the left with categories like 'General', 'FAO Courses', 'Stellenbosch Courses', and various CGIAR centers. The main content area lists available courses under these categories. On the right, there is a welcome message, a calendar for August 2006, and a language selection dropdown set to English (en). The browser window title is 'Internet'.

The On-line Learning Resources (OLR) project was one of the projects of the CGIAR Information and Communication Technology/Knowledge Management (ICT/KM) Programme funded through the World Bank. Its aim was to share all of the CGIAR learning resources in electronic format using the worldwide web. Initially, the project intended to use the IRRI approach and tools to develop a

CGIAR Knowledge Bank but, influenced by the CIP Training Coordinator, the CGIAR training community got to appreciate advances in ICT/KM to deal with learning resources from a Reusable Learning Objects (RLO) and Learning Object Metadata (LOM) perspective and soon it was decided to develop a CGIAR learning objects repository in strategic partnership with the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KUL) in Belgium since it became clear that the CGIAR did not have the internal expertise needed to deal with the IT angle for this. Later on this repository was linked to a Learning Management System (LMS) – Moodle that allowed Centres to offer on-line and blended learning events. The websites created for this still exist <http://ariadne.cs.kuleuven.be/CGIARFinder/> and (<http://ariadne.cs.kuleuven.be/cgmoodle/>) but their use has been very limited in recent times. A final phase of the OLR project involving several Centres discussed ‘Quality Standards’ for training and education since this was a concern highlighted in the 2006 report on ‘*Evaluation and Impact of Training in the CGIAR*’. This resulted in the publication of ‘*Quality Matters – a brief guide to quality assurance in agricultural education and training*’ (2010). The Collaboration between Centres in the context of the OLR project was possible due to the fact that funding was available from the CGIAR ICT/KM programme. Its success and impact however were limited by the fact that the use of ICT/KM for capacity strengthening is at the infancy stage at most Centres and only a few Centres continued to contribute to the project after the funding was discontinued. It is interesting to note that several CRPs, as well as the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF), now highlight the role of the use of ICT/KM in capacity strengthening and thus this can hopefully become an important area for inter-Centre/CRP collaboration lest all concerned start developing their own approaches, methods and tools to deal with this.

The Agricultural Open Curriculum and Learning Initiative – AGROCURI (<http://www.agrocuri.org/>) initially started as the Global Open Food and Agriculture University (GOFAU) of the CGIAR. The initial idea for the latter was discontinued early on since it was generally felt that the CGIAR had no comparative advantage to develop its own degree-awarding learning institution (university) because as such it would compete with existing universities. Preference was thus given to strengthen national learning institutions in developing countries through curriculum and learning resources development in the areas of agro-ecology, agricultural economics and agri-business. It serves as the global repository for comprehensive learning materials on food and agriculture available to the public without limitations. AGROCURI aims to transform vital research findings from the global agricultural knowledge base into accessible, value-added learning materials for instructional use in higher education, professional training, and agricultural extension. It is a joint effort of a consortium of educational and research institutions in developing and developed countries. Next to IFPRI and ICRISAT, several other CGIAR Centres have been involved, also with the purpose of developing a major funding proposal. The main activity, being the learning materials repository, exists next to the one created by the OLR project and this

clearly illustrates a lack of collaboration between CGIAR Centres when it comes to the use of ICT/KM for capacity strengthening. Again, it is often the lack of sustainable funding that determines if Centres will work together or not as well as that of a 'coordination mechanism' and 'championing' to promote such effort.

The screenshot displays the AGROCURI website, which is part of the CGIAR Agricultural Open Curriculum and Learning Initiative. The page features a navigation bar with 'Home', 'Browse', and 'Contribute' options, along with a search bar and a 'Partners' link. The main content area is divided into several sections:

- Welcome to AGROCURI:** A introductory text block explaining the initiative's goal to provide a global repository of learning materials on food and agriculture.
- Curricular Framework:** A section listing thematic areas such as 'Agro Ecology' and 'Agricultural Economics/Agri Business'.
- Featured Content:** A section currently showing 'No Postings Yet'.
- Latest Content:** A table listing recent articles with their titles, authors, and dates.

Title	Author	Date
Managing the Process High Value Agriculture	suresh	01/10/2009
tesrt	suresh	01/10/2009
Differentiated Deposits and Backstop Technology	asenso	01/10/2009
Supply Chain Management Processes	suresh	03/09/2009
Intellectual Property Rights in Agriculture: Farm Level Issues	suresh	02/09/2009
- Sign into AGROCURI:** A login section with fields for 'Username' and 'Password', a 'Sign in' button, and links for 'Log in using OpenID', 'Register', and 'Forgot your password?'.
- How to use the site:** A section with links to 'How to use AGROCURI(655 KB)' and 'Content uploading guidelines(575 KB)'.
- Upcoming events:** A section currently showing 'No Entries' with a 'more' link.
- CGIAR News:** A section with a link to 'October 2009 Story of the Month: Curbing Desertification Today: A Prelude to Coping with Climate Change'.

The browser's address bar shows 'Internet' and the page is displayed at 100% zoom.

Another example of inter-Centre collaboration in eLearning and supporting training and extension resources is the Cereals Knowledge Bank which involves IRRI, CIMMYT and Bioversity.



In 2005-2006, the Science Council CGIAR commissioned an external review on the **Evaluation and Impact of Training in the CGIAR**. The report, summary recommendations and response of the Science Council are available from the CGIAR website³ and the following are some [still] pertinent points that need to be taken into account when considering inter-Centre/CRP collaboration in capacity strengthening for the future.

- The panel recommended that the CGIAR System set up and fund a suitable inter-Centre mechanism to foster closer cooperation and coordination in such areas as strategic planning; developing compatible formats for databases and financial recording systems; quality assurance; performance indicators; and exchange best practices.
- The CGIAR at large should recognize, as many Centres do, that training is not only for institutionally strengthening NARS but also for the execution and refinement of Centre research. The limitations that short-term project funding imposes on NARS strengthening must be recognized and overcome as far as possible through long-term Centre-NARS-investor cooperation and commitment.
- For NARS, the panel recommends high-level policy discussions to clarify which training needs can or cannot be covered by the CGIAR. It also urges greater care in selecting

³ http://www.cgiar.org/corecollection/docs/Evaluation_and_Impact_of_Training_2006_july.pdf and http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/templates/ispc/documents/About_Us/Reports_to_ExCo/SC_Report_to_ExCo10.pdf and http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/templates/ispc/documents/Meetings_and_events/ISPC_meetings/10-SC5/SC_Meeting_SC5_Report_May2006.pdf

appropriately qualified candidates and ensuring that they will be able to use what they learned. NARS and their governments should themselves shoulder such responsibilities as ensuring downstream dissemination of research products. The panel questions CGIAR direct involvement in training farmers and extension workers except when integral to Centre research.

- The main recommendation for CGIAR Centres is that they strengthen their focus on carrying out training and promoting learning that is compatible with their particular research priorities and mandates. Training strategists should bear in mind that the typical conditions of success are demand for the offered technology to meet identified needs, long-term commitments from Centres and funding agencies, local institutional support and leadership, a mix of formal and informal training and learning activities designed to fit specific needs, and multi-disciplinary training teams with the necessary critical mass of scientists. Centres should ensure that appropriate planning, monitoring and evaluation procedures support both formal and informal training and learning activities. Quality assurance protocols should be developed and applied systematically to all stages of planning, managing and delivering to NARS training and learning.

From these recommendations, it is clear that there is a need for CGIAR Centres to collaborate more in the area of capacity strengthening and that whatever mechanism aimed to achieve this should benefit from long-term and sustainable funding.

In December 2006, and based on the recommendations of the 2006 report on *'Evaluation and Impact of Training in the CGIAR'*, there was another attempt to revive the IARCs Training Group in the form of a 'side event' on CGIAR Capacity Strengthening during the annual CGIAR Annual General Meeting (AGM) through a **2-day workshop on 'CGIAR Capacity Strengthening and Multi-Centre Distance Learning Initiatives⁴'** (Washington, USA). The workshop brought together training and capacity strengthening staff of the CG Centres, universities from the north and the south, as well as distance education organizations. The workshop sought to share information among the participants on key aspects of capacity strengthening and distance education, to explore opportunities for collective action and to develop specific action plans for selected priority areas. The participants shared a common belief that by taking collective actions, this community can position CG capacity strengthening strategically to improve context and impact of CGIAR research. Prior to the meeting an online discussion forum was organized through DGroups with the aim to set up objectives and agenda for the workshop and for the AGM capacity strengthening side event, share the information on ongoing and planned training initiatives and discuss the Science Council training evaluation and impact study. As a result of this meeting, participants identified four action areas and developed milestones for these.

⁴ *'CGIAR Capacity Strengthening and Multi-Centre Distance Learning Initiatives'* (January 2007) E. Goldberg et al. Report of a Workshop November 30 – December 1, 2006, Washington, D.C.

- Action area 1. Operationalize collective actions by strengthening mechanisms for communication and coordination (establish a virtual workspace to facilitate sharing of information).
- Action Area 2. Position CGIAR capacity strengthening effectively within the external environment and strategic partners, including universities, educational networks, CSOs, and other learning institutions (understand weaknesses in CGIAR capacity strengthening, demonstrate needs and demand, identify strategic partners, establish mechanisms to incorporate CGIAR research into learning systems, support instructional design, etc.).
- Action area 3. Develop a common framework for online learning and distance education (advocacy, inventory of ongoing activities, pilot projects, improve access to repositories, multi-partner workshop).
- Action area 4. Establish common quality assurance standards (shared space with an inventory of standards, existing standards within the CGIAR, indicators, research, etc.).

Results of the meeting were shared at an AGM side event on Members Day “CGIAR Capacity Strengthening and Multi-Center Distance Learning Initiatives” jointly sponsored by USAID and the ICT-KM System wide Initiative and chaired by USAID. Some of the action areas did produce some results and their ongoing activities and progress were reported on in 2007 and 2008 newsletters. Again, by 2009 the creation of the new CGIAR resulted in a certain level of uncertainty about future CGIAR capacity development and no further action has been taken since in spite of the fact that the outcomes of this workshop can be of interest to capacity strengthening collaboration under the planned CRPs.

At another **inter-Centre capacity strengthening workshop** jointly organized by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI-ISNAR Division) and the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and held in Nairobi in September 2007, the need for collective action in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) among CGIAR capacity strengthening groups was discussed and agreed upon. The focus was on how to fill gaps left by the previous training efforts involving national systems and the international Centres in order to respond to changing and emerging needs and opportunities in the region. The group agreed that a formal consortium of capacity strengthening groups within the CGIAR Centres operating in Africa would be formed. This would be achieved through aligning on-going and planned activities under a number of broader programmatic themes which respond to specific needs and at a minimum transaction cost for the Centres. The ‘Regional plan for Collective Action in Eastern and Southern Africa’ would facilitate the formation of this consortium and provide an umbrella for its operation. The consortium will identify key areas where it can add value to the capacity strengthening agenda of the region. This would be informed by the system priorities of the CGIAR, ongoing initiatives in SSA, and the groups perceived strengths and opportunities. A concept note was to be prepared to develop a functional inter-centre capacity strengthening

consortium for SSA. The Group participated in a workshop in September 2008 with FARA to establish effective mechanisms to fully engage and contribute to the initiatives of FARA and the Sub-Regional Organizations in capacity strengthening. These efforts were also overtaken by events when the new CGIAR was created and the focus moved to inter-Centre collaboration in research and capacity development under the newly proposed CGIAR Research Programmes.

