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1. Introduction

1.1 Workshop Context

An important emphasis of the CGIAR Research Program on Roots, Tubers and Bananas (RTB) in 2014 is the piloting of a structured process for shifting from an output-focused research agenda (7 disciplinary RTB Themes) to a Results Based Management (RBM) model, based on flagships, which follows a sequential process, putting stakeholder participation at the center. During this transition the RTB workplan will mainly concentrate on: (1) defining the Theory of Change and impact pathways for selected RTB flagships, (2) developing an M&E system toward measurement of outcomes, and (3) using feedback from the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system to manage the program.

For each flagship, a “flagship team” has been constituted – including process coordinators. To train flagships process coordinators for their tasks in 2014 and set the ground for the implementation of stakeholder/partner workshops – to validate, contextualize and improve the existing delivery flagship impact pathways – a 3-day workshop was conducted from 9-11 June 2014 in Nairobi, Kenya.

Participants came from CGIAR centers active (1) in the RTB flagship pilots for “quality seed potato” and “banana xanthomonas wilt (BXW)” in East Africa, (2) in M&E (3) as collaborating partners, eg. the CGIAR Research Program on Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics.

1.2 Objectives of the Workshop

In the workshop, RBM process coordinators and teams will gain knowledge and become empowered to:

- Guide and accompany the pilot RBM process and flagship implementation (including the stakeholder workshops and next steps) for their respective flagship.
- Bring stakeholders together to understand, discuss, improve and harmonize around the RTB set of Impact Pathways, Theory of Change and Results Based Management concept.
- Contribute to the design of a planning, monitoring and evaluation system which can simplify the planning and reporting process in each of the pilot RBM flagships.

1.3 Planned Products of the Workshop

- Guiding documents, presentations and materials for Process Coordinators available for use in the workshops they coordinate.
- Inputs for improving the draft Facilitators’ guideline for RBM in delivery flagships to facilitate its finalization.
- First steps of a Community of Practice (CoP) on RBM process coordinators and teams established.

1.4 Structure of the Workshop Report

The workshop report is structured in 3 blocks: (1) RTB and Results Based Management, impact pathway/theory of change and M&E; (2) workshop presentations on linked topics; (3) workshop next steps and evaluations. Main focus is given to the first block. For a time sequential order of sessions and exercises, see the agenda of the workshop (Annex 1). Each of the thematic blocks contains links to power point presentations, introductory presentations, introductions for exercises and subsequent discussion results. All figures used in the text are taken from the workshop presentations. Details on group work results are presented in Annex 3.
2. Getting started: Welcome and participants presentations

The workshop started with the welcome by Graham Thiele, RTB Program Director who gave a quick introduction into the background and objectives of the workshop. He also presented Sophie Alvarez, the workshop facilitator, who guided participants through a quick review of the agenda for the following three workshop days.

The floor was opened with an interactive round of presentation of participants, followed by an exercise in teams to exchange and develop ideas around three topics: (1) definition of rules for a good workshop environment, (2) planning social/recreation side events for participants, (3) draft methods and procedures for workshop evaluation. Results of this work can be found under Annex 3.1.

3. Introduction into RTB – Results Based Management

The full presentation given by Graham Thiele, a starting point and general introduction to the thematic background and context of the workshop, can be found under the following link: [http://bit.ly/1lVol5G](http://bit.ly/1lVol5G)

![RTB Crops](image)

**Figure 1- RTB Crops**

RTB is one of the 16 CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) that bring the 15 CGIAR Centers together in a new way of collaboration. The creation of CRPs is a consequence of the CGIAR Reform process, to focus on results that matter to people and the planet. Since its beginning in 2012, RTB brought together four CGIAR-Centers (Bioversity, CIAT, CIP, and IITA) with many partners. In 2013, Cirad joined as a global partner. RTB research covers six crops, organized around seven disciplinary Themes\(^1\). Cross-cutting projects (across crops and centers) are implemented, eg on gender integration, seed system development, small scale cassava processing, banana bunchy top disease, and pest risk assessment.

**Challenge:**

- Disciplinary Themes offer a strong basis for planning and monitoring of research products, but do not provide a coherent basis for tracking research and development outcomes.
- Achieving outcomes requires collaboration across Themes.

RTB scientists developed a framework for Results Based Management (RBM) based upon a linked set of discovery, delivery and “learning & support” flagships. Central to putting RBM in place is securing the collaboration of stakeholders/who should share accountability for achieving outcomes.

---

\(^1\) 1: Unlocking the value and use potential of genetic resources; 2: Accelerating the development and selection of cultivars with higher, more stable yield and added value; 3: Managing priority pests and diseases; 4: Making available low-cost, high-quality planting material for farmers; 5: Developing tools for more productive, ecologically robust; 6: Promoting Postharvest technologies, value chains, and market opportunities; 7: Enhancing impact through partnerships.
A “Flagship” is a construct that combines flagship products/linked products, impact pathways and strategic objectives (see figure 2). Capacity strengthening, gender, communication and advocacy aspects are taken into consideration to improve user orientation and adoptability of technologies and to improve gender equity. For each delivery flagship, the main research products have been identified, impact pathways were tentatively mapped out and indicators for Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDO) were constructed.

Flagship types and examples:

Delivery flagships (near market-ready “scalable” technologies): Small and medium scale processing targeting rural women; providing nutrient rich food; managing and containing diseases; functioning RTB seed systems (value chains).

Discovery flagships (mid-long term options): Next generation breeding for genetic gain; game changing traits.

Learning & support flagships: Framework for seed system development; learning for post-harvest and value addition.

All CRPs have to move to RBM until 2017, as this is a clear donor requirement. In a call by the Consortium Office to all 15 CRPs, RTB has been awarded as one of 5 CRPs to pilot RBM in 2014 and 2015. RTB will implement the pilot RBM with three delivery flagships, a discovery flagship and a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework.

RBM key elements are:

- Program’s strategic goals (IDO) and relationship to System Level Outcomes (SLO) on CGIAR level
- Impact pathways (results strategy)
- Performance targets
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Performance assessment
- Learning strategy

Important steps for RTB to move to full implementation of RBM:

- RBM pilot on the basis of flagships during 2014
- Request for extension of RTB (for 2015-2016) submitted to the Consortium – showing how the

Figure 2- Flagship example: OFSP

Figure 3- RBM Cycle
transition from Themes to flagships will be implemented.

- Preparation of a proposal for the Consortium’s call for the second phase of CRPs (2017-2020): full implementation of RBM, outcome based budgets, performance evaluation, etc.
- Strengthening of the engagement with the CRP Humidtropics, sub-regional organizations and national partners.

**Comments and discussions** after the presentation mainly focused on the following topics:

**RBM concepts:**

- Include the aspect of “resource allocation” into the key elements of RBM.
- Integrate the “management of risks” (risk of investment, not achieved results, critical assumptions, etc.) into RBM.
- In the RBM cycle there is a strong focus on management and less about implementation. Add “implementation” to “monitoring” in the cycle.
- Concepts and wordings are sometimes confusing; avoid too much technical jargon and take care to make the story simpler.

**Business cases/investment aspects:**

- Flagship “business cases”, as mentioned in the presentation are value propositions, a kind of “aspirational statements” regarding what IDO(s) we think we can contribute to, with which activities, enabling outcomes, budget and teams. Each one must show some evidence that this business case achieves added value, including prior history of research.
- There should be emphasis on “agility” with respect to investment: smaller chunks, smaller investments. Agility concerning resource use and decisions give more options for success. However, the complexity of the flagship structure might make it difficult to prepare for agility: rationalizing the structure for decision making and finding simple ways to monitor and make decisions will be important for agile investment planning and implementation.

**Outcomes: role of publications**

- What role will publications have in the future for measuring outcomes? In the RBM thinking, publications are insufficient for measuring outcomes. Publication records cannot show and measure behavior change. Publications will still play an important role as CGIAR Centers are still research/scientific organization, and not primarily development organizations. Publications are important research outputs and not MAIN indicators, but still to be used.

