

**Management response to Ex-post Impact Assessment of the Study: 'Impact of
Climate Change on Water Resources and Agriculture in Sri Lanka'**

June 2015

CCAFS Program Management Committee

Management response statement:

This study, not an ePIA, provides a qualitative assessment of the early outcomes from a 50k policy study done in 2010. While strong independent evidence is not provided, the policy study appears to have been effective in producing early outputs, i.e. a contribution to national policy and programmes to be implemented in coming years. This does not however constitute an ep-IA.

Notes on the study:

- Poor
- Main focus on quality of output – not even an outcome study, let alone an impact study (“too early to quantify the welfare benefits”)
- Based on questionnaires from 7 stakeholders (3 report authors, 1 policy person, 3 unidentified) who scored the IWMI report
- Six indicators were used to assess impacts: nature, relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, scale and methodological advances
- No counterfactual – cannot say whether government investments in cc adaptation would have happened without the study (though note this finding: “no competing claims from other research studies and hence the causality could be established, though the timing could be a coincidence”)
- Refers to SPIA

Interesting findings:

- The outcome-focus of the work under review appears good – a USD50k study that had wide influence on government programming
- “Thus, even a very conservative estimate of these investments indicate a many fold benefit flows when compared to the actual costs of the research. Thus the research is likely to generate high returns and benefit-cost ratios. The induced public investment in establishing rain gauge stations itself would be 20 times of the research costs (benefit-cost ratio= 20).”