The last time that some CGIAR Centres and various partner learning institutions met to discuss capacity strengthening for agricultural research and development was during the March 2010 **CIPCAD meeting**^{5&6} (*Challenges & Innovative Processes for Capacity Strengthening in Agriculture for Development*) in Montpellier, France, in preparation of the broader GCARD (*Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development*) meeting during the same month. About 77 participants, including 5 CGIAR Centres (CIP, ILRI, ICRAF, Bioversity, ICARDA) representing international, regional and national research organizations and networks, universities from the north and the south, NGOs and farmer organizations attended the meeting. The programme was structured in the following sessions:

1. Joint and collaborative post graduate training
2. Relevance of post-graduate and doctoral agricultural research for development at advanced research institutes and universities in the north
3. Continuing education of agricultural research for development professionals
4. Multi-stakeholder platforms
5. Information and communication technologies (ICT)

For each of these sessions, participants presented several case studies which served as the basis for group and plenary discussions. Of particular interest is that the majority of participants in this forum were non-CGIAR Centres and thus there was a strong emphasis on ‘alternative’ providers for agricultural and natural resources management capacity building as shown in the following statement:

‘Effective and efficient training institutions as well as Multi-Stakeholder Platforms are a critical element in the success of the CRPs and in “what is new” in the CGIAR. Considerable experience exists with capacity strengthening of such systems. However, much of this experience is with organisations outside the CGIAR. The envisaged CG “Platform for Capacity Strengthening, Learning and Knowledge Sharing” is therefore strongly encouraged to form partnerships with the concerned non-CG organisations in the new spirit of the CGIAR. The greatest added value of this CG Platform would be in mobilising this non-CG experience for providing capacity strengthening support to the CRPs and in promoting learning between CG and non-CG partners on the “how to” of capacity strengthening’.

⁵ <http://www.agropolis.fr/cipcad/pages/cipcad.php>

⁶

http://www.fao.org/docs/eims/upload/276926/CIPCAD_GCARD_Cap_strengthening_final_statement_1_.pdf

A '*Strengthening capacities for ARD and enhancing efficiency of the innovation chain – CIPCAD/GCARD final statement and action plan*' was presented during the GCARD 2010 meeting.

In recent times (2010-2011), IFPRI conducted an electronic survey on '*Capacity Strengthening in the CGIAR – Status, Trends and Future Directions*' involving all capacity development staff of the CGIAR Centres. A draft version of the report has been circulated to CGIAR Centre staff and the final results and conclusions of this survey are to be published in the near future. This will also be of interest to future capacity development collaboration in the context of the new CGIAR and its CRPs.

Some conclusions

As mentioned, there may well have been several other capacity development projects, meetings and activities involving two or more CGIAR Centres. Additional information was also provided by staff of the CGIAR Centres who participated in the e-consultation. Based on the above experiences however one can conclude that even though there has been a lot of talk about, and interest in, inter-Centre collaboration in capacity development, there has been relatively little evidence to show for this to be working effectively and efficiently and the following reasons can be cited for this:

- In most cases, there are no real incentives for CGIAR Centre capacity development staff to take on [additional] responsibilities and work that diverts from an already overloaded Centre agenda in this area.
- Apart from some well-funded, short-term, projects, there has been no central funding or mechanisms that allow Centres to collaborate in this area in spite of several recommendations to this effect and the fact that other system and Centre-wide entities such as communication units, information technology departments, libraries, GIS support units and others do benefit from financial support that allows them to collaborate more effectively.
- Contrary to these other system and Centre-wide services, the complex area of capacity development requires strong input from and collaboration with a multitude of stakeholders, both internal and external, and this makes it often more difficult and challenging to effectively collaborate between Centres.
- Apart from some cases, there have been no real champions for CGIAR capacity strengthening at a higher level and this makes it difficult for the voice of the capacity development community to be heard.
- As a CGIAR capacity development community of practice, there have been different views on a number of issues related to capacity strengthening (e.g. advances in ICT and eLearning,

standards, methodologies) and there have been no mechanisms to deal with conflict resolution.

- The CGIAR and its constituent Centres tend to be in constant change (staff, structure, funding...) and this makes it difficult to stay the course of [collaborative] capacity development which requires long-term, sustained efforts.

CGIAR RESEARCH PROGRAMMES (CRP)

The new CGIAR

Under the new Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) model, the Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers (established in April 2010) is a new entity established to lead, coordinate and support the CGIAR Centers. The Consortium leads the formulation of CGIAR's Strategy and Results Framework (SRF), and the development of research programs under the strategy.

It defines the four strategic system level outcomes (SLOs) that should be pursued in future international agricultural research, namely increase in food security, reduction of rural poverty, reduction of under-nutrition, and more sustainable management of natural resources; and it identifies thematic areas in which the CGIAR needs to have strong competencies in order to be able to carry out the research needed to achieve the vision of the CGIAR. An effective impact on the SLOs requires core competencies and exploitation of synergies across the CGIAR system.

The CGIAR Research Programme (CRP) is designed as the key instrument to achieve this greater alignment of research outputs with the selected four SLOs. The CRPs will make explicit the execution of CGIAR research within an Agricultural Research for Development (AR4D) framework that allows a clear linkage between investment in the CGIAR research and the potential impact on development outcomes in collaboration with research and development partners. The key role of partnerships to reach concrete impact on the ground through the elaboration of an impact pathway for each CRP is highlighted in the SRF. Finally, this document addresses a number of important governance, management, and institutional issues, and makes a number of recommendations to be taken into account when looking at the future.

The following table lists the 15 CGIAR Research Programmes and indicates the respective CGIAR Lead Centre as well as the collaborating CGIAR Centres. The proposals for these collaborative research and training programmes are available on <http://cgiarconsortium.cgxchange.org/home/strategy-and-results-framework/megaprogram-development>

CGIAR Research Programme	Africa Rice Centre	Bioversity	CIFOR	CIAT	CIP	CIMMYT	ICARDA	ICRISAT	IFPRI	IITA	ILRI	IRRI	IWMI	World Agroforestry Centre	World Fish
CRP1.1-Integrated agricultural production systems for the poor and vulnerable in the dry areas		●		●	●		★	●			●		●	●	●
CRP1.2-Integrated systems for the humid tropics		●		●	●	●				★			●	●	
CRP1.3-Harnessing the development potential of aquatic agricultural systems for the poor and vulnerable		●		●									●		★
CRP2-Policies, institutions and markets to strengthen assets and agricultural incomes for the poor		●		●	●	●	●	●	★	●	●		●		●
CRP3.1-WHEAT – Global alliance for improving food security and the livelihoods of the resource-poor in the developing world		●		●	●	★		●	●		●	●	●		
CRP3.2-MAIZE – Global alliance for improving food security and the livelihoods of the resource-poor in the developing world				●	●	★		●	●		●	●		●	
CRP3.3-GRiSP – Global Rice Science Partnership	●			●								★			
CRP3.4-Roots, tubers and bananas for food security and income		●		●	★					●					
CRP3.5-Grain legumes for health and prosperity				●			●	★		●					
CRP3.6-Dryland cereals – Food security, better health and economic growth for the world's most vulnerable poor						●	●	★			●				
CRP3.7-More meat, milk and fish by and for the poor				●		●					★			●	
CRP4-Agriculture for improved nutrition and health		●		●	●	●	●	●	★	●	●		●	●	●
CRP5-Water, land and ecosystems	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	★
CRP6-Forests and trees – livelihoods, landscapes and governance		●	★	●										●	
CRP7-Climate change, agriculture and food security	●	●	●	★	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

★ = lead Centre; ● = collaborating Centre

Capacity strengthening in context

In addition to the research areas of special CGIAR competency there are a few critical areas that cut across the potential Research Programmes and affect the ability of the CGIAR to have an impact on the SLOs. In these cross-cutting areas the CGIAR will build institutional capacities, or focal points, capable of providing strategic coherence, greater research efficiency and scientific quality to the overall research effort within the CGIAR. These cross-cutting activities will be managed through the Consortium Office. The three cross cutting areas are gender inequality in agriculture, capacity strengthening, learning and knowledge sharing and development of research methods and comparable data as an international public good.

The following textbox reflects the views of the Consortium Board on capacity strengthening as expressed in the latest version of the Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) for the CGIAR (February 2011). Whereas the previous version still recommended *‘a dedicated unit to promote Capacity Strengthening, Learning and Knowledge Sharing would work at the system level to serve CRPs, centers and partners in these areas’* it is now suggested to have a *‘dedicated informal network to promote capacity strengthening’*.

Capacity Strengthening, Learning and Knowledge Sharing

142. Aligning research within the CGIAR around the SLOs involves integration across a range of very different research areas, integrating research outputs into research outcomes, usually within an innovation systems framework, and greatly expands field-based, in situ research activities, often within longer term benchmark sites. The range of partner institutions expands significantly with quite different roles and relationships and includes public, private and civil society partners. Partner capacity is critical to the development of agricultural research for development agenda and yet capacity constraints will vary depending on the institution and the overall socio-economic context. However, the time frame within which the partnership will remain operational will vary significantly. The result is that the locus for capacity development within the CGIAR moves within the CRPs as a support function to the different types of research partnerships. The nature of the capacity strengthening will expand from imparting research skills to include more learning-by-doing, testing of new methodologies and participatory approaches, often building on a base of new knowledge. This implies more innovative approaches to capacity strengthening, often tied to more effective knowledge management, and much more differentiated approaches, depending on immediate need within the implementation of the CRP.

143. A dedicated informal network to promote Capacity Strengthening may work at the system level to link CRPs, centers and partners in these areas. It will support capacity-strengthening and other relevant activities that will be built into each CRP. The system-wide network will share the latest research findings and results on capacity strengthening and it will provide CRPs with fora to share capacity strengthening experiences.

144. This informal network will help the CRPs and their partners to develop and use advanced ICTs for capacity strengthening, so that CGIAR research outputs reach target users and beneficiaries. This effort will include providing CRP partners with access to applications and resources such as databases.

145. The network should be developed by drawing on the capacity-building expertise of the CGIAR Centers, and of other educational institutions. Given the growing role of the private sector in outreach and capacity strengthening along agricultural value chains, this informal network should also seek to harness company contributions to the capacity-building effort.