**4. The Impact Pathway as a key element of RBM**

An important aspect of the RBM cycle (see figure 3) is defining the theory of change/impact pathway and the RBM framework with stakeholder participation. The workshop content and process were designed on the premise that draft impact pathways for each of the RBM pilot flagships already exist, and that key is to learn how to socialize, adapt and improve these impact pathways with stakeholders. A set of tools and processes exist to make impact pathways explicit, to discuss, improve and adjust them with relevant partners and stakeholders. This led to the workshop design as a combination of theoretical presentations with practical exercises for making impact pathways and their M&E requirements clear and explicit, and to orient workshop participants in sharing and discussing these with stakeholders in a participatory process.
The exercises followed step by step the elements of the impact pathway, as can be seen in figure 4.

4.1 **Introduction into Key Concepts of RBM and the Impact Pathway Logic**

The full presentation given by Sophie Alvarez, on key concepts of RBM and the impact pathway logic, can be found under the following link: [http://bit.ly/1IcpCPx](http://bit.ly/1IcpCPx)

Sophie introduced participants into concepts of RBM - a management strategy to ensure that processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of desired results (products, outcomes and impacts). RBM rests on clearly defined accountability for results, and requires monitoring and self-assessment of progress towards results, and reporting on performance.

Impact pathways are an important step in the RBM cycle, as they allow describing, defining and understanding how activities link up to visions and impacts.

It is important to make impact pathways explicit to

- Help establish an explicit common set of pathways, and thus a sense of shared purpose amongst implementing partners.
- Involve the necessary actors, partnerships and alliances in a joint process.
- Identify synergy areas with other similar initiatives, or with other related initiatives.
- Get participation of product users in design of these products and their scaling strategies.
- Establish a common framework for examining change processes (M&E).
- Systematically provide information for learning, decision making and communicating (with donors, partners, general audiences) during the projects’ implementation.

An impact pathway is build-up of different elements (activities, products, outcomes, impact) that follow a timeline, however, they are *never* as linear as shown in figure 5. This is a simplified presentation – a reduction of complexity for visualization and to facilitate the discussion with others around a common set of issues.
ACTIVITIES are carried out to produce PRODUCTS, which contribute then to the achievement of two major types of OUTCOMES:

- Research outcomes and
- (first level) development outcomes.

Next user groups are actors who “use” what we produce to contribute to expected outcomes. Next users can be national partners, international research organizations, NGOs, farmer’s cooperatives, etc. End users (beneficiaries) are individuals, households and communities.

Outcomes in Next Users (also called research outcomes) can be described in terms of the changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills (KAS changes) and practices of next users. KAS changes are a necessary condition to spur major practice changes and the “use and/or promotion” of products.

Development outcomes are direct benefits for end users (beneficiaries).

Comments and discussion:

General comments:

- A key take home message should be added on the linkage of delivery and budget: RBM will allow to link budget to what we really deliver (activity based budgeting).
- One key aspect of RBM is to develop and implement a learning strategy.
- Stakeholder engagement is important from the very beginning in the development of the impact pathway, as partners will help contribute to and measure progress along impact pathways.
Demand - Supply

- Sometimes we have to be proactive and cannot wait until next/end users clearly express a demand (eg for new varieties). Not all work we are doing is coming through request. Sometimes we already are in provision/doing things (supply orientation). The process of making impact pathways explicit with stakeholders is in many cases an opportunity to balance demand and supply by adjusting activities, products and expected outcomes by deepening the understanding of specific contexts.
- As a research institution, it is important that our impact pathway is carefully balanced between “evidence-based” and user demand. The case of the orange fleshy sweetpotato shows that in some cases, needs that can be identified by scientists are not necessarily initially perceived by farmers, but that through use of the product adoption is beginning and the need is being translated into an actual demand.

Construct and elements of the impact pathway

- There can be many outputs and deliverables inside one product. In RTB, a product is defined as a higher level of aggregation.
- We need the linear presentation of the impact pathway as a way to simplify reality for visualization and discussion. But how to best capture and reflect the “non-linearity”?
- It is good to have two types of outcomes, which allow showing step by step the progress from research linking into development.
- How are programmatic RTB impact pathways (longer term) and single projects (with rather short term visions) linked up and influencing each other? How do “site” or “country” impact pathways “nest” into regional or program-level impact pathways? Having a common goal which we all work towards (in this case, the RTB IDOs) makes it easier to articulate the many different interlocking pathways of the program, but this nesting is still a challenge for all CRPs, including RTB.

Data collection – feedback

- In RBM, the feedback that comes from M&E data collection and analysis can be used mainly for two purposes: (1) to check and adjust management strategies and (2) to justify and adjust the allocation of funding not only at the level of products, but also at the level of progress towards outcomes.
- Theories of change/impact pathways are defined at a certain moment in time, but reality changes as we go along. Thus, we need to view and understand impact pathways as an iterative and reviewable process. We need feedback and learning strategies to be able to capture these changes into progressive versions of the impact pathway.
- Impact Assessment is not, per se, part of the M&E system. Impact Assessment measures change at the IDO/impact level, often many years after the design and implementation of interventions. However, impact pathways and data collected and analyzed for monitoring and adaptive management purposes can and should provide valuable information to posterior Impact Assessment.
4.2 **GROUP WORK TO PRACTICE FORMULATION OF IMPACT PATHWAY ELEMENTS**

After input presentations on impact pathways components and concepts, participants were asked to “practice” the concepts by writing products, research outcomes and development outcomes. In plenary then was discussed what made each of the proposed elements a good example, or not. For details on the group work see Annex 3.2.

- We have to be careful with the wording of your products and outcomes. It is important how you formulate and how precise you are:
  - When thinking about next user groups: try to be as specific about the actor groups as possible. Use here (if you know them) their names, types or location of your next users.
  - When thinking about next user practice changes: try to use action words- such as 'coordinate', 'plant', 'participate in', 'integrate', 'release', etc.
- Although sometimes this focus on the “right wording” looks like “word smithing” or “spell checking”. However this reflection on the right wording helps triggering the thinking process, to check your understanding of the context and the concrete changes you want to achieve in an outcome.
- “RELEASE a variety” is a research outcome! When using actions like “release”, try to be specific by describing the difference between the actual and the “improved” situation (eg the way “release” happens: faster, participatory, accompanied with a clear implementation plan, etc?).

4.3 **DEVELOPING THE “FUTURE” OF THE IMPACT PATHWAY – LONG TERM OUTCOMES, VISION OF SUCCESS FOR ACTIVITIES**

The process of specifying impact pathways in a systematic way is a two-way road:

- Starting from research products, activities and strategies. Then progressing through the likely outcomes (changes in KAS) into IDOs and the ultimate desired impacts.
- OR: Starting from IDOs, to identify what development needs must be met. Then “going back” step by step, through development and research outcomes, to identify and formulate research products, activities and strategies in a way to best contribute to the achievement of those IDOs.

The exercises for the analysis of the impact pathway in the workshop started by looking at the components that are already well formulated, the parts that can be called “non-negotiable”. In the RTB flagships’ case, the “future” portion of the impact pathway, IDOs and system level development outcomes (SLO) on CGIAR level have already been set in motion, in a decision making process that goes well even beyond each individual CRP.

**Seven IDOs** are defined for RTB – selected from a common set of 11 IDOs for all CRPs:

1. Improved productivity in pro-poor RTB food systems
2. Increased and stable access to food commodities by rural and urban poor
3. Improved diet quality of nutritionally vulnerable populations, especially women and children
4. Improved ecosystem services for enhanced food system stability and sustaining novel genetic diversity for future use
5. More effective policies supporting development and use of pro-poor and gender inclusive RTB technologies developed and adopted by agricultural organizations, national governments and international bodies
6. Minimized adverse environmental effects of increased RTB production, processing and intensification
7. Increased and more gender-equitable income for poor participants in RTB value chains.

Exercise on “Vision”:
Another part of the “future” of the impact pathway is “vision”. A vision can (and usually does greatly) vary from flagship to flagship, from country to country and from community to community. Key questions for reflection on how to envision the future are: what would success look like in the specific context? How will the products and strategies influence how things are working?