CRPs and capacity strengthening

As indicated in the SRF, all CRPs needed to indicate a clear strategy for capacity strengthening including a problem statement, beneficiaries and target audiences, capacity strengthening activities, outputs and outcomes as well as an indication of potential impact. Almost all CRPs do see this as firmly embedded in, and an integral part of their research strategy and agenda. Most of them include a specific chapter or paragraphs dedicated to capacity strengthening. The following are some observations regarding these CRP capacity strengthening proposals:

1. When looking at several CRPs, one gets the impression that their capacity development strategies are very ambitious and several **lack focus or clear priority setting**. The 'fast tracked' CRPs tend to have the clearest and most detailed capacity strengthening strategies. Most of the other CRPs are still in a [final] draft format and are awaiting comments from the Consortium Board at the time of looking at these programme proposals.
2. As a general comment, all CRPs highlight the **weaknesses of the national systems** in being capable of collaborating as partners in the implementation of these CRPs. Most of them indicate that capacity building, strengthening and development will be required if the CRPs are to deliver the proposed outputs and envisaged outcomes. Only a few CRPs substantiate this claim and provide more detailed information on the subject. Since this serves to justify the investment in capacity strengthening in the context of the CRPs, it would be good if CRPs could be more specific in presenting this and focus on national systems that stand to benefit most from institutional capacity strengthening if a CRP is to achieve its vision, mission, goals and objectives.
3. Most CRPs also see capacity strengthening as closely **interlinked with other cross-cutting** areas such as partnerships, communication, knowledge management and gender/youth. It is often not very clear how these will all interact with each other for the benefit of [collaborative] capacity development.
4. CRPs tend to list a very broad range of **partners and audiences** as being potential collaborators or beneficiaries. They include; farmers, households, consumers, researchers, technicians, extension agents, NGOs, CBOs, international research organizations, networks, universities, students, teaching staff, policy makers, regional, national and sub-national institutions, public and private sectors, development agencies, donor spheres, other CRPs, etc. Whereas it is agreed that the targeted partners and audiences will be very different from one CRP to another in the implementation of their research activities, this too requires some clear focus and prioritization since attempting to strengthen the capacity of all concerned is unrealistic even if several CRPs indicate that this will be done in collaboration with other capacity strengthening institutions and providers. The question is – in how far can the CGIAR realistically address

the learning needs of its collaborating partners and target audiences and how is this seen in the context of broader national capacity development which is the responsibility of countries rather than that of the CGIAR? The CRPs should therefore clearly identify its boundary partners for capacity development and focus on its areas of comparative strength and advantage to achieve this.

5. **Gender, youth and marginal communities** are at times singled out as priority targets for capacity strengthening but it is not always clear how their specific learning and capacity strengthening needs will be addressed.
6. Looking at the broad range of beneficiaries of CGIAR capacity development, it will be challenging to see how the **needs and opportunities** of these target audiences will be identified and assessed. Bearing in mind that many national institutions are thin on the ground in terms of human capacity, it is likely that different CRPs will be interacting with the same institutions and individuals and this may be rather confusing if various CRPs use different approaches, methods and tools. The same applies to other generic capacity development activities such as impact assessment, curriculum design, monitoring an evaluation, ... all of which have a range of approaches, methods and tools as well. Centres and CRPs will certainly benefit from some standardization in these areas as not to confound their partners and learners.
7. Most of the CRPs list a variety of the usual **capacity strengthening activities** such as; short and long-term courses, workshops, conferences, individual learning, mentoring, learning resources development, eLearning, South-South and North-South collaboration, on-the-job-training, farmer field schools, peer-to-peer learning, learning research, information and knowledge platforms, learning institution curriculum development, learning needs identification and assessment, internships, attachments, case study development, extension materials,... The proposed activities differ from CRP to CRP when addressing a specific learning or capacity strengthening need and its corresponding anticipated outputs, outcomes and impact.
8. A number of CRPs propose some **'innovative' approaches** to capacity strengthening – learning alliances and thematic networks, learning cycles, user-driven learning among others. Many of these require skills such as facilitation, participatory approaches, reflective learning, ethics, co-learning, fostering dialogue, observation, communication and others. Quite often, such innovations are proposed by CGIAR Centres that have considerable experience in developing or applying these and it is certain that some of these can also be used in other CRPs. This again can constitute an important area of collaboration between CRPs. It will be useful to have a 'case studies' library of these that can be shared by all CGIAR Centres and CRPs so that they can learn from each other.
9. The use of **ICT/KM and eLearning** feature in the capacity development strategies and activities of several CRPs. Very few Centres however have the necessary expertise in this area and thus partnership and collaboration

will need to be established with strong alternative providers (Universities, private sector, international and regional learning organizations, ...) especially in the technology and instructional design areas since subject matter is definitely the area of strength and comparative advantage of the CGIAR. Since this is expected to be an important approach contributing to capacity development in the future, some form of coordination and standardization will be needed as to avoid that beneficiaries of these technologies will need to become familiar with a multitude of platforms and software. Internally, collaboration also needs to be established with the CGIAR ICT/KM Programme, the IT, libraries and communications departments of the Centres.

10. Logically, **subject matter** for capacity strengthening activities is closely linked to that of the specific CRPs but in several cases mention is also made of subjects that are cross-cutting between several or most CRPs: systems thinking, research design, experimental design, data collection, storage and analysis, scientific writing, facilitation skills, leadership, research and development project proposal writing. These are definitely areas where CGIAR Centres and CRPs can benefit from closer collaboration aimed at avoiding duplication of efforts.
11. If it can be said that presently there is relatively little **collaboration in capacity development** between the 15 Centres and if the new 15 CRPs will be looking internally within the CGIAR to get the necessary capacity development support and services, it is likely that this lack of collaboration will continue to persist and as a result the CRPs may become more interested in looking at external providers to achieve their mission and implement their strategy and activities.
12. All CRPs needed to develop clear **management plans and budgets**. In some cases this is also considered for the capacity development component of the proposals but for others it is still unclear as to how this will be managed and funded. Since each CRP does involve more than one Centre, it can be expected that those Centres will be collaborating closely together and develop the CRP capacity development plan. However, many of the Centres will also be involved in other CRPs and their capacity development component and it is not clear how all of this will be coordinated and managed. The SRF proposal to deal with capacity development as an 'informal dedicated network' is unlikely to address this at the CRP, Centres and overall level.

Conclusion

There is still a lot of confusion and many questions remain about how the CRPs will be dealing with capacity development, individually and collectively, in the future. Capacity development staff of the Centres have been involved in the capacity development strategies of specific CRPs but there has been little or no thought about inter-CRP (and Centre) collaboration in this area. Since the 'new' CGIAR is relatively young and many CRPs still need to be refined prior to implementation, there is still time to consider this and be pro-active as to find ways to efficiently and effectively work together.

COLLECTIVE ACTION

Capacity strengthening in context⁷

CGIAR Collective Action in Eastern and Southern Africa, is the evolving, collaborative program of a network of the fifteen CGIAR Centers with Sub-Regional Organizations, FARA, regional networks and voluntary partners primarily from national agricultural institutes and universities that aims to add value to ongoing agricultural research in eastern and southern Africa. The goal of the programme is to foster the emergence of a coordinated, cohesive program of agricultural research in Eastern and Southern Africa that produces clear economies of scale and scope at low transaction costs, to successfully address regional priorities.

The vision of Collective Action is to realize the CGIAR's mission of achieving sustainable food security and reduce poverty in developing countries through scientific research and research related activities in the fields of agriculture, forestry, fisheries, policy and environment in the eastern and southern Africa region through better alignment of research activities, more effective collaboration and dynamic integration of research programmes.

The mission is to enhance the impact of research in eastern and southern Africa by progressively bringing about integration of international regional and national research around shared objectives; **strengthening of the capacity of partners**, sharing of research platforms and services; and development of joint programmes based on dynamic comparative advantages.

One of the key principles guiding the Regional Plans for Collective action is seeking key intervention areas (thematic, **capacity building**, institutional) for collective action that promise improvement without too great a risk of causing existing, functioning agricultural frameworks and arrangements to collapse. In describing the principles and desired outcomes, the Alliance of the CGIAR Centres resolved that one of the principles of Collective Action is that the bulk of the funds required for the work of the Regional Plans will be earmarked for research **or capacity building**. Collective Action operates in a triangle of Regional Goals – **Capacity** – CGIAR System Priorities that balances a bottom-up approach with the needs for institutional innovation, that responds to stakeholders expectations and starts with a focused approach on research that has both utility and probability of success, evaluates costs and benefits of the approach and scales-up organically.

Collctive Action consists in four Flagship Programmes (FP) that respond to the needs of the region for international and regional public good knowledge,

⁷ <http://regionalplan.wordpress.com/>

information and technology that lies in the comparative advantage of the CGIAR.

- FP 1 – *Integrated Natural Resources Management (INRM)*
- FP 2 – *Institutions and Information for Achieving Impact at Scale*
- FP 3 – *Conservation and Enhancement of Agricultural Biodiversity for Improved Agricultural Production*
- FP 4 – *Improving Impact of Emergency Response on Agricultural Livelihoods in Highly Stressed and Unstable Environments*

The Collective Action Regional Plan envisages three types of outputs:

1. Type 1 – *Institutional arrangements and frameworks*
2. Type 2 – *Collective, value-adding research*
3. Type 3 – *Aligned, independently managed research*

Outputs related to **capacity strengthening** are seen as ‘Type 1’ and include:

1. Formulation and launch of a systemic **capacity strengthening** initiative to support SCARDA
2. Follow-up and related outputs on **capacity strengthening**, including support to emerging African Centres of Excellence (e.g. BecA, ReSAKSS)
3. **Support to the inter-centre capacity strengthening group**, regional hubs and platforms.

In the context of the latter, the ‘Collective Action and Capacity Strengthening’ project aims at supporting the CGIAR capacity strengthening community by providing a forum to discuss past, present and future [collaborative] capacity strengthening in the CGIAR as well as the opportunities, limitations and constraints affecting this type of inter-Centre collaboration.

Ongoing research – the CGIAR Research Map ⁸

An important Type 1 output of Collective Action is the development of an interactive database of CGIAR research in eastern and southern Africa available on the internet. This research map allows access to up-to-date information about the research projects undertaken by CGIAR centres throughout Africa. It is a collaboration between Collective Action, the ICT-KM Programme of the CGIAR, CGIAR Centres and over 250 scientists who have contributed their research information. It gives users the unique opportunity to carry out a more specific and targeted query based on different key fields, link the data to project outputs and other relevant documents. Each identified CGIAR research project has a fact sheet that lists its title, research area, countries, lead centre, principal investigator, collaborating scientists, timeline, overview, research

⁸ <http://ongoing-research.cgiar.org/>

partners (ARI, IARC, Government, NARI, NGO, Private Sector, University, Regional Organization or other) and search tags.

This repository is continuously updated. At the time of implementing this project, the total number of projects included was 431.

Searching for *capacity building, strengthening, developing, training, education* and *other related terms or tags* yielded about 66 projects with activities related to this. Out of these, about 13 involved collaboration between 2 or more CGIAR Centres but not necessarily in capacity development. The following table lists the Centres and the corresponding total number of their research projects listed in the database, the number of those projects mentioning capacity strengthening or related tag and the number of collaborative projects with a capacity strengthening or related tag that they are involved in with one or more other CGIAR Centres.

CGIAR Centre	Total projects	Individual project (+CS)	Collaborative project (+CS)
Africa Rice Centre	21	-	-
Bioversity International	27	5	1
CIFOR	14	2	2
CIAT (TSBF)	26	2	2
CIP	9	1	-
CIMMYT	19	3	2
ICARDA	52	4	1
ICRISAT	32	1	6
IFPRI	24	6	4
IITA	38	-	3
ILRI	54	6	3
IWMI	40	6	3
World Agroforestry Centre	57	28	7
World Fish Centre	18	2	-

In the absence of more detailed information about capacity strengthening in these projects, It is difficult to draw any major conclusions as to inter-Centre capacity strengthening collaboration since a) the database provides but a time-bound snapshot of past and present CGIAR research projects, and b) the data is collected by different people and the inclusion of information on capacity strengthening components of a research project may be rather subjective.

Some general conclusions that can be drawn from the sample taken from this database and the corresponding information are that:

- Contrary to common belief, not all CGIAR research projects involve specific capacity strengthening components or activities.

- The ratio research projects with capacity strengthening vs total projects is rather low for most Centres; and
- There is limited collaboration between Centres in CGIAR research projects in the Africa region, also in their capacity strengthening activities.

CGIAR Collaborative Research Project with capacity strengthening tag	Bioversity	CIFOR	CIAT	CIMMYT	ICARDA	ICRISAT	IFPRI	IITA	ILRI	IWMI	World Agroforestry Centre
Research and capacity building programme between IFPRI and NEPAD							★	●	●	●	
Capacity strengthening through strategic analysis and knowledge support for agricultural development in Mozambique (Moz-SAKSS)						★				●	
TerrAfrica position paper on climate change						●	●				★
A globally integrated African soil information service (AFSIS)			★								●
Managing uncertainty: innovation systems for coping with climate variability and change			●			★			●		●
CIFOR-ICRAF biodiversity platform 'Research on biodiversity conservation on a landscape level'		●									★
Increasing benefits to smallholder farmers from improved soil fertility through integration of pigeon peas, groundnuts and conservation agriculture in maize production systems of Malawi						●					★
Chinese trade and investment in Africa: assessing and governing trade-offs to national economies, local livelihoods and forest ecosystems		★									●
Designing community-based breeding strategies for indigenous sheep breeds of smallholders in Ethiopia					★				●		
Strategies to use biofuel value chain potential in Sub-Saharan Africa to respond to global change							●				★
Sustainable intensification of maize-legume cropping systems for food security in eastern and southern Africa (SIMLESA)				★		●					
Drought tolerant maize for Africa (DTMA)				★				●			

CGIAR Collaborative Research Project with capacity strengthening tag	Bioversity	CIFOR	CIAT	CIMMYT	ICARDA	ICRISAT	IFPRI	IITA	ILRI	IWMI	World Agroforestry Centre
Novel approaches to the improvement of banana production in Eastern Africa: the application of biotechnological methodologies — Phase II	★							●			
Total number of collaborative projects	1	2	2	2	1	5	3	3	3	3	7

★ = lead Centre; ● = collaborating Centre

To get a better idea about the CGIAR research projects that involved two or more Centres and that mentioned capacity strengthening, Principal Investigators or contact persons for the Research Map of the Lead Centres were asked to provide some information on possible collaboration between partnering Centres in the area of capacity strengthening. This is made possible by the inclusion of a *'Ask a Question'* box included on the project fact sheet. The following questions were asked:

- Was or is there any collaboration in the area of capacity strengthening between the Lead Centre and the Partner Centre(s)?
- If so, can you briefly describe this collaboration and highlight the drivers of success or failure of such collaboration?
- If not, would it have been beneficial to collaborate in this area and how can/could that best be achieved?

Out of the 14 requests for information through the fact sheets of the CGIAR Research Map, 4 persons responded with some information. It must be noted that some of the projects had ended by the time of conducting this exercise and that some Principal Investigators or associated partners in the project had left.

The following paragraphs highlight some examples of this exercise.

CIFOR-ICRAF Biodiversity Platform 'Research on Biodiversity Conservation on a Landscape Level' (Tanzania site)

CIFOR-ICRAF Biodiversity Platform 'Research on Biodiversity Conservation on a Landscape Level (Tanzania site)'⁹

The project started 2007 and finished in 2010. In the overall project, CIFOR was the lead centre and ICRAF the partner centre. In the Tanzanian site, the activities started in 2008, and were led by ICRAF, and implementation was mostly done through the Tanzanian Forest Conservation Group (TFCG). Finnish JPOs at ICRAF were coordinating the activities in Tanzania up to August 2009. The following are some capacity strengthening activities in which both centres were involved in or contributed to:

1. A training on Participatory Action Research (PAR) for Tanzanian partners and collaborators, was organized in 2008 in the project site in Tanzania by the ICRAF site Leader and the Theme Leader in governance issues, from CIFOR. The training was considered successful based on the participants' feedback. There was a need for capacity building in PAR among the partners to enable the project to work according to its objectives, e.g. to build collaborative governance of natural resources. The Participatory Land-use planning processes, and the stakeholders involved in conducting them, in the project area benefited from the PAR training. Yet, there were some more fundamental constraints in the operation of the local government (e.g. lack of resources to support and facilitate PAR in the long term, weak legal literacy among villagers) that will likely limit the scope of impacts of this capacity strengthening.
2. A five days' writing workshop organized by CIFOR (with funding from Japan) in Bogor, Indonesia, in October 2009, where two scientists/project staff from ICRAF, and one project staff member from our Tanzanian partner organization (TFCG) participated, aimed at improving skills in scientific writing. The collaboration was successful in the sense that it led to the writing of two book chapters that are included in the recently published book "Collaborative Governance of Tropical Landscapes" (ed. by Pierce Colfer & Pfund, Earthscan), and contribution by some of the project staff to other chapters as well. One of the book chapters involves both ICRAF and CIFOR staff.
3. Building of a Landscape Mosaics project database to gather data and findings from all five project sites, to enable further cross-site comparisons. Once completed, this may lead to new publications involving staff from both centres. The planning of the database contents was a collaborative process, in which staff from CIFOR and ICRAF and site partners (e.g. TFCG) participated. It was started at a rather late stage of the project, which made it difficult to comprehensively address the differences in the research methodologies and data sets between the five sites. Probably, the success would have been better, if the database was designed earlier on and by a smaller group of scientists, and who knew the contexts and the project rationale well. The database work is not yet finished and the development of the database continues at CIFOR.
4. Several students were conducting research and contributing to project activities, some of them directly working with CIFOR and ICRAF, and some with the partner organisations.

⁹ Information provided by Heini Vihemaki (ICRAF).

In this research project the capacity development activities were mostly planned, organized and implemented by scientists of the World Agroforestry Centre and CIFOR with limited involvement from capacity development specialists of these Centres. This is not unusual for other CGIAR projects as well since in many cases the human and financial resources of the CGIAR capacity development units do not allow them to be more effectively involved in all of a Centre's capacity development activities. In a number of cases their role is limited to data and information collection about the Centre's learning activities and the provision of logistic and administrative support to activities such as individual learning. The question that arises is 'what kind of additional value a capacity development unit can provide to improve such activities'?

The topics for these capacity development activities (Participatory Action Research [PAR] and Scientific Writing) would definitely have benefitted from inter-Centre collaboration since these regularly feature as topics for other Centres as well and thus there must be a wealth of learning resources from other Centres that could have been adapted and used for these learning activities. In the case of science writing, it must be noted that these soft skills are not necessarily an area of CGIAR comparative strength or advantage and that there are a lot of external providers available that can deal with this.

Even though the 'training' on PAR was considered successful by the participants, the comment on fundamental constraints and impact clearly show that capacity development is much more than training. A detailed learning needs and opportunities identification and assessment exercise could have brought some of this to the fore and may have yielded information and activities that could have avoided constraints and generated more impact.

Student thesis research remains a popular capacity development activity at many Centres since it contributes to the implementation of a Centre research agenda and scientists are mostly keen on getting MSc or PhD students involved in their work. What does Centres' capacity development staff see as their value-adding to this activity beyond administration and logistics?

Chinese Trade and Investment in Africa: Assessing and Governing Trade-offs to National Economies, Local Livelihoods and Forest Ecosystems

Chinese Trade and Investment in Africa: Assessing and Governing Trade-offs to National Economies, Local Livelihoods and Forest Ecosystems ¹⁰

To date, there has been little intentional capacity strengthening, beyond the mutual capacity strengthening that comes from working in partnership on a very interesting project, between the lead centre (CIFOR) and the partner centre (ICRAF) on this project. However, through this project ICRAF has been able to hire a researcher and CIFOR invited him to a workshop in Bogor, and also agreed in principle that it would be good to facilitate a research trip for him in Africa, which would certainly widen his horizons while contributing to the project. CIFOR also

¹⁰ Information provided by Louis Putzel (CIFOR)

shared with ICRAF some useful research tools to facilitate research on the topic using economic botany to untangle some of the less obvious aspects of global trade. This project could contribute to building ICRAF-China's capacity in this area. In phase 2, the project provides for work with Ph.D. students in partner universities in Africa.

This project illustrates that [internal] capacity strengthening is sometimes also seen as a form of professional development of Centre staff and at many Centres this is a Human Resources Department responsibility. Also for this project, individual learning is seen as a priority in capacity development. Even though this is a popular area for capacity development, some people argue that once a student achieves her or his goal of obtaining a degree through thesis research with a CGIAR Centre, it is uncertain whether this will have any significant impact on institutional capacity strengthening and broader capacity development.

Building Capacities for Evidence and Outcome-based Food Policy Planning and Implementation – the Example of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme

Building Capacities for Evidence and Outcome-based Food Policy Planning and Implementation – the Example of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme ¹¹

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is an Africa-wide framework for revitalizing agriculture and rural development in order to accelerate economic growth and progress toward poverty reduction and food and nutrition security. This study reviews CAADP and its strategic objectives, key players, implementation modalities, and approach to ensuring evidence and outcome-based policy planning and implementation. The study also lays out CAADP's common analytical framework at the country level and shares economic modelling results from member countries of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in which analysis was conducted to examine agricultural growth and investment options for meeting CAADP growth and expenditure targets and the Millennium Development Goal target of halving poverty. Finally, the paper discusses CAADP's review and dialogue mechanisms and knowledge support systems that have been put in place to facilitate benchmarking, mutual learning, and capacity strengthening that will improve agricultural policy, program design, and implementation.

This is a very broad [policy] capacity building programme led by IFPRI that involves contributions in terms of 'content and subject matter' from some other CGIAR Centres (IITA, ILRI, IWMI) without however involving their respective capacity development departments or staff.

¹¹ Information obtained from IFPRI Discussion Paper 01019 (August 2010) by Ousmane Badiane, Sunday P Odjo and John M Ulimwengu.

Collective Action Newsletters

Collaboration between CGIAR Centres and their partner organizations was reflected in an article¹² on the subject in the August 2007 issue of the *'Alignment & Collective Action Updates'* newsletter. This article highlights three sets of capacity strengthening challenges in African agriculture: weak institutional infrastructure, low levels of human capacity and poor linkages among academic, research and private sector institutions. This can be addressed by developing strategic approaches to combine the efforts of regional and sub-regional organizations in Africa and the CGIAR Centres working in the region. To achieve this, it is suggested that the CGIAR collaborates with the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA). FARA is the technical arm of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) for advancing the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) which embraces agricultural research and technology development, dissemination and adoption. FARA's responsibility under CAADP includes the following themes; integrated natural resources management, adoptive management of appropriate germplasm, development of sustainable market chains, and prudent policies for sustainable agriculture. CGIAR Centres can play an effective role in strengthening capacity in these themes in conjunction with FARA's regional partners. CGIAR – FARA collaboration is seen as yielding synergistic results through working with the sub-Sahara Africa Challenge Programme coordinated by FARA, its programme on 'Strengthening of Capacity for Agricultural research and Development in Africa' (SCARDA) that aims at strengthening the institutional and human capacity of African agricultural research systems to identify, general and deliver research outputs that meet the needs of poor people, and its 'Building Africa's Scientific and Institutional Capacity' (BASIC) programme that aims at strengthening the capacity that Africa requires for endogenously-driven innovation systems that will make African agriculture increasingly knowledge based and rooted in sustainable natural resources management. The latter will be achieved by raising the quality and relevance of agricultural education at the tertiary level and by developing a new cadre of professional for agricultural science, extension, business and policy analysis. These three programmes will provide opportunities for CGIAR Centres to effectively disseminate their knowledge bases within African institutions to build their capacity for agricultural research and development. Capacity strengthening in Africa also requires closer collaboration with sub-regional organizations such as the 'Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa' (ASARECA), the 'West and Central Africa Council for Agricultural Research and Development (CORAF-WECARD and the 'Southern African Development Community – Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resource Directorate' (SADC-FANR). The paper suggests that IFPRI-ISNAR programme in 'learning and

¹² Kwado Aseno-Okyere and Suresh Babu. *'Capacity Strengthening through Collective Action: CGIAR and Regional Organizations in Africa'*. *Alignment & Collective Action Updates*, Vol. 1:3, August 2007.