Figure 9- Vision exercise

To practice the facilitation of a “vision” development, participants went into 3 working groups (potato, banana impact pathways and RBM) to carry out the exercise described in figure 9 (results are available in Annex 3.3.) and bring to plenary the main difficulties and, if any, “a-ha” moments encountered:

Group 1
- Good exercise to carry out with stakeholders.
- Be careful with the wording of the questions. These leave too much space for discussion.
- Include talking about unintended negative effects.

Group 2
- Exercise shows that stakeholders might have different visions.
- Challenge for bilateral projects – same stakeholders might not be involved any longer.
- How about: not vision in 10 years but 5 years? Possibly easier for stakeholders?
- Regarding the question about whether all are benefitting equally, it was helpful to look at beneficiary group by beneficiary group, next user by next user, to distinguish eg rural-urban, day-labour, migration, parts of value chain, “do no harm”, etc.

Group 3
- Not easy to locate ourselves 10 years ahead and look backwards.
- Focus on key aspects – those directly attributable to RTB influence.
- Identify key points to pay attention to in the development of the vision.
4.4 The “Start” Of The Impact Pathway – Activities/Products

To continue specifying impact pathways it is also possible to go back to the “starting point”, looking at the products. These however are NOT “non-negotiable”, as the case for IDOs and SLOs mentioned above. As described before, one of the main advantages of making impact pathways explicit is that this allows to “come back” and improve the products and their corresponding activities and strategies, to better respond to the needs identified in the outcomes and vision discussions. As short reminder on key characteristics of activities and products in the impact pathway: the correct phrasing when thinking of products is important: What WE develop WITH partners, WHO will use it and for WHAT.

Exercise on “activities/products”:

![Products exercise-instructions and Revising outputs-exercise]

3 working groups discussed the products of their impact pathway. Results of this exercise can be found in Annex 3.4.

4.5 Research Outcome Statements – Identifying Next User Groups; Knowledge, Attitude, Skills and Practice Changes

The uptake of products by next users and the achievement of research outcomes are the “middle” of the impact pathway. These outcomes can be formulated in many ways, but a useful one is to think of them in terms of changes in KAS, underpinning behavior and practice changes by NEXT USERS. This allows to think concretely of: “who is doing what”.

Exercise on “outcome statements/next users”:

For this exercise, the teams went back to their groups to practice formulating a few outcome statements. Group work results can be found in Annex 3.5.
4.6 Strategies For Achieving Outcomes – Partnerships, Review Of Activities And Outputs

To ensure that activities lead to products and products are leading to intended outcomes, strategies are key. When analyzing and developing strategies it is important to include:

- **Gender** (see section 4.7, below)
- **Communication and advocacy**
  - Communications and knowledge sharing are opportunities to help you achieve your goals.
  - Consider partners, targeted audience, common local practices, cultural context.
- **Partnerships**: the partner arrangements and evolving relationships necessary to achieve outcomes - the non-linear aspects of our impact pathways.

**Partnerships & Social Network Analysis**

Social Network Analysis (SNA) is a method to elucidate, discuss and manage partnerships. The use of SNA adds a level of complexity to making impact pathways explicit:

- Drawing network maps can help group members understand and visualize their networks.
- Analysis and discussion of network maps can lead to actions that strengthen these networks.
- Help in identifying key actors and obstacles that can help or hinder our work.
- Maps help communicate partnership structures “at a glance”.

**Advantages of network models**

- Actor-oriented descriptions: observable, understandable, verifiable.
- Captures real-life complexity: We are subject to multiple influences; we influence many others.
- Network models help understand advocacy process: Advocacy processes happen through different actors, acting in networks; These interactions, relationships and influence are modeled in network maps.

**Exercise on “strategies”**: 

![Strategies](image)

**How will your flagship/project contribute to make these changes happen? What are your ideas on how to help people change? What will your project do that is different? Better?**

**Strategies** can be the way (for example, co-develop instead of impose) you do things. Strategies are also the timing, methods, partnerships, ‘language’, etc. you choose to use.
The groups split back up into the 3 teams to develop strategies for each of their respective impact pathways (results in Annex 3.6). Quick feedback after the exercise highlighted the following aspects:

- Make changes happen; assure and make it sustainable.
- KAS changes are necessary but not always sufficient to reach practice change.
- How can we bring in the aspect of “ethics”? Ethics are at present not yet deeply analyzed and integrated into CGIAR work and impact pathways.
- RBM group highlighted the importance of a strategy to establish a focus team that guides/supports the RBM process; building ownership on anchoring RBM in CRP and Centers. The strategy also has to include approaches on how the RBM team should help/support flagships and scientists.

4.7 Gender in RBM and Impact Pathways

The full presentation on gender and RBM in impact pathways given by Netsayi Mudege, RTB Gender Research Coordinator, can be found under the following link: [http://bit.ly/1yUZftt](http://bit.ly/1yUZftt)

To give an introduction to gender in RBM, Netsayi highlighted the relevance of gender in RBM, and the importance of taking gender into consideration in each element of the impact pathway, especially when discussing with stakeholders. Other points are:

- Gender-sensitivity in a results-based framework reveals the extent to which a project has achieved improvements in the lives and overall social and economic well-being of women and men.
- Men and women have different development priorities, needs and constraints, and may be therefore affected differently by development projects, programs, and policies.
- Timely and systematic collection of sex-disaggregated data and gender information helps to inform managers and other stakeholders whether the intervention is benefiting both men and women.

Key aspects are to be analyzed and integrated in each element of the impact pathway:

**Activity:** (see Figure 14- Gender in Activities)

**Product:** It may be relevant that some of the products specifically target women and/or vulnerable sections of the population, taking into account relative literacy, language, etc.

**Research outcome:**

- KAS of these groups must be addressed differently, leading to (if needed) different capacity building, strategies and products.
- What are the different challenges that men and women may face in accessing technologies or other products?

**IDO/impact:**

- How will men and women be impacted differently?
- What are the gender aspects of those products relating to policies, advocacy and analysis?

![Figure 14- Gender in Activities](http://bit.ly/1yUZftt)
To help successfully integrating gender into impact pathways with stakeholders, consider the following guidelines:

- Identify also non-traditional networks/partners especially those with gender skills
- If women empowerment is one of your intended outcomes/impacts, involve partners with necessary expertise.
- Ask yourself whether the outlined roles for partners and next users are taking into account gender dimensions and if these are made clear.

Comments and discussion:

- Why not use “gender and diversity”, to also include vulnerable groups?
- Gender integration “is not just about sex disaggregation”. This needs to always be made explicit and to clarify exactly what this means in practice.
- It is difficult to give one-size-fits-all recommendations: to do good gender analysis, which is important to help with decision making in the RBM framework, we have to understand the context and its constraints in order to design appropriate approaches.
- We have to analyze and understand gender trade-offs, triggers of change, quality indicators, both farmer and communal decision-making processes and access to assets, for this, we need to work with partners experienced in gender in each of the implementation contexts (countries, sites, communities).

4.8 CHECKING THE LOGIC OF IMPACT PATHWAYS STEP BY STEP

Impact Pathways are a series of hypotheses that describe the mechanisms from products to impact. In a last step of “checking the logic” the impact pathways is revised in its completeness, to see if all the elements defined make sense. This is a very important step to make sure not to have too many unrealistic assumptions but a good, logical framework in place, before start thinking about M&E and indicators. Guiding questions to check the logic of the impact pathways are:

- Should you be able to produce those products with the strategies, activities and partnerships you have discussed and made explicit?
- Will they be used by the next actor groups you have for each product?
- Are those products each likely to contribute to the desired changes of KAS, and ultimately of practice?
- Would the changes of practice (in synergy with other factors, and with each other) contribute significantly to impact in end users?
5. Discussing Impact Pathway Indicators – M&E Plan

Another purpose of making impact pathways explicit is the production of a framework for progress that allows for adaptive management by using M&E results to adjust the course of the projects.