Capacity Strengthening coordinates FARA's capacity strengthening activities in collaboration with the CGIAR.

Another Collective Action Newsletter (May 2009) reports on a workshop (18-19 May 2009) in Mozambique aimed at strengthening the strategy and improve the coordination of Mozambique's Institute for Agricultural Research Institute for Agricultural Research (IIAM) 10-year research strategy. During this meeting, nine CGIAR Centres profiled their present and future work in Mozambique as a basis for discussions and this also covered their activities in capacity development.

Conclusion

The CGIAR's Regional Plan for Collective Action in Eastern and Southern Africa has also emphasized the importance of capacity development and inter-Centre collaboration in this area. Even though it proposed various ways of achieving this, implementation has been overtaken by the new strategic directions of the CGIAR through its new research programmes. Some of the regional and sub-regional partners and activities collaborating with the CGIAR will continue to exist in the future and thus the CGIAR's suggested ways to collaborate with these will need to be taken into account by the CRPs and their capacity development strategies.

The e-consultation

Organization and outcomes

Looking at past, present and future inter-Centre and proposed CRP capacity strengthening, a series of questions related to collaboration and collective action in this area was developed and submitted to CGIAR capacity development specialists at the Centres through an e-consultation¹³ discussion that took place between 10 and 31 March 2011.

The screenshot shows a Google Sites page titled "CGIAR Capacity Strengthening and Training Officers". The page layout includes a navigation sidebar on the left with links like "Home", "Announcements", and "CS/Training Documents". The main content area is divided into several sections:

- Home:** A introductory paragraph stating the site's purpose to archive documents on capacity strengthening (CS) or training within CGIAR.
- Recent Announcements:** Contains two items:
 - Call for IFAR fellowships 2011 open - deadline of applications is March 15, 2011:** A notice about enhancing professional development of professionals from developing countries.
 - Update your contacts information:** A request to update contact information on the "CS Contacts in the CGIAR" page.
- E-Consultation - participate by March 31, 2011!** A section with a list of six questions for discussion:
 - Examples of capacity building and development activities
 - Drivers of success or failure in inter-Centre collaboration?
 - CGIAR's areas of comparative strength and advantage
 - Existing or planned 'innovative approaches' to capacity development
 - The CGIAR SRF now proposes a 'dedicated informal network'
 - The use of ICT and e-learning for capacity

Responses were obtained from ten Centres and fifteen capacity development staff of these: World Agroforestry Centre-ICRAF (Thomas Zschocke, Jan Beniest), IFPRI (Babu Suresh, Elias Zerfu), Bioversity (Elizabeth Goldberg, Per Rudebjer, Henri Kamau, Margareta Baena), ICRISAT (Rosana Mula), CIMMYT (Petr Kosina), IWMI (David Van Eyck), ICARDA (Iman Kaffass), IRRI (Noel Magor), ILRI (Purvi Mehta), CIAT (Simone Staiger). Most participants contributed using e-mail addressed to the CGIAR virtual capacity development community (CGIAR - Capacity Strengthening, Education, and Training [CG Group only]). The complete transcript of these contributions is available from the authors and the following textboxes highlight the key outcomes of this exercise.

¹³ <http://cs-training.cgxchange.org/e-consultation>

Can you give **examples** of capacity building and development activities for which your Centre **collaborated** or still collaborates with one or several other CGIAR Centres?

- Most Centres indicate that they have collaborated in one or several collaborative capacity development projects with other Centres and these have already highlighted elsewhere in this report. There is also an inventory¹⁴ on collaborative learning activities available on the CGXchange site on the web.
- Bioversity has worked with CIMMYT, CIP and IFPRI in joint capacity development project proposals. They also collaborate in learning portals, with the Cereals Knowledge Bank (IRRI, CIMMYT) and the System-Wide Genetic Resources Programme on the Crop Genebank Knowledge Base. Several specialist training courses have also involved Centres such as ICRAF, IFPRI, ILRI, IRRI and AVRDC (research methods, impact assessment, genebank management). Development of learning resources has been done in collaboration with ILRI and CIAT.
- ICRISAT works with ICARDA on the HOPE and LEGUMES projects.
- IRRI and CIMMYT collaborate in the area of the Cereals Knowledge Bank, CIMMYT works on the capacity development components of the Cereals Systems Initiative for South Asia with IRRI, ILRI and IFPRI, on Drought Tolerant Maize for Africa with IITA and on Durable Rust Resistant Wheat with ICARDA.
- IRRI actively collaborates with CIMMYT, AfricaRice and CIAT on the knowledge banks and research-extension linkages.
- Most Centres also highlight the planned collaborative capacity development under the new CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs) which are all multi-Centre initiatives.

What do you see are the **drivers of success or failure** in inter-Centre collaboration in capacity strengthening?

Drivers of inter-Centre collaboration can either lead to success or failure and according to the Centres this is mostly due to the following:

- Strategic integration of capacity development in CGIAR collaborative research for development as opposed to stand-alone learning projects.
- Clearly defined competencies for learning outcomes within an overall results framework.
- Collaborating Centres have available expertise and a strong interest in a capacity development activity (e.g. eLearning) that may involve several Centres.
- Capacity development that is demand-driven by partners and learners (bottom-up vs top-down) has a better chance to succeed.
- Availability of long-term and sustained funding for capacity development is needed since this is probably the only lasting legacy of the CGIAR with the national institutions.
- There must be clear and quantifiable benefits in terms of time and cost for the collaborating Centres.
- Personalities, inter-personal relationships and a real sense of community can make or break inter-Centre collaboration in capacity development.
- The collaborative capacity development activities must be demonstrated, communicated and

¹⁴

<https://docs.google.com/a/cgxchange.org/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=Y2d4Y2hhbmdlLm9yZ3xjcy10cmFpbmluZ3xneDo1NTQ2YmFkN2YxMjQ1OTU5> (login access to CGXchange and GoogleDocs required).

documented to the outside world.

- There must be 'champions' for collaborative capacity development at the highest levels of the CGIAR and within the donor community.
- Centres must recognize the value of inter-Centre collaboration in capacity development, allow their [training] staff to actively participate in this and provide for incentives to encourage this.
- Inter-Centre collaboration in capacity development works best when a few dedicated Centres work together rather than attempting to get everybody on board.

Looking at the complex nature of capacity building and strengthening, what do you see as the CGIAR's areas of **comparative strength and advantage** in this area for which it will not be possible to easily find alternative service providers?

- The CGIAR is a network of recognized 'Centres of Excellence' in the area of agricultural and natural resources management research for development and has subject matter expertise and experience that is rarely or incompletely available from other providers.
- The CGIAR is in an ideal position to serve as an information broker in agricultural research for development because of its broad networking and partnership strengths.
- CGIAR research is multi- and interdisciplinary in nature leading to a more holistic coverage of and approach to the research/knowledge to action continuum.
- The majority of CGIAR Centres are locally present in the developing countries of the tropics where the needs are but their work and results also entail a more global perspective.
- Many CGIAR Centres have state-of-the-art research facilities (laboratories, libraries, fields) that can be used by national partners who do not have these.
- The CGIAR Centres mostly have a proven track record in high quality capacity building, strengthening and development that benefits its national partners and audiences.

What are the existing or planned **innovative approaches** to capacity strengthening that can benefit most CRPs and how can they contribute to enhanced collaboration in this area?

- Linking capacity development services and activities to the overall agricultural innovation systems.
- Using multi-stakeholder processes for capacity development in agricultural and natural resources management value chains.
- Working with regional alliances and capacity development platforms on specific subjects.
- Mobilizing resources with and for partner institutions.
- Strengthening institutions and networks of higher learning rather than substituting their weaker capacity development areas.
- Participatory learning processes and institutional strengthening as opposed to standard training.
- Using advances in ICT/KM to support learning (blended learning, mobile learning, learning resources repositories, Open Educational Resources,...).
- Formalize effective inter-Centre/CRP' capacity development collaboration (e.g. central unit, think-tank, Chief Learning Officer)

The SRF now proposes a '**dedicated informal network**' to promote Capacity Strengthening, Learning and Knowledge Sharing. Where do you see its added value and how should it be structured and managed to fulfil its role?

- It is not clearly understood what this means by most Centres and thus mostly rejected as a means to promote inter-Centre/CRP collaboration in capacity development.
- More formal ways must be explored to develop a coordinating mechanism that adds value but remains flexible enough as not to represent another layer of hierarchy or bureaucracy that complicates capacity development for the Centres or the CRPs.
- Without additional financial and human resources it is unlikely for any coordinating mechanism to succeed.
- Any coordinating platform, unit, network must add real value to what the Centes and CRPs are or will be doing.
- This requires a scoping study that reflects the views of all.
- Partners and capacity development beneficiaries should be consulted on how this should be dealt with.

The use of **ICT and eLearning** for capacity strengthening are suggested by several CRPs. What available approaches, methods and tools are available now and can they contribute to promote collaboration in capacity strengthening? What are the innovative approaches in this area that need to be explored?

- This is a rapidly evolving field that offers many approaches, tools, methods, etc. and most Centres do not have all the qualified staff to get involved in this.
- There is a need for standardization and inter-operability in this area and this can definitely be better done through a more coordinated and collaborative way of working.
- Electronic CGIAR learning resources (Open Educational Resources, Learning Objects) should be offered as a 'single stop shop' rather than having interested audiences needing to consult several repositories maintained by several Centres (e.g. CGIAR Virtual Library approach).
- There is an increased interest in using Web 2.0 tools for learning, especially on behalf of the younger generation of learners.
- Explore mobile- (mLearning) and me-Learning using individual learning paths.
- Collaboration needs to be established with established and experienced alternative providers (African Virtual University, Commonwealth of Learning, Universities,...) since there is presently insufficient capacity within the CGIAR to effectively deal with this.
- Any project in this area requires a serious cost/benefit analysis as to assess the usefulness of this for national partners and institutions that should also be consulted on the way ahead in this area.
- This will require additional and long-term funding if it is to be successful.

Conclusions

From this discussion, and the desk study on the subject of collective action in capacity development, it is clear that CGIAR Centres do work together in this area either in a project or an informal way. This collaboration may have been successful or unsuccessful and Centres cite a number of reasons for this that will need to be taken into account for successful future collective action in capacity development. It is also clear that the CGIAR has a number of important comparative advantages as opposed to possible alternative providers and thus capacity building can be expected to remain an important activity for the Centres and the CRPs. Some Centres suggest new and innovative ways to deal with future capacity strengthening but it is also clear that the CGIAR would benefit from some more reflection and coordination when it comes to this. Most Centres would prefer to see a more formal coordination mechanism that adds value to their work and collaboration as opposed to the proposed 'informal dedicated network'. Care should however be taken not to make this a bottleneck for individual and collaborative capacity development activities. Advances in ICT/KM can definitely be seen as becoming more important in the future and also for this more collaboration and coordination will be needed.