Claudio Proietti, RTB&CIP consultant for M&E, gave an overview on the key elements of the proposed system and ongoing activities of the RBM for RTB and CIP – showing in more detail information for each of the elements of the M&E system. The full presentation given by Claudio can be found under the following link: [http://bit.ly/1veppTu](http://bit.ly/1veppTu)

**Objectives:**
- Support strategic and operational management;
- Support learning and knowledge sharing;
- Promote transparency and accountability.

**Scope:**
- Country related – with possible aggregation at regional, center and RTB level
- Common framework through centers and RTB-flagships
- Common set of indicators and targets
- Harmonized mix of approaches and tools

**Structure:**
2 blocks: (1) output monitoring (supporting annual planning, budgeting and reporting, indicators of progress) and (2) outcome monitoring (output performances, outcome indicators and qualitative approaches).

---

**Structured in 2 blocks**

**Key elements**

- Impact Pathway
- Objectives
- Structure
- Methods and tools
- Scope

**Figure 16- Key elements of M&E**

**Figure 17- 2 blocks of the M&E system**
There is a junction between the two blocks 1 and 2 on the level of outputs, as shown in figure 17. There is no division of importance, roles etc. between the two blocks. In contrary: they are strongly linked through financial resources in a clear way through outputs to outcomes.

**Important further steps** to define an RBM-M&E plan are:
- Design the global system
- Define the Outcome indicators framework:
  - Identifying indicators all along the impact pathway
  - Define a common set of indicators per Flagship
  - Develop an M&E plan (country specific)
  - Implement the M&E and use findings
- Define an M&E plan (country specific)
  - Detailed description of each indicator
  - Data needed and sources
  - Baselines
  - Frequency of measurement
  - Responsibilities
  - Data flow and management
- Implement the M&E and use findings

**Exercise on M&E:**
An exercise to identify and clarify users, type of utilizations and management processes in which monitoring findings will be used was realized. Questions to be answered were: Who will use monitoring findings? When? How? All participants were invited to write down answers on cards. Claudio then analyzed and organized the cards in clusters of similar information and presented the results.

**Presentation of results:**
A specific focus was put on the internal uses of the M&E findings as reflected in the results. Figure 18 presents the steps in which the participants have identified a possible use of the M&E findings. As shown, the opportunities and the expectations (for details see Annex 3.7.) concerning the M&E cover all the RBM cycle.

**Comments and discussion:**

**Construction of M&E process**
- The role of partners is missing and not clarified in the presentation: where are partners in data collection/help with data collection? Do we use joint systems? Answer: Yes, for the definition of the impact pathway and RBM system, we will identify which M&E elements and data already exist in the country and with partners and establish joint work.
There seems to be a measurement focus in the monitoring process, which sounds more like evaluation. How does monitoring play through? Answer: Evidence based decision making requires data on changes. Monitoring process in itself consists in how data is used for management.

Measuring
- We have to carefully think about what could be a manageable system for RTB in terms of number of indicators.
- What happens if there is no baseline? Answer: Possibly our first measurement will be used as baseline. But there also exist already other possibilities for comparison. Lots of changes with end users have to be organized and measured with partners, using national statistics and data existing on country and international level.
- For indicators on IDO level, data from RTB priority assessment can/will be used.

Mapping of project activities
- Clear mapping of project activities allows crossing activities and contributions. Combination of different sets of products and projects is a challenge. Around 120 projects in CIP are now mapped. In CIP this exercise has started to be done, finding a correspondence in the financial unit.
- Not all projects have to make own impact pathways. But have to make contributions explicit.

Country level reporting
- Are country levels the first steps for reporting? Why? Answer: Countries are the first/minimum level needed within a flagship to be consistent. There are different flagships in one country and therefore relevant to have shared indicators and joint contribution. We are expected from CGIAR Consortium to report on country level!

6. Workshop presentations

6.1 Strategy for Scaling Out Quality Seed Potato

Monica Parker, CIP process coordinator for the “quality seed potato” flagship, presented an example of how the RBM pilot flagships already have impact pathways designed, and some products already under way. In presenting these already defined elements to stakeholders for discussion, it is important not to present these as “set in stone” – rather present what exists as iterative work which can be improved. Monica’s presentation showed the flagship, which was key element of the stakeholders workshop on 12-13 June 2014. Her full presentation can be found under the following link: [http://bit.ly/1mDJ3b0](http://bit.ly/1mDJ3b0)

Monica started her presentation by showing, why a strategy for quality seed potato is required, and on which development challenges the strategy is to be based. In a next step Monica explained how the piloting of a so called 3-Generation Project to support seed potato systems in Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda was followed by several stakeholder meetings to develop a potato roadmap. This consultative process resulted in a roadmap to guide investment in potato value chains and the joint agreement that quality seed is the key entry point
for vibrant potato value chains. To be able to improve livelihoods of potato farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa, an integrated approach in joint partnership with all stakeholders is required to tackle deteriorated potato seed quality.

The strategy developed for seed potato - on the basis of the roadmap - contains 7 main key elements/products:

- Client-oriented approaches to rapidly access quality seed
- Robust market-demanded varieties
- Seed technologies and business models
- Decentralized multiplication
- On-farm seed quality and integrated crop management technologies
- Awareness campaigns to create demand
- Scaling strategies and evidence base

Monica presented each of the products in more detail, showing its main characteristics and how it contributes via the impact pathway to reaching the impact of improving livelihoods.

She also highlighted the importance of partnerships for successfully reaching the goals and gave an example of the newly created “(Irish) Potato Coalition” as being a unique opportunity for all stakeholders along the value chain to work together toward a shared goal.

**Exercise: Peer review of the presentation**

A peer review exercise followed the presentation under the guiding questions:

- How to ensure that the presentation delivers the key messages to stakeholders?
- How do we outline what we intend to do in the flagship – but leave it sufficiently open for partners to be able to suggest new issues or ways of improving the impact pathway?

In groups, participants were tasked to identify 3 highlights and 3 options to improve the presentation. The groups presented a summary of their work in plenary (see Annex 3.8 for details).

**Great things in the presentation:**

- partnership approach to scale out mentioned.
- technical details very well presented/explained.
- having incorporate success stories.

**Options for improvement:**

- In the slide on development challenges, the opportunity was missed to.
  - include the aspect of gender, for example seed multipliers are mostly women.
  - show, why would we address seed bottleneck, how the needs were captured, by whom the needs were identified.
- Summary slide missing on how partnerships work together.
- More conceptualization about “how to improve livelihood” of farmers would show better, how livelihood would be improved at the end.
- The example of Nathan (a farmer who is now buying most of his seed and has stopped saving seed) should be treated with caution. We may not wish to pass the message that depending on purchased
seed is the best way. Being reliant on external seeds however, is not goal – although the emphasis given on this one example of a farmer who is not typical of other farmers in the area seems to suggest so.

6.2 **Humidtropics And RTB: Prospects For Collaboration And Shared RBM**

Kwesi Atta-Krah, program director of Humidtropics, presented the characteristic of the CRP as well as entry points and collaborations with RTB. The full presentation given by Kwesi Atta-Krah can be found under the following link: [http://bit.ly/Tq28la](http://bit.ly/Tq28la)

The CGIAR Research Program on Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics (Humidtropics) aims to improve overall agricultural productivity, and transform the lives of the rural poor in the humid tropics’ target regions. This is being achieved through integrated systems approaches in Research for Development (R4D), with a focus on sustainable systems intensification and capacity to innovate through partnerships and broad stakeholder participation.

In 2013, the operational structure of the program was consolidated and the research organization realigned to reflect the adoption of (IDOs) that shape the orientation of the research. A second major development in 2013 was the adoption and initiation of Flagship Projects as the essential blocks for structuring, organizing and implementing R4D to achieve anticipated outcomes and impacts at scale.

There are **five Flagship Projects (FP)**:

- **FP 1** is developed on thematic crosscutting basis, to ensure overall strategic coherence, e.g. in methods development, across the entire program, and with strong emphasis on integrating gender and capacity development. The remaining four Flagships are developed based on the geographic locations of the Action Areas as follows. Activities in these areas take place at selected Action Sites.
  - **FP2** East and Central Africa Highlands (ECA),
  - **FP3** West Africa Humid Lowlands (WAHL),
  - **FP4** Central Mekong (CM), and **FP5** Central America and the Caribbean (CAC).