The 'new' CGIAR is putting a lot more emphasis on inter-Centre collaboration in research, capacity development and partnerships through the CRPs and the views expressed by CGIAR capacity development staff need to be taken into account if collective action in this area is to be successful, effective and efficient.

The partner workshops

After getting the views of the capacity development staff of various Centres, two workshops were organized to solicit information, views and recommendations from selected partners in Kenya and Mozambique.



Nairobi, Kenya

A total of 25 participants attended the one-day workshop on 19 April 2011 at ILRI, Nairobi, Kenya. They represented Kenya-based NGOs, universities, ministries and some international or regional organizations active in capacity development and having experience in working with CGIAR Centres.

The objectives of this workshop were:

1. To present the outcomes of a study and survey on past collective action in CGIAR capacity development of the CGIAR Centres.
2. To share some experiences in partner capacity development activities undertaken in collaboration with CGIAR Centres.
3. To highlight the concepts and principles of capacity development as they apply to the CGIAR Centres and their partners.
4. To discuss advantages and challenges in working with CGIAR Centres in the area of capacity development and to develop recommendations for the future.

The programme and list of participants of the workshop are attached as annexes 1 a & b to this report.

The workshop was opened by Bruce Scott, ILRI Director Partnerships and Communication who highlighted the importance of capacity development for the CGIAR and its partners in view of the present generation gap in agricultural research and development professionals in many countries of the developing world. Even though CGIAR Centres continue contributing to capacity development, declining donor funding has affected this important aspect of their work. Some Centres have been more successful in generating and retaining resources for capacity development and it is important that all Centres collaborate in this area as to create synergy and economies of scale as opposed to duplication of efforts and wastage of scarce resources. ILRI for example, continues to recognize the importance of capacity development and remains committed to this through increased funding for these activities. CGIAR capacity development remains in strong demand since it offers opportunities to young agricultural professionals to work along Centre scientists and thus benefit from the knowledge and innovation generated by the Centres and their partners through joint research, mentoring and the use of these Centre's research facilities. He highlighted the efforts of the Collective Action Initiative, funded by IDRC, the European Community and IFAD, in collaborative agricultural research for development in Eastern and Southern Africa which can be seen as a precursor of future collaboration between CGIAR Centres and their partners as envisaged in the 'new' CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs). For these as well, capacity development will remain an important and integral component of the work.

Purvi Mehta, the ILRI Capacity Strengthening Manager/Coordinator then provided more details about the changing CGIAR and its constituent 7 Research Programmes. This change is driven by the need for collective action to achieve greater impact, enhanced responsiveness from the system, extended partnerships and better outreach. Capacity development in the new CGIAR is seen as an important impact pathway and is a cross-cutting factor for all CRPs. It is a multi-dimensional function involving individual, policy and institutional levels that is strategically built-in in all CRP proposals and implementation plans. The presentation ended with ILRI's strategy and activities in capacity development which is aligned with the planning and implementation of the new CRPs.

Jan Beniast, who until recent worked as the Training Unit Manager of the World Agroforestry Centre, conducted a study including a survey of past and present collaboration in CGIAR capacity development. He gave several examples of joint capacity development projects, activities and meetings, and concluded that funding often becomes a limiting factor in sustainable collaboration between the Centres as well as changes in staff and partnerships active in such collaboration. An e-consultation involving most of the capacity development staff of the CGIAR discussed questions and issues related to drivers of success and failure of inter-Centre collaboration, the comparative advantage(s) of collaborate with the CGIAR in terms of capacity development, innovative approaches in capacity development, a proposed approach and structure to collaborate and recent advances in eLearning and the use of ICT/KM for collaborative capacity development. He concluded that there is

ample evidence that Centres can and have successfully collaborated in capacity development for agricultural research and development but that more is needed and this requires more formal management arrangements and be guided by learning partners and beneficiaries.

Thomas Zschocke is the new Training Specialist at the World Agroforestry and presented concepts and principles of capacity development applicable to the CGIAR and its Centres (see also pages 2 – 6). This was illustrated using CIP's Papa Andina approach to capacity strengthening which highlights the complex nature of capacity development but also illustrates that if all the right mechanisms and approaches are in place, capacity development becomes a major activity in achieving impact where it is needed.

The next session of the workshop allowed the participants to share some of the aspects of their capacity development work and activities with a focus on their collaboration with CGIAR Centres and other partners. The following table briefly summarizes these presentations.

INSTITUTION/NAME	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT WORK	PARTNERSHIPS
Ministry of Livestock Development – Veterinary Services/ M Muhari	Develop knowledge and skills for animal health disease control and the development and improvement of vaccination technology. Research results are available and the challenge is up-scaling.	ILRI, KARI, German NGO, CBO in Narok
Integrated Partnerships for Community Prosperity (IPACOP)/ C Wambugu	Long-term (farmer-to-farmer) training on farmer seed technology, supply systems for fodder shrubs and fodder quality. Also works on capacity strengthening for agricultural development (goats, vegetables, tree nurseries) of households affected by HIV/AIDS in Uganda	ICRAF, US-NGO, KEFRI, KARI, FARM AFRICA, UN HABITAT
Collective Action Programme (ICRAF/ILRI)/ K Longley	Works with Somalia Agricultural Technology Group (SATG) on technology support (sorghum variety selection, seed production and dissemination), farmer training and value chain development for (export) livestock production. The work requires capacity development at all levels.	ICRISAT, CIMMYT, AVRDC, FAO
Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS)/ J Wanjiku	Develops knowledge support systems for partners in Africa based on CGIAR generated agricultural research. Implements group training in policy analysis and advocacy, GIS, monitoring and evaluation, database development and management.	ILRI, ICRAF, IFPRI and most other CGIAR Centres as information providers.
Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture	A network of 25 universities in Eastern and Southern Africa aimed at strengthening postgraduate teaching	ILRI, ICRAF, Bioversity, BECCA

INSTITUTION/NAME	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT WORK	PARTNERSHIPS
(RUFORUM)/ W Ekaya	(MSc, PhD) at these universities. Provides funding and support for activities such as student research, departmental research, fieldwork. Works closely with several CGIAR Centres in curriculum design, teaching and use of research facilities.	
Benevolent Institute of Development Initiatives (BIDI)/ M Muthui	Works with local communities and builds capacity in livestock and agricultural development. Conducts needs assessments leading to priority development programmes and activities such as agriculture and farmer enterprise development, food, health, water and environment and poverty alleviation. Accepts student attachments in these areas for field research and experience.	No CGIAR collaboration to date but strongly interested in forging links in areas of common interest.
Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)/ L Ako Kima	Active in capacity development activities at university, development (extension) and farmer levels. Curriculum development, student attachments, teaching. Strengthens consortia of NGOs and trains in various subjects (e.g. policy issues). Provides funding for research and sponsors students. Works along 'value chains'. Focus on women and youth.	ICRISAT, CIP, CIMMYT, AfricaRice, ICRAF
Ministry of Livestock Development/ Technology and Economics Unit D Ojigo	Strengthens the capacity of implementing institutions and partners in animal diseases and their diagnosis using CGIAR generated results. Focus on database development, information management systems, use of ICT (e.g. mobile phones).	ILRI
African Wildlife Foundation/ D Nkedianye	Develops capacity of pastoralists and various other stakeholders involved in land use planning and natural resources management. Training of community youth in GIS techniques and mapping of resources.	ILRI
Wageningen University/ C Kilelo	Is a student at Wageningen University conducting PhD research at ILRI. Benefits from mentoring and use of facilities for her research on dairy development.	ILRI
African Agriculture Technology Foundation (AATF)/ S Oikeh	Develops capacity of farming communities and related partners in assessing and using proprietary technologies that solve farmer problems. Focus on getting results from research to farmers e.g. work with private sector and CGIAR on	CIMMYT, Monsanto, KARI

INSTITUTION/NAME	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT WORK	PARTNERSHIPS
	transgenic and drought resistance maize.	
Land O'Lakes – Dairy Sector Competitiveness Programme/ M Munene	Building stakeholder capacity of 114 farmer groups, 869 service providers and 270,000 farmers in the areas of dairy sector value chain (post harvest technology, preservation storage, bulking management, policy) and poultry production. Member of the National Dairy Taskforce and active in the committee on dairy sector research. A budget of 9 million US\$ also allows them to fund collaboration with different partners active in the sector. Interest in youth, student attachments and farmer field schools (FAO)	ILRI, ICRAF, FAO
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)/ E Kaisin	IFAD is an important donor to the CGIAR and has a strong interest in capacity development in its portfolio of projects since this is seen as a key activity in achieving impact at the development level, as a management tool and in monitoring and evaluation processes.	ICRAF, ILRI among other Centres, FAO, UNDP, AGRA
Ministry of Agriculture – Extension and Training Services/ C Mariene	The department is responsible for training of farmers and extension staff on various subjects related to agricultural crop production, natural resources management and the environment. This is [partially] done through 27 Farmer Training Centres in the country and 'common interest groups' (e.g. onion producers).	ICRISAT, ICRAF, KARI, NGOs, Universities
Ministry of Livestock Development – Research Extension Liaison/ H Mwangi	Emphasizes the need for all actors active in agricultural capacity development to share information and knowledge. Indicates that a national ministry is in a good position to coordinate this.	ILRI

After these presentations, workshop participants were divided into three groups and requested to express their views on the following issues:

1. What do you consider to be the main **advantages** of working with CGIAR Centres in collaborative capacity development?
2. What do you consider to be the main **challenges** of working together with CGIAR Centres in collaborative capacity development?
3. Can you suggest **innovative collaborative arrangements** with CGIAR Centres for effective capacity development?

Each of these questions was addressed using a 'café' style method during which groups of participants (5-6) visited each café that had a note-taker and a facilitator soliciting their views. This method allowed all participants to share their views on all questions while adding to the views expressed previously by the other groups. The following text boxes reflect the outcomes of this activity.