**Partnerships** with CRPs is being explored in terms of coordination, co-location and collaboration in specific research activities. The partnership established between Humidtropics and RTB is a most significant one. In 2013, a number of engagements culminated in a workshop for planning concrete joint projects starting in 2014 for implementation between Humidtropics and RTB.

With special focus on RTB and CIP, joint work was realized related to the Humidtropics Flagship Projects on producing analytical tools and development of procedures related

---

**Figure 20-** Humidtropics-CIP-collaboration in potato work
to the use of potato and sweet potato for the intensification and diversification of farming systems, such as for crop growth simulation and yield gap analysis.

Comments and discussion:

- Important is to change the mindset towards a system approach. This is not easy but crucial to understand when interventions are system based.
- Challenge often is to know how and where to map-in bilateral and W3 funding in the general strategy of the CRPs (crop or system?) when there is an overlap. Eg, Africa Rising Ethiopia.
- Sometimes it is the question of just putting some money from Centers to complement work. Humidtropics Cluster 4 domain of new partnership makes sure that joint financing is done – e.g. joint work on potato in western Kenya.

7. Next steps and workshop evaluations

7.1 MOVING AHEAD WITH RBM – POST WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

The workshop introduced RBM, gave participants the chance to apply some key concepts in joint group work and learn from each other.

Some of the participants of the process coordinators workshop were responsible for the kick-off of the first stakeholder workshop from 12 to 13 June 2014 for the “quality seed potato” impact pathway. However, stakeholder workshops are only one (of the first) steps in rolling out the RBM flagship pilots. Graham presented an overview of some key aspects (see figure 22), that need further reflection and detail.
Each of the 3 groups went back into teamwork to discuss specific aspects relevant for their group. Detailed reports to be found in Annex 3.9.

7.2 Half Way Evaluation

Based on the questions formulated by the team on “define evaluation criteria and methods” on the first workshop day (see Annex 3.1), a half-way workshop action review before lunch of the second workshop day took place, led by Simon Heck, (CIP Deputy Manager sweetpotato program - SSA). Participants were asked to vote on progress made so far. See tables below (where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest) for the voting results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are we getting clarity on key RBM concepts?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we learning how to engage with stakeholders for the idea of RBM?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we starting to understand how we will implement RBM with stakeholders?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants also provided comments about the preceding workshop session and suggestions for improvement in subsequent sessions of the workshop.

- Done well in defining outcome, output aspects. Not yet clear how to manage the system.
- We jumped too quickly into impact pathway analysed without having properly understood RBM as a whole. Up to now we have bits and pieces and not yet “the full picture”.
- Knowing about RBM then doing – practical application; case studies and examples are missing.
- Mix of objectives of workshop: Learning or applying what we need to know? However: we are on different levels of understanding! Some participants are more familiar and others are learners.
- Clarify: Who in team is supposed to do what? Responsibilities/roles at all levels?
- Is RBM about trying to check/control delivery? Is it all about accountability?
- Many components of what was presented we have already always been considering in our planning! What is added? What is new? Management of indicators of progress?
- We need guidelines to know how to engage stakeholders into impact pathway work when projects are already at a more advanced stage (projects are at different stages). What to do in which stage of the project?
- Who is the right person/practitioner to engage with stakeholders? Are there different types of engagement?
- How are impact pathways and indicators interrelated? How do we identify metric? How transform into system of M&E?
- Create overall picture of what it does M&E for RBM.

To close this session, the group responsible for the workshop planning and implementation received the task to consider the results of the review and feedback on how they will be addressed.
7.3 Feedback on Half Way Evaluation

Responding to questions raised during the half way evaluation Graham presented an overview on roles and responsibilities in the different elements of the RBM cycle. The number of stars is the relative involvement of different team members in the process. Not everybody has to be involved in the same intensity in each step in the cycle and not everybody has to have the same knowledge intensity in all steps of the cycle.

Other suggestions given in the half way evaluation were directly addressed in the following sessions of the workshop in the afternoon and the following day.

7.4 Workshop Closing - Feedback Round in Plenary

Learning effects – personal level

- Learned about impact pathway
- Needed to perceive this very clearly: from product all the way through to IDOs
- Learned a lot from group sessions with scientists and joint work on impact pathway (eg changes, farmers constraints)
- Helped to reflect/think and plan to have stakeholder workshop
- Learned about RBM and advanced towards more/higher M&E capacity
- RBM came in stronger in the second half of the workshop what helped in getting full picture
- Learned about centrality of impact pathway and theory of change for M&E; how important RBM is.
  Not to see RBM only as an “evil” and obligation to be done.

Workshop structure/presentations

- Graham’s presentation very instructive (eg different concepts M&E, use of information and management)
- Show role of impact pathways in M&E and management earlier in the workshop
- Presentation on M&E earlier in workshop
- Show at very start the table of roles and responsibilities in RBM – helps participants to place themselves in the workshop
- More case studies
General learning effects – look into future

- Professionalize and simplify process RBM. We have to stronger emphasize on feedback mechanisms and learn by doing HOW to integrate and design the mechanisms.
- Documenting not only successes, but lessons to improve.
- Take advantage to learning from this strategic objective/flagship for other SO/flagships and also for other CRPs. There is a big potential of application of what we learned.
- It is important and good to do more work and training on M&E.
- Focus work stronger on M&E and management as it is a good entry point and helps to strengthen the opportunities to stimulate and monitor gender integration.
- Introduction and application of RBM is probably more complicated that we thought – from theory to practice. This workshop is a good start of a joint learning process.
- We have to invite more and more people to better understand the RBM process and concept. It is difficult but worthwhile doing it.
- For learning reasons the engagement of stakeholders is important.

The workshop closed with a joint cocktail and dinner; welcoming the newly arrived partners and stakeholders as participants of the following 2 days planning workshop on: “Business plan for going to scale with quality seed potato” (see workshop report under the link: http://bit.ly/VV74ke).
# ANNEXES

## ANNEX 1. WORKSHOP PROGRAM

### Monday 9th June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Participants’ introduction</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>Workshop logistics. Joint development of rules, evaluation, etc.</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Plenary presentation/Q&amp;A: planning for greater impact - Introduction into RTB-Based Management (flagships, Impact Pathways, Intermediate Development Outcomes, etc.)</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Input presentation: Introduction into key concepts of the impact pathway logic; Connecting to RTB Impact Pathways</td>
<td>Sophie (All)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>Presentation, group work and discussion: Strategy for taking work on quality seed potato Peer review: 3 highlights, 3 “options to improve”</td>
<td>Monica (All)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Group work on example formulation/wording…..</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Joint walk in the national park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process group meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tuesday 10th June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Presentation and Q&amp;A: Humidtropics and RTB. Prospects for collaboration and shared RBM</td>
<td>Kwesi/Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>Plenary: playback from Monday exercise</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Input Presentation and group work: Developing the “future” of the impact pathway – long term outcomes, vision of success for activities</td>
<td>Sophie (All)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Playback to plenary</td>
<td>Sophie (All)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Input presentation and group work: The “start” of the IP – activities/outputs/products</td>
<td>Sophie (All)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Half way AAR</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Input presentation and group work: Research Outcome Statements – Identifying next user groups, Knowledge, Attitude, Skills and Practice change</td>
<td>Sophie (All)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>Continue group work: writing Outcome Statements, next user groups, Knowledge, Attitude, Skills and Practice change</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Close of the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday 11th June 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Introduction of the day – Feedback on AAR</td>
<td>Graham, Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Presentation: Gender in IPs</td>
<td>Netsayi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Presentation and group work: Strategies for achieving outcomes-Partnerships, Review of activities and outputs</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group work continued and plenary</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>Presentation: checking the logic of IPs step by step – including gender perspective</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Presentation and group work: Discussing Impact Pathway Indicators along the IP to regional / program outcomes, M&amp;E plan</td>
<td>Claudio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Moving ahead with RBM post workshop activities</td>
<td>Graham, Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation and group work: Next steps, Organizing your own IP workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First ideas for a Community of Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Workshop closing</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Cocktail and dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 2. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
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<td>Kwesi Atta-Krah</td>
<td>Humidtropics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Parker</td>
<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netsayi Mudege</td>
<td>RTB</td>
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<tr>
<td>Oriana Muriel</td>
<td>CIAT-RTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Ortiz</td>
<td>CIP</td>
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<tr>
<td>Paul Demo</td>
<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe Monneveux</td>
<td>CIP</td>
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<tr>
<td>Richard Ofei</td>
<td>IITA-RTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Heck</td>
<td>CIP-Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Alvarez</td>
<td>CIAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Nyekanyeka</td>
<td>CIP-Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Osvald</td>
<td>VITA-Ireland (Irish Potato Coalition) Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wobill</td>
<td>IITA-Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronique Durroux</td>
<td>RTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Jogo</td>
<td>CIP-Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3. WORKING GROUP RESULTS