ADVANTAGES

- Research and capacity development of the CGIAR Centres reflect global experiences and a rich history of collaborative research in a multi- and inter-disciplinary environment
- The CGIAR has a strong convening power that also helps in mobilizing resources for its collaborative work
- The CGIAR has a large repository of high quality outputs and international public goods
- Being Centres of Excellence, the CGIAR has good governance and can be more flexible and responsive to partner needs and demands
- Through its wide network of partners, the CGIAR is able to extend its knowledge to many boundary partners
- Its presence in developing countries of the tropics makes its research and capacity development work more relevant to these countries and its farming communities
- The CGIAR mostly works at the cutting edge of agricultural research for development
- The CGIAR is at the forefront in training and mentoring agricultural scientists and professionals
- The CGIAR has a rich history of success in capacity development and is seen as a trusted partner in this area
- The CGIAR is in a position to mobilize resources for NARS and strengthen institutional capacity
- Being an international NGO, national and local political agendas do not interfere with its research agenda
- The 'new' CGIAR will focus on enhanced inter-Centre collaboration in research and capacity development and this will be beneficial to its partners
- The CGIAR contributes to confidence building at the individual, institutional and national levels

CHALLENGES

- Lack of communication and awareness about CGIAR research and capacity development among potential partners and end-users of results
- Lack of joint planning and resource mobilization/use for capacity development projects and activities
- Lack of championship or nodal points at partner level to interact with CGIAR Centres
- The need for a more holistic approach linking research and capacity development
- CGIAR Centres are not easily accessible (contact persons for partnerships) and their resource persons in research and training are often not available to collaborate with partners
- CGIAR Centres are expensive to work with in the context of collaborative projects and activities
- Disparities between partners for resources and capacities that lead to dependency of non-CGIAR partners on the system

- Successful partnership models and arrangements should be properly described and available for others to learn from.
- CGIAR Centres are at times not very flexible in adapting their research and capacity building activities to address emergencies (e.g. drought, seed availability,...) or respond to urgent needs
- CGIAR research programmes are too rigid, project-oriented and lack flexibility

INNOVATIVE COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

- Wide sharing of research results with all capacity development stakeholders through effective knowledge management
- Greater involvement of stakeholders in the research and capacity development process
- Collaborative resource mobilization and sharing for capacity development projects and activities
- A committed unit or platform that enables all stakeholders to effectively interact with CGIAR Centres and CRPs for capacity development
- Collaborative learning needs identification and assessment, monitoring and evaluation and impact assessment for capacity development
- User-driven and partner involvement in eLearning and related content development
- Assist in localizing/contextualizing CGIAR research results for local capacity development
- Assure longer term sustainability and continuity of capacity development projects and activities
- Invest in local institutions and involve their staff in collaborative capacity development
- Develop mechanisms for diffusion and up-scaling of CGIAR generated technologies
- Clearly clarify the mandate of the CGIAR in capacity development (also under the 'new' CGIAR), communicate this to all other stakeholders and increase the investment in CGIAR capacity development

The outcomes of these discussions were presented during a plenary session and raised the following comments and recommendations:

- Advantages can also become shortfalls and thus need to be relevant to be really considered as such.
- There is a need for enhanced and increased partner involvement in capacity development. The situation is not a static one and the CGIAR should be outward looking to identify new partnerships and opportunities and to listen to their views and requests.
- Continuity and sustainability of capacity development efforts is needed on behalf of both the partners and the CGIAR. The CGIAR alone cannot deal with this and should realize its limitations recognizing that alternative providers may be able to assist in this area.
- It is suggested to take stock of a few collaborative capacity development projects or activities, to review them and learn from

them as well as write these up so that others can learn as well. Communication about success or failure is needed.

- Networks of partners involved in capacity development often have strong and weaker members and at time the emphasis for collaboration is placed on the former because of the better chance to get good results. CGIAR Centres must also take this into account and make sure that there is a focus on getting everybody up to speed, especially weaker capacity development partners.
- There are many different models of partnership collaboration within the CGIAR and not all of them have been equally successful. It will be good to take a step back and look at these models as to modify the way the Centres interact with partners in capacity development and then agree on a common best practice model.
- Capacity development impact is part of a much broader impact of CGIAR research for development and Centres should agree to jointly develop a methodology for this.
- There is no 'blueprint' for capacity development but impact assessment should be included from the very beginning and people should learn from each other through horizontal impact assessment.

The workshop formally closed at 17.00 pm with Purvi Mehta offering a vote of thanks to all involved in this activity.

Maputo, Mozambique

A total of twenty-six people attended the same type of workshop at IIAM, Maputo, Mozambique. representing various national and regional institutions such as ministries, NGOs, learning institutions, research, IARCs and donors. The workshop had similar objectives as the one in Nairobi, Kenya. Its programme and participants are attached in annexes 2 a&B to this report.



The workshop was opened by Calisto Bias, Director General of the Institute for Agricultural Research of Mozambique (IIAM)¹⁵. He stressed the importance of capacity building and strengthening for national agricultural research for development and indicated that this is probably the most important and long-lasting legacy that CGIAR Centres can contribute to a country since it enables national partners to effectively conduct their agricultural and natural resources management research work in a sustainable manner. He lauded the CGIAR for having organized this capacity development workshop involving several national, regional and international partners, especially since collective action in research is already well established in Mozambique through the *'Platform for Agricultural Research and Innovation'* (PIAIT). The mission of this platform is to ensure that technologies, management practices and information are useful and accessible by the Mozambican farmers. Its general objective is to support agricultural research for development in order to collaborate with the Government and interested organizations engaged in poverty and hunger

¹⁵ <http://www.iiam.gov.mz>

alleviation through the delivery of results that specifically address problems affecting Mozambique's agricultural sector. Capacity development and training are key components in these efforts. PIAIT brings together national research and development partners with international and regional institutions and organizations such as CGIAR Centres, EMBRAPA, Michigan State University and IFDC. PIAIT is managed through a Platform Management Unit (UGP) headed by Carlos Dominguez and is based at IIAM in Maputo.

After this official opening, Carlos Dominguez, on behalf of PIAIT, and Purvi Mehta, on behalf of ILRI, also welcomed the participants and highlighted the importance of this one-day workshop aimed at soliciting the views of the participants on future collective action between CGIAR Centres and their partners in collective action for capacity development. The participants then briefly introduced themselves.

Next on the programme were the introductory presentations by Purvi Mehta on *'Capacity Development and the new CGIAR'* and Jan Beniest on *'Collective Action in CGIAR Capacity Development'* and an abbreviated version of *'Concepts and Principles of Capacity Development'* based on the presentation of Thomas Zschocke during the previous workshop as described in the Nairobi workshop report.

The next activity on the programme consisted of several written and oral presentations on agricultural capacity development by several participants, national and regional, and this is captured in the following table.

INSTITUTION/NAME	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT WORK	PARTNERSHIPS
IIAM – Zonal Centre South/ C Senete	Conducting capacity development for agricultural crops and livestock production. Improvement and evaluation of crops such as maize, transfer of technology. Farm discussions are one way of interacting with producers. Collaborative projects with CGIAR Centres.	CIMMYT
IIAM – DCA/ B Tinga	Training of livestock producers on increased animal productivity, animal traction, innovation and marketing.	ILRI
IIAM – Directorate/ C Bias	IIAM collaborates with many CGIAR Centres in the area of research and development for maize and wheat production, tropical legumes, rice, roots and tubers, livestock. Training consists of short in-service learning events and individual learning at the postgraduate level.	CIMMYT, IITA, IRRI, CIP, ILRI, ICRISAT and CIAT
IIAM – Zonal Centre North East/ F Chitio	Training of extension agents, community based organizations and farmers on technology transfer through on-farm trials and field demonstrations	ICRISAT, CIP, IITA
IIAM-DAS/ S Maciel	Conducts research and training of farmers and extension staff in animal	ILRI

INSTITUTION/NAME	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT WORK	PARTNERSHIPS
	production (artificial insemination, vaccines,...) and mentors new graduates. Develops and monitors research projects at the community level and liaises with ILRI for specialized training at their laboratories in Nairobi, Kenya.	
IIAM – UGP Coordination/ A Nhamusso	Carry out livestock research and provide services in the areas of diagnosis of animal diseases, vaccine production, quality control of animal nutrition and artificial insemination.	ILRI
IIAM – Directorate of Animal Science/ CM Dias	Conducts research and training in livestock production, agriculture and forestry. Services for vaccine production and use, disease control, artificial insemination, animal nutrition.	-
Michigan State University – Food Security Group/ D Tschirley	Conducts undergraduate and graduate training (agricultural markets analysis and policy) and strengthens links between in-country collaborative research and training of students through institutional capacity building in African countries. Collaborates with several international and regional organizations in the area of tertiary agricultural education in Africa.	IFPRI, World Bank, COMESA, ...
IITA Mozambique/ S Boahen	IITA conducts farmer managed trials on cowpea and soybean and trains farmers and farmer associations on the subject through 'learning by doing'. This aims at promoting consumption of these crops and nutrition improvement. The Centre also conducts graduate student training (MSc, PhD)	IIAM, CLUSA, TECHNOSERVE, Universities and others
IRRI/ A Ndayiragije	Training of Ministry staff, extension officers, provincial agricultural departments, NGOs, private sector and farmers in rice related agricultural production.	AFRICARE and CIAT through the Global Rice Science Partnership (GRISP)
CIP/ MI Andrade and W Grunebers	CIP is a leading knowledge Centre for potato and sweet potato through the development and provision of learning resources training opportunities and the delivery of high quality professional services, innovative training technologies and capacity development evaluation tools. CIP also supports project design and technical backstopping related to capacity strengthening and contributes to quality digital learning as well as to CGIAR collective action in capacity	IITA

INSTITUTION/NAME	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT WORK	PARTNERSHIPS
	development. CIP is also active in school gardens as well as in policy development and advocacy.	
ILRI/ S Moyo	ILRI provides capacity development support to a wide range of partners and audiences. The approaches used are experiential learning, interdisciplinarity, integration with research activities, training of trainers, and are all aimed at long term sustainability and continuity. Individual learning is an important activity (MSc and PhD supervision and mentoring. Group training focuses on innovation systems in livestock research, monitoring and evaluation techniques, research methods, statistical analysis, GIS and risk mapping for disease surveillance. Challenges are shortage of students for certain topics, non-availability of ILRI supervisors for certain topics and inability to meet certain training demands from partners.	IIAM and national partners in Mozambique

In the afternoon, a plenary session was organized to address the following questions:

1. What are the main advantages/opportunities of working with CGIAR Centres in capacity development?
2. What are the main challenges/difficulties for the same? and,
3. What are some new and innovative approaches that can foster collective action in capacity development between the CGIAR and its partners?

The following text boxes highlight the outcomes of this plenary session.

ADVANTAGES/OPPORTUNITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CGIAR provides high quality research expertise and support in agricultural research for development that assists national partners. • A mandate to contribute to capacity development. • The CGIAR has a strong communications focus that benefits its partners and target audiences. • The CGIAR has the financial and human resources as well as the ability to mobilize such resources for AR4D and such resources are also made available to its national partners. • Through the CGIAR, national institutions have access to broader networks and partnerships. • National institutions benefit from higher visibility, credible co-publication and increased confidence when working and publishing with CGIAR Centres.

- CGIAR research influences policy making and advocacy in many relevant areas.
- CGIAR Centres generate new technology and make this easy to access and transfer for national partners.
- Partnerships between national institutions and the CGIAR Centres are mutually beneficial.
- Budding and weaker institutions can learn from the CGIAR and thus get uplifted in their standing as compared to stronger ones.
- The CGIAR covers the complete research to action spectrum and thus has something to offer to partners at various levels.

CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES

- The CGIAR often prefers to collaborate with stronger national partners and institutions thus increasing the gap with the weaker ones.
- The CGIAR is at times strong on promises but weak on delivery and follow-up.
- National partners and CGIAR Centres sometimes have different goals and objectives making it difficult to collaborate.
- Sometimes the objectives are similar but the approaches to achieve them differ and both sides are thinking of their own commitment and impact.
- CGIAR Centres at times work in isolation from local context and conditions and do not respond very well to emerging and urgent needs.
- Planning of agricultural research for development must be done jointly with the national partners.
- Communicating results of collaborative research must give credit to all concerned when reported to the outside world, especially the donor community.
- There is a lot of inequality when it comes to available [financial and operational] resources between the CGIAR and its national partners.
- Capacity development and training need more attention and should not be seen as an afterthought of the research collaboration since this is often the most lasting legacy of the Centres.
- The CGIAR at times poaches national scientists and other staff thus leaving national institutions weaker as a result.
- There are insufficient [scientific] forums where NARS and IARCs can meet to discuss issue of common interest and collaboration.
- The CGIAR must make sure that it trains a critical mass of scientists rather than limit capacity development and training to a few individuals involved in specific activities.
- CGIAR Centres are at times impatient when working with national institutions since they are driven by donor commitments and requirements to deliver.
- CGIAR collaborative research for development projects and activities are often short term arrangements and lack long-term commitment.
- Portuguese speaking countries such as Mozambique have communication problems with a largely Anglophone system such as the CGIAR.
- Some CGIAR training is irrelevant to national institutions.

INNOVATIVE COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

- Maintain certain long-term capacity development projects and activities (e.g. rice production courses, introduction to agroforestry,...) to make sure there is a critical mass of people trained in these areas.
- Jointly plan agricultural research for development including the capacity development needed to achieve the necessary outcomes and impact in these areas.
- CGIAR Centres and national institutions should jointly lobby for more investment in agricultural research for development and related capacity development.
- Develop joint [capacity development] project proposals and provide for adequate financial resources (salary topping-up) to effectively involve the national partners where possible.
- Develop indicators for collaborative CGIAR capacity development [impact] together with the partners.
- Share state-of-the-art physical facilities with partner institutions (libraries, laboratories, etc.) beyond directly collaborative projects and activities.
- National partners should be more pro-active in proposing capacity development projects and activities and approach CGIAR Centres rather than the other way around.
- Provide for small grants projects to enable learners to practice the knowledge, skills and attitudes they acquired in their day-to-day work.
- Focus on youth in capacity development and promote attitude and mentality change when it comes to agriculture which is at times perceived as being less attractive as a field of work.

After this plenary discussion, Calisto Bias, Carlos Dominguez, Sabonisso Moyo and Purvi Mehta thanked all participants for their time and contributions and officially closed the workshop.

Overall conclusions and recommendations

- Capacity development is an important impact pathway for the CGIAR Centres and newly created CRPs.
- Whereas in the past it has been possible for CGIAR Centres to conduct their capacity development work in relative isolation with little incentives for inter-Centre collaboration, this will not be possible in the context of the new CRPs since the very reason of their existence is to promote partnerships and inter-Centre collaboration in agricultural research for development.
- Capacity development, in the context of CGIAR, implies capacities in terms of scientific and technological knowledge, agricultural research products and services, and innovation capacities to respond to demand and anticipate it.
- It encompasses individual and institutional capacity development spanning; participatory research, action learning, fellowships and internships, production of learning resources and curriculum development as well as overall capacities to generate, disseminate and adopt knowledge.
- Collective action between the CG centres and their regional and national partners in capacity development will have significant benefits such as;
 - Enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the CRPs
 - Enable strategic partnerships in the CGIAR and in the AR4D system (e.g., GFAR and others)
 - Define quality standards for training, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and impact assessment as well as promote and facilitate their implementation within a culture of continuous improvement
 - Contribute to the up scaling of successful initiatives, methods and tools to learn, strengthen capacity and share knowledge
 - Provide selected shared services
 - Strengthen the capacity of national partners to innovate in agriculture
 - Reach out to end users and facilitate their use and reuse of research outputs
 - Strengthen the capacity of universities to form skilled human capital for the AR4D system
 - Promote new knowledge sharing, management and information technology tools and methods.
 - Complement and leverage on the efforts done by various CGIAR (often in isolation thus far) and give a comparative and competitive advantage.




- The e-consultation with the CGIAR centres, as part of this project, revealed that the reasons for limited collaborations, among the centres, are manifold but the more important ones are the lack of funding for joint activities, as well as that of incentives, making it difficult for Centre staff active in capacity development to collaborate. In addition to this, successful collaborative attempts have often not been very well demonstrated or documented making it hard for potential champions interested in promoting this to lobby donors and other interested parties for resources.
- There is a need for the sharing of knowledge on capacity development projects and activities. Success and failure stories need to be documented so that all concerned can benefit and learn from this. This will also lead to avoiding the duplication of efforts.
- The CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) suggest that Centres work together in implementing CD in the CRPs through an ‘informal dedicated network’. Such a network already exists, albeit mostly as an electronic portal under CGXchange. It has not been very active or efficient in addressing inter-Centre collaboration in capacity development to date. It is therefore unlikely that such an ‘informal network’ will be the best way for Centres to collaborate under the CRPs and therefore the authors and several others recommend the establishment of a more formal and authoritative mechanism, perhaps lead by a ‘Chief Learning Officer’ who can ‘champion’ the inter centre collaborations on CD.

ANNEX 1a – Nairobi Workshop Participants

No	Name	Organization /Institution	Contact
1	Bruce Scott	ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute)	b.scott@cgiar.org
2	Charity Mariene	Ministry of Agriculture, Extension and Training Services, Kenya	cmariene@yahoo.com
3	Charles Wambugu	IPACOP (Integrated Partnerships for Community Prosperity)	
4	David Nkedianye	AWF (African Wildlife Foundation)	nkedav@yahoo.com
5	David Ojigo	University of Nairobi	davidhesronae@yahoo.com +24202700716 (0722)382283
6	Edward K Kiema	NDOC (National Disaster Operation Centre)	edawrdkisenge@yahoo.com
7	Etienne F.P Kaisin	IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development)	e.kaisin@ifad.org +254(0)2 762 10 28
8	Evelyn Katingi	ILRI (Collective Action in Eastern and Southern Africa)	e.katingi@cgiar.org
9	H .G. Mwangi	Ministry of Livestock Development, Research-Extension Liaison, Kenya	giochemwangi@yahoo.com
10	Henry Kamau	Bioversity Kenya	h.kamau@cgiar.org
11	James Moindi	Ministry of Livestock Development, Kenya	
12	Jan Beniast	Private Consultant, ILRI	j.beniast@cgiar.org
13	Juliet Wanjiku	ReSAKs (Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System)	jmawanjiku@cgiar.org
14	Julius Nyangaga	ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute)	j.nyangaga@cgiar.org
15	Kate Longley	ICRAF/WAC (Collective Action in Eastern and Southern Africa)	k.longley@cgiar.org
16	Laetita Ako Kima	AGRA (Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa)	Lkima@agra-alliance.org +254203750627 (0738 803803)
17	Margaret Kroma	AGRA (Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa)	
18	Margret Muthui	BIDII (Benevolent Institute of Development Initiatives)	maggiokola@yahoo.com
19	Mary Munene	Land O'Lakes, Kenya Dairy Sector Competitiveness Program	mulinge@landolakes.co.ke +254722517149
20	Muriithi Muhari	Ministry of Livestock, Director of Veterinary Services (DVS)	m.muhari@yahoo.com C
21	Purvi Mehta	ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute)	p.mehta@cgiar.org
22	Susan Macmillan	ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute)	smmacmillan@cgiar.org
23	Sylvester Oikeh	AATF (African Agriculture Technology Foundation)	s.oikeh@aاتف-africa.org

No	Name	Organization /Institution	Contact
24	Thomas Zshocke	ICRAF (World Agro-forestry Centre)	t.zshocke@cgiar
25	Wellington Ekaya	RUFORUM Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture	ekaya@afrionline.co.ke



ANNEX 1b – Nairobi Workshop Programme

TIME	SUBJECT	RESOURCE PERSON(S)
8.30 am	- Participant arrival and registration	P Namukula
9.00 am	- Welcome/Workshop opening	P Mehta - B Scott (ILRI)
9.15 am	- Introduction to the workshop	J Beniast
9.25 am	- Capacity development and the [new] CGIAR	P Mehta
9.45 am	- Collective action in capacity development	J Beniast
10.15 am		
10.45 am 11.15 am	- Capacity development – concepts and principles - Partner experiences in [collaborative] capacity development	T Zschocke (ICRAF) Participants
12.30 pm		
14.00 pm 14.15 pm	- Introduction to the working groups task - Working groups discussions	J Nyangaga – J Beniast Participants
15.00 pm		
15.30 pm 16.00 pm 16.45 pm	- Working group presentations - Plenary discussion - Workshop closing	Participants

ANNEX 2a – Maputo Workshop Participants

No	Name	Institution/Position	Contact
1	Calisto Bias	IIAM	calisto.bias@gmail.com
2	Paula Maria Dias	IIAM - DCA	paulatravd51@hotmail.com
3	Benedito Tinga	IIAM - DCA	beneditotinga@yahoo.com.br
4	Fernando Chitio	Director zonal Center-North-east	fernandochitio@gmail.com
5	Siboniso Moyo	ILRI Regional Rep	S.MOYO@CGIAR.ORG
6	Purvi Metha	ILRI Nairobi	P.Mehta@CGIAR.ORG
7	Jan Beniest	ILRI	J.BENIEST@CGIAR.ORG
8	Carlos Dominguez	ICRISAT	c.dominguez@cgiar.org
9	Constatino Senete	Director zonal Center-south	senetec2003@yahoo.com.br
10	Sonia Maciel	DAS-IIAM	soniaamaciel@gmail.com
11	Antonieta Nhamusso	IIAM representative	anhamusso@gmail.com
12	Levi Moura Barros	EMBRAPA representative	levi@cnpat.embrapa.br
13	Roda Nuvunga	Ministry of Science and Tech	roda.nuvungaluis@mct.gov.mz
14	Felicidade da Graça	Ministry of Science and Tech	felicidade.graca@mct.gov.mz
15	Custodio Bila	Veterinary faculty	cbila@hotmail.com
16	Isabel Andrade	CIP	m.andrade@cgiar.org
17	Alexis Ndayiragije	IRRI	A.Ndayiragije@cgiar.org
18	James Garrett	IFPRI	j.garrett@cgiar.org
19	Moses Siambi	ICRISAT	s.siambi@cgiar.org
20	Steve Boharen	IITA	s.boahen@cgiar.org
21	John McMahon	USAID	j.mcmahon@usaid.org
22	Irene de Sousa	USAID	isouza@usaid.gov
23	Paula Pimentel	USAID	ppimentel@tdm.co.mz
24	Imelda de Sousa	EU	Imelda.sousa@ec.europa.eu
25	Carlos Zandamela	IRRI	
26	Carla Menezes	IIAM - DCA	carlamenezes786@teledata.mz

ANNEX 2b – Maputo Workshop Programme

TIME	SUBJECT	RESOURCE PERSON(S)
8.30 am	- Participant arrival and registration	(PIAIT)
9.00 am	- Welcome	P Mehta
9.05 am	- Workshop opening	IIAM Director General
9.15 am	- Introduction of the participants	Participants
9.30 am	- Capacity development and the [new] CGIAR	P Mehta
9.50 am	- Introduction to the workshop and 'Concepts and principles of capacity development'	J Beniést
10.15 am		
10.45 am	- CGIAR Capacity development and collective action	J Beniést
11.00 am	- Participant presentation (forms)	Participants
11.15 am	- Panel discussion – CGIAR Centres: - IITA - CIP - IRRI - ILRI	P Mehta/C Dominguez S Boharen I Andrade A Ndayiragije S Moyo
12.30 pm		
14.00 pm	- Introduction to the interactive session	J Beniést/P Mehta
14.10 pm	- Interactive session on 'Collective Action in Capacity Development – the views of partners on advantages, challenges and approaches in working with the CGIAR'	Participants
16.00 pm	- Workshop closing	