Annex 3.1. Rules, Evaluation, Social events

Group “rules” defined the following guidelines:
(1) Laptops and tablets to be closed during plenary – maybe used for documentation in groups,
(2) Cellphones on silent mode,
(3) Presenters to indicate at the beginning the time to ask questions during presentations,
(4) Indicate by raising your hand if have a question or a contribution to make,
(5) One conversation only (no side conversations).

Group “evaluation”: Three questions were formulated to assess progress and capture opinions from workshop participants (see section 2).

Group “social”: Joint action as a teambuilding walk in the National Park and joint activities as soccer playing where planned and implemented.

Annex 3.2. Formulation of impact pathway elements

**Group 1: Wellington**

**Assignment:** Identify 3 key products and discuss potential risks and assumptions

**Product 1:** Models/decision support tools to guide investment decisions in seed potato business

Key elements of the product:
- The enabling environment: institutional, policy, financial and legal environment to support seed potato businesses
- Economic analysis: Willingness to pay for quality seeds; relative benefits of using quality planting material
- Which category of farmers/clients is likely to benefit from using quality seed: is it the poor or better off farmers
- Is there scope to design different models for differentiated categories of clients

**Product 2:** Training modules supported by documentation for implementing decentralized seed multiplication

**Group 2: Ted**

**Assignment:** 1-2 Next users and Practice Change practice (research outcomes) and Knowledge Attitude and Skills Changes underpinning

**Next Users: NARS and Private Sector**

Practice Change (Research Outcomes)
- NARS have a shorter period to release improved varieties
- Private Sector engages in rapid seed multiplication/production value chains
Knowledge, Altitude and Skills (KAS) Changes Underpinning

- We recognize that the fact that private sector is able to produce 3G seed, this implies they are making use of the knowledge which was embedded with this product.
- We also note a shift to participatory variety selection which was not the case before.

**Group 3: Oriana and Oscar**

**Assignment:** Products

- Robust marketing varieties
- Methods and training modules for on-farm seed quality production and use.
- ICM technologies described with suitability for specific agro-ecosystems.
- Models and decision support tools to guide investment on seed potato business, including:
  - Analysis of demand.
  - Selection of suitable technological options.
  - Cost-benefit analysis.
- Training modules, supported by documentation for implementing decentralized seed multiplication.
- Scaling strategies and evidence base analysis

Some assumptions:

- Informality in the seed system.
- Is there a need for more economic analysis?
- Does the introduction of quality seed lead to a real investment for those very poor?

**Group 4: Julius**

**Assignment:** Development outcomes

1. Private sector (eg Kisima farm) is using 3G technology and profitability providing quality seed, hence increasing employment opportunity.
2. Farmers are increasingly using quality seed potato from 3G system to increase production and incomes
3. Farmers are maintaining seed quality on-farm through positive selection and small seed-plot Technique.

**RTB IDO contributing to:** IDO1: Improved productivity of potato among small farm households

**Annex 3.3. Developing the future of the impact pathway/visions**

**Potato group:** Veronique

Q: What are the benefits end users are enjoying as a result of project?

A: Increased income thanks to an integrated approach to better quality seed. The project offer choices to farmers in order to get access to better seed, via different methods. They can get them on farm, via informal sector (eg neighbors). As a result the yields increase, the price of quality seed potato is reduced, which allows for better income and also food security, improves as farmers can save some potatoes for home consumption.
Q: Are some user groups benefitting more or less than others?
A: Our approach is inclusive of men and women. By offering more choices to access quality seed potato, we are giving decentralized seed multipliers – many of whom are women – business opportunities. The choices are actually catering for specific needs. So we started from an unequal situation for men and women, to a situation where the available options can benefit both genders.

Q: What are the next users doing differently now?
A: Actually our team is doing things differently as we were influenced by our partners, including by NGOs who provided guidance based on their experience with gender issues.

Also, the NARS and the private sectors are working differently as they have adopted novel technologies.

And most important, our partners have implemented a feedback loop, by which they give feedback and information back to end users after working with them. Information sharing goes both ways and is making a difference in the way they engage with end users.

Q: Did some of the groups have better access to your outputs than others? Why?
A: As is typically the case, farmers who already have resources have better access to quality seed, because they can buy seed in big quantity, transportation is not an issue for them, etc.

Q: How are the products disseminating? Scaling out?

We knew that access to quality seed potato would be more challenging for poor farmers, so we chose strategies to reach out to the poorest farmers and promote that access. Not only did we do demonstrations tailored to them, but we also made sure they could afford the seed potato by purchasing them in smaller packaging, that they could save seeds on farm, that they had decentralized seed access when transportation may be an issue for them.

We knew the RTB Research Program was targeting the poor farmers so we ensure our strategies were not leaving them aside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BXW group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem statement:</strong> banana as a critical crop for both food security and income generation; BXW compromises productivity and forces farmers out of banana production, with negative social (food insecurity; lack of income) and environmental (soil degradation) effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End users:</strong> out of a total of 15-20 million people in the region, mainly members of smallholder farming households, but also other actors along the value chain (transporters, processors, traders), we aim at reaching to at least 50% (7.5-10 million people).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Which benefits do end users have (in 2024) from BXW research and resulting development interventions?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased banana income, reinvested in food purchases, children's education, and housing. In general, higher resilience of production and livelihood systems, with smoother income flows and higher response capacity (e.g., brewing beer in case of cash needs, selling banana bunches in case of health emergencies). Urban banana consumers continue to have access to an affordable, preferred and starch-rich food crop. Less soil erosion due to perennial cropping (as opposed to annual crops that tend to replace banana in case of high BXW infestation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phased approach: 1) restoration of former production levels; 2) increasing productivity beyond former levels.

2) *Are there differences among end users in terms of benefits perceived?*

Our gender- and age-sensitive approach seeks to ensure equitable conditions to benefit from BXW management for women, youth and other vulnerable groups. After 10 years, we have advanced in several aspects, including gender and age equitable farmers' organization and collective marketing, but have not been able to completely close the gender and intergenerational gap. In general, better-off farmers have adopted BXW management practices more readily than resource-poor farmers. In banana value chains

3) *What are next users doing differently?*

GOs (plant protection, extension), NGOs and private companies (engaged in production of plant materials, trading and processing), when interacting with farmers, pay attention to differences across farmers in terms of gender- and generation-specific labor division, income generation and decision making (according to household typologies).

4) *Are there differences among next users in terms of access to outputs?*

Well-resourced next users have had higher capacity to access and use our outputs.

5) *How does dissemination work (scaling out)?*

Our multi-sectoral scaling approach accounts for the different roles of NARS, SROs, NGOs, GOs (protection agencies), private sector, and media along the impact pathway. We have been using regional networks (BARNESA) and other innovation platforms for scaling. Pooling and leveraging of human and financial resources is critical for this approach.

---

**RBM group: Oscar/Simon**

**RBM vision of success (Oscar)**

**Main elements directly attributable to RBM:**

- Change of thinking starting from the outcome side to guide investment.
- System that “harvest” outcome related information and makes it available to different audiences.
- More learning: better understanding of processes.
- More focused research towards impact.
- Better efficiency in investment decisions.
- More coherence of research agenda among CG, CRPs, Centers, and wider set of partners.
- More stakeholder participation to influence processes towards outcomes, particularly farmer involvement and influence.
- Improved management decisions at all levels, not only at the top.
- Better accountability, transparency leading to increase credibility of investors and stakeholders.

**Elements indirectly linked to RBM:**

- Fully functioning system with result-based accounting and good reports provided for management decisions.
- More impact of our programs.
- Greater innovation, empowerment of stakeholders for selecting and scaling-up success interventions.
• CG and coalition of partners more able to influence policy making and other changes towards impact.
• Increased and more stable funding, wider set of investors attracted, research facilities renewed.
• Research agenda strengthened widening it from technical orientation to institutional change.
• More inclusion of disadvantaged population needs in decision-making process.

Elements of the RBM vision (Simon)

• It makes sense to develop a Theory of Change and Impact Pathway for RBM itself (in support of the TOC’s of the RTB flagships).
• The RBM pilots should be used to develop and implement this RBM TOC. At the end of the 2 year period, we can then learn about implementing and customizing RBM for RTB flagships.

Possible products of the RBM daisy:

1. Adapted guidelines for implementing RBM at CRP and country level
   • Adapted RBM tools and methods
2. Complete map of products and outcomes
   • Set of TOC’s
   • Methodologies for contextualization
3. Learning framework
   • Protocols for learning
   • Communication
   • Adaptive management tools
4. Performance management system
   • Target setting (activity, outputs, research outcomes)
   • Quality control of implementation
   • Incentives
   • Performance assessment tools (“traffic light” system)
5. M&E system
   • Metrics for products and outcomes
   • Methods and tools for data management (incl. linked databases)
   • Methodology for verification and quality control (output and research outcome level)

Annex 3.4. The “start” of the impact pathway – activities/products

Potato group: Dieudonne

Next users and corresponding IDOs for the Potato Flagship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Proposed formulation</th>
<th>Next users</th>
<th>IDOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client-oriented approaches to rapidly access quality seed</td>
<td>Client-oriented package to rapidly access quality seed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Robust market-demanded varieties</td>
<td>Robust market-demanded</td>
<td>• NARS</td>
<td>1, 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Proposed formulation</td>
<td>Next users</td>
<td>IDOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seed technologies and business models (3G)</td>
<td>Seed technologies and business models (3G)</td>
<td>Farmers, NGOs</td>
<td>1, 2 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On-farm seed quality and ICM technologies</td>
<td>On-farm seed quality and ICM technologies</td>
<td>Extension officers, NGOs</td>
<td>1, 2 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Locally adapted protocols for seed quality control</td>
<td>Locally adapted protocols for seed quality control</td>
<td>Plant Health Authorities, Seed producers</td>
<td>1 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Options for demand creation with seed and ware potato</td>
<td>Awareness campaigns for increased demand with seed and ware potato</td>
<td>Extension workers, Donors, NGOs</td>
<td>4, 2 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scaling strategies and evidence base</td>
<td>Scaling strategies and evidence base</td>
<td>NGOs, Ministries of Agriculture, Private sector</td>
<td>5 and 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BXW group**

**Flagship: Gender-specific integrated management of BXW disease**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linked Products</th>
<th>Next users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Resistant and wilt escaping varieties             | Government extension and plant protection organizations(PPOs) National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS)  
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)- local and international Private sector – Nurseries- in NARS, SMEs, individuals  
- TC labs  
- Value chain actors  
Farmer Organizations |
| 2. Cultural control packages                         | Government extension and PPOs National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS)  
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)- local and international Farmer Organizations  
Value chain actors |
| 3. Tools and approaches for cost-effective production of CPMs | Government extension and PPOs National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS)  
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)- local and international Farmer Organizations (Private sector??) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linked Products</th>
<th>Next users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)- local and international</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Diagnostic tools for disease detection and surveillance</td>
<td>Government extension and PPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)- local and international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RBM group**

Identifying next users and outcomes from these products: Example of “Learning Framework”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next users</th>
<th>Change in practice</th>
<th>Change in KAS</th>
<th>Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRP and center managers</td>
<td>Implement management decisions that are more responsive to monitoring results and lessons learnt</td>
<td>K: Up-to-date monitoring results, linked into management decisions; lessons from joint learning</td>
<td>Learning framework that includes protocol for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: People value critical reflection; commitment to collaborative learning; acceptance of possible change in roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilitators</td>
<td>Partners align their management decisions to joint learning</td>
<td>S: to objectively facilitate the learning of lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagship coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3.5. Research outcome statements – Identifying next user groups, knowledge, attitude, skills and practice change

**BXW group:** Eldad

**Research Output:** Resistant and wilt escaping germplasm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next user groups</th>
<th>Practice/behavior change</th>
<th>Research Outcome</th>
<th>KAS changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda NARS (NARO-Uganda)</td>
<td>Disseminate the new germplasm in integrated way: 1. via nurseries and mother gardens 2. Partnering with NAADS 3. Mount promotional campaigns to all agro-ecologies to ensure nations coverage of access to new germplasm</td>
<td>Practice/behavior change</td>
<td>KAS changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Biosafety issues internalized and institutionalized in NARO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patterns of consumer preferences and demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traits, attributes of improved germplasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Positive mindset towards GMOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Social skills and PR management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIOBASS (south Kivu)</td>
<td>Integrate the new germplasm into their extension approach: 1. Include market analysis for the new germplasm 2. Facilitate establishment of CPM multiplication and nurseries 3. Lobby local govs for use of GMO 4. Accelerate sensitization to more FOs</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Traits and attribution of the new germplasm; its role in the overall extension approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patterns of consumer preferences and demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Positive mindset towards GMOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>PR management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytolab TC (Burundi)</td>
<td>Increase investment for the production of new germplasm</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Biosafety issues internalized and institutionalized Patterns of consumer preferences and demand Traits and attributes of the new/improved germplasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traits and attributes of improved germplasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Positive mindset towards GMOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>PR management skills for GMO; GMO-appropriate standard operating procedures for the lab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3.6. Strategies for achieving outcomes

**Potato group:** Thomas O.

- Strategy: in order to include resource poor and female farmers, the small seed plot strategy is included in the work package. This means that these farmers can rapidly increase their supply of seed by growing small levels of seed in disease-free plots, as identified by extension workers or experts. Then this plot is plant with a high seed density. This allows these resource poor farmers to rapidly increase their quantity of quality seed.

- Experience has seen that working with extension services can be extremely difficult, and challenges opportunity for scaling up impact amongst communities aiming to work as seed or ware potato farmers. By working through lead farmers as ‘extension multiplier’, essentially multiplying the impact which extension services can have in a region through identifying and supporting lead farmers to spread best practice amongst their community. By working in a participatory manner, such as identifying female lead farmers, this will further strengthen the scaling up of the intervention.

- Yet another strategy for improving the reach and scale of the intervention is that of joint planning of activities, budgeting and human resource allocation of the intervention. Often, CIP or other CG agencies are called in as substitutes when partners fail to deliver on their contracted services. This is manageable in short-term bursts, but for future planning is not a sustainable practice. This has financial implications and issues of sustainability and structure. By working with partners to have common planning with grassroots and implementing agencies, this issue can be dealt with. This is a long-term strategy; an example of this is the Irish Potato Coalition. The scale achievable benefits all players. Through this CIP and other CG agencies to complement the strengths and weaknesses of other partners.

- The final strategy which the potato working group identified is a set of guidelines of dealing with big agri-business, or general engagement with the private sector. Strategy is required to deal with this engagement and developing guidelines or principles and policy for engaging with the private sector are required. These principles should provide guidance to CIP (or other CG agencies) in engaging with the private sector, which can then be handled on a case-by-case basis. This could also be developed as a list of “Do’s” and “Don’ts”. Politically, it is difficult to support a multinational when our money, and that of our partners, comes either from taxpayer’s or donor’s money. However, to exclude engagement with this level of the private sector is not possible. However, by creating a set of guidelines, we (CIP, CG agencies and partners) can avoid negative media or press coverage of engaging with the private sector. Our money, and that of our partners, comes either from taxpayer’s or donor’s money. However, to exclude engagement with this level of the private sector is not possible. However, by creating a set of guidelines, we (CIP, CG agencies and partners) can avoid negative media or press coverage of engaging with the private sector.

**BXW group:** Emmanuel

**Strategies (partnerships and funding) for achieving changes in KAS**

Advocacy (evidence-based)

Key documentations

- Guidelines
- Manuals (language adjusted to audience)
Platforms

- Sub-national (Kivus)
- National (Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda (BXW specific > establish links to Humidtropics (R4D platforms, Crops including RTB, IP RTB diseases).

Capacity building

- Trainings Handling of Public Relations around GMOs and Pool of trainings
- Sensitization workshop - Biosafety (including training needs assessment)
- Biosafety trainings (skills development);
- In-house capacity where existing and available
- Partners in BXW partners and other partners
- Consultants (sub-contracted)

RBM group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmers Breeders, NARS and private sector actors breed, release and promote varieties using gender sensitive participatory approaches</td>
<td>Number of varieties released</td>
<td>Varieties of CIP Origin/ART/ LR Country of release Year of release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Institutions promoting varieties</td>
<td>Formal and informal institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of promotional activities per institutions</td>
<td>By type of institution NGO etc Promotional activities; Radio program, field days, demonstration plots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seed Multipliers especially Decentralized Multipliers (Women and men) selling affordable locally available quality seed</td>
<td>Number of Decentralized Multipliers</td>
<td>Disaggregated by gender Location Average distance to Decentralized DVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity of seed sold by DVMs</td>
<td>Quantity in tons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annex 3.7. Discussing Impact Pathway Indicators - M&E plan**

### Annual planning (including participatory process with stakeholders)
- Bring useful information about progress towards RO, FLDO, IDO
- Feedback loops to output development

### Annual budgeting and resources allocation
- Resource reallocation across activity
- Improve resource allocation
- A module, eventually connected to OCS that allows/ensures quick evaluation/ contribution of components (eg bilateral projects) to a given CRP/Flagship or Center Strategic objective

### Critical reflection session and stakeholders engagement
- Setup critical reflection sessions to use M&E findings to improve program/project implementation practices and results achievement
- Monitoring process with partners
- Show points of engagements with stakeholders/partners

### Review and evaluation
- Mid-term project review
- Project evaluation report
- Mid-term reviews

### Learning
- Fora for joint learning at different levels: Program, Center, Platform (learning alliances, communities of practices, innovation platforms)

### Performance assessment
- Evaluation of research investment in different regions/countries/crop and evaluation of corresponding results
- Individual performance assessment
- Performance agreements and appraisals at the individual level
- Decisions about incentives for well performing (outcomes) flagship teams
- Performance evaluation (staff and teams)
- Performance appraisals for scientists and managers and provide incentives such as bonuses
- A module that allows/ensures linkage with work plans

### Reporting
- Mid-year and annual reporting to donors of existing projects
- Annual reporting (to Consortium)
- FLDO reported annually to donors
- Quarterly report on outputs in relation with appropriate financial expenditure information. Reports addressed to project managers and board subcommittee.
- Technical reporting at the research outcomes level.
- Review meetings with stakeholders
**Development of communication materials**

Better coverage and highlighting of activities/results on RTB/CIP communication outlets (website, social media, stakeholders’ annual report)

**Decision making for extension or new project proposal development**

- Designing new projects within a flagship
- Designing new projects for fundraising
- Developing extension proposals

---

**Annex 3.8. Peer review presentation on quality seed potato**

**Group 1: Julius**

**Great things:**

- Language was appropriate for the expected stakeholder mix (simple, no tech jargons)
- Development challenges clearly articulated
- Presence of potato coalition likely to signal on-going initiative to those likely to doubt
- Incorporating success stories signals that “the thing works”
- Presentation made a compelling case for investment

**Things that could be improved:**

- Highlight some of the key pictures I the presentation to “drive home” the case of point
- Strive to pre-emptively answer the question “what is there for me” that may be in the minds of some key stakeholders
- Keep the presentation shorter – try to cover in less time.

**Group 2: Oriana**

**Great things:**

- Technical details and concepts well explained
- Objectives very clear. Very understandable what they want
- Involved many actors along the line
- Indicators of success stories

**Things that could be improved:**

- More contextualization on real impact on communities and poor farmers. For example, try to measure the increase of income compared with today’s income, changes or improvements on livelihoods, were they able to send their children to school?, etc.
- More explanations on Crop Production System – how it will be implemented and how the project would deal with consequences
- Institutional changes, challenges that farmers have to implement and face.
**Group 3: Elmar**

**Great things:**
- Very strong technical approach
- Private sector involvement
- Clearly demonstration of the value of partnership
- Engagement of farmers
- Some very nice visuals

**Things that could be improved:**
- Gender aspects have to come out clearer
- Link between the approach and IPC not clear
- Reduce the technical part
- Use more evidence based data, no. of farmers benefitted yield increases, trade-offs etc.
- Name and describe countries and agro-ecologies better
- Example of the farmer Nathan might be misleading
- Business model is not clear enough
- Stakeholder map missing
- Partnership strategy should be highlighted more and come earlier in the presentation
- Mention awareness creation strategy
- Add the end a summary would be very useful

**Annex 3.9. Moving ahead with RBM**

**BXW group: Emmanuel**

*Starting from the points mentioned by Graham for “Next steps” – combined with the “objectives” of the stakeholder workshop the table was designed.*

*As BXW to hold stakeholder workshop in September, chance taken, that team is together to reflect about preparation of the workshop – and not focus on next steps.*

**BXW pilot: pre-stakeholder workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Pre-stakeholder workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improved impact pathway (IP)</td>
<td>2-pager on flagship; 2-pager on linked products; Review gender dimension; Relevant countries: DRC, Uganda, Burundi, Rwanda, Kenya, Tanzania, Lab work (Leena)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partnership engagement</td>
<td>BARNESA keep in the loop; Define links with Humidtropics; Engage with invited stakeholders by sharing information on: - impact pathways, - BXW flagship (2-pager), - linked products (2-pager).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SN | Tasks | Pre-stakeholder workshop
--- | --- | ---
3 | Track progress along IP | Not relevant
4 | Joint M&E/shared Metrics | Request information on current M&E related to BXW from invited stakeholders.
5 | Learning strategy | Point out joint learning as principal element of the collaborative process when inviting stakeholders.

**Additional tasks**
- Save the date message
- Finalize list of participants
- Logistics
- Invitation (major sale points, tentative agenda)
- Budget administration

**RBM group:** Simon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>What is involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish RBM process team for follow-up and building RBM ownership in RTB</td>
<td>Graham, Oscar, RTB focal points, Dagmar, others...</td>
<td>June/July 2014</td>
<td>Check people’s availability (time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building ownership, anchoring RBM in CRPs and centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>What is involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtain center buy-in (DDG-R level); make use RTB Annual Meeting</td>
<td>RBM process group</td>
<td>29 Sept – 3 Oct</td>
<td>Session on RBM: how RBM will benefit RTB centers (present and explain road map for piloting phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP business plans to articulate RBM at flagship level</td>
<td>Flagship coordinators, Graham, Oscar</td>
<td>June - Sept</td>
<td>First 3-year rolling business plans to be approved by BOT in Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting RBM roll-out to CIP BOT</td>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
<td>Write-up and presentation of RBM roll-out plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting and guiding RBM piloting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>What is involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop roadmap for rolling out RBM through pilots</td>
<td>RBM process team working with pilot teams (potato, banana)</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Develop overall roadmap and specific Implementation Plans for each pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop specific methodologies and tools for piloting (elements we want to pilot; methodologies for piloting)</td>
<td>RBM process team working with pilot teams (potato, bananas); engage external consultants;</td>
<td>Outlines by December 2014 Validated through RBM pilots by June 2016</td>
<td>Scan for examples, manuals, guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>