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Introduction

- This report details the results of the 2006 Stakeholder Perceptions reputation research conducted by GlobeScan Incorporated, on behalf of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).
- The CGIAR is committed to measuring the impact of its activities, and has implemented a comprehensive performance measurement system. An important element of this measurement system is the assessment of stakeholder perceptions of both the CGIAR and its 15 research Centers.

- As such, the CGIAR commissioned GlobeScan to study the perceptions of its key stakeholder groups with the purpose of:
  - Providing information that is useful and relevant to both the CGIAR and each of the 15 Centers
  - Providing input to the CGIAR’s performance measurement process
  - Guiding the development and refinement of stakeholder communication programs
Introduction

- To help guide the research, GlobeScan conducted preparatory in-depth interviews with six key stakeholders of the CGIAR including the CGIAR Director, two Member representatives, two Center Directors, and one Partner. The results served as input into questionnaire development.

- This report contains results pertaining to the CGIAR as a whole and describes in detail the organization’s performance on specific attributes and ten reputation drivers. It also describes the channels of influence on the reputation of the CGIAR.

- A separate report has been prepared presenting Center-specific results. It describes Center performance on 24 specific attributes, and identifies how stakeholders view the performance of specific Centers on eight composite reputation drivers.

Notes to Readers

- All figures in the charts and tables of this report are expressed in percentages unless otherwise noted. Total percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Summary of Methodology

- Random samples of 60 stakeholders for each of the 15 Centers, stratified by Partner Type, were selected by GlobeScan to participate in the survey. In addition, approximately 10 to 20 of each Centers’ self-described most important partners (MSPs) were added to the random samples. Contact information for these Partners and each Center’s MSPs was sent to GlobeScan by the Centers. The CGIAR provided GlobeScan with contact information for all of its Members.

- An additional 94 respondents, representing all Members of the CGIAR, were contacted with a request to complete the survey. Survey completions from CGIAR Member representatives constitute approximately 75 percent of the CGIAR’s 2005 donor funding.

- In total, 1175 Partners and 94 Member representatives were contacted to participate in the online Stakeholder Perception Survey beginning June 6, 2006. Respondents had the option to complete the survey in English, French, or Spanish.

- Of the 1269 stakeholders that were contacted, 348 completed the survey by closing date of July 16, 2006, resulting in a 27 percent overall response rate. However, 23 percent of the e-mail addresses were unreachable, making the response rate of reachable stakeholders 37 percent.

- Please see slide 60 of this report for a detailed description of the stakeholders surveyed, and slide 68 for a thorough explanation of the sampling approach and methodology.
Key Findings and Implications
Key Findings and Implications

- The CGIAR overall has a generally positive reputation among stakeholders. More Members and Partners agree that the CGIAR “does an excellent job advancing sustainable agricultural development through research” than disagree. In many cases, however, the data indicate that stakeholders have reservations.

- Overall, the CGIAR is viewed positively for its core function: conducting high quality research.

- Respondents are somewhat critical of the CGIAR and its Centers with regard to how it executes its core function. Concerns center around transparency, partnership and efficiency.

- Conducting quality research is by far the most important driver of CGIAR’s overall reputation.

- When the analysis is altered to examine what determines the perception that the CGIAR helps Partners achieve their own objectives—a measure of how the CGIAR is valued among partners—transparency and consideration of partners emerge as among the most important drivers of the perceived value of the CGIAR among Partners.
Key Findings and Implications

- Concerns about transparency are nuanced. Stakeholders tend to believe that the CGIAR “makes complete and accurate information available” about internal decision-making processes, but few think that these processes are “fair and well understood.” The implication is that more effort is required to help stakeholders digest and understand the information that is provided to them.

- Since partnership and collaboration are fundamental to the structure of the CGIAR network and the way it conducts business, strategic attention is required for these elements. Further, given the increasing importance of transparency in stakeholder relations in all sectors, and the ongoing need to demonstrate value for investment, CGIAR has opportunities to improve its overall reputation among stakeholders.

- Taking no action to improve stakeholder perceptions with regard to partnership, transparency and efficiency may pose risks to the organization’s image in the future.
Key Findings and Implications

• Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are among the most critical of CGIAR’s stakeholders. These groups are also most influential with regard to CGIAR’s overall reputation, including with Members of the CGIAR.

• To address the importance of CSOs to CGIAR’s reputation, a communication strategy should be developed specifically for this challenging group, demonstrating how the CGIAR makes decisions and sets priorities.

• The research suggests that the views of critical CSOs can be influenced through other CSOs that may be more friendly to CGIAR messaging, through universities, and through multilateral organizations. CSOs, however, have more influence on these groups than they do on CSOs. Nonetheless, these groups communicate extensively such that the channels are already established.

• The CGIAR also appears to have a softer than average reputation among Partners working in universities. Understanding how the CGIAR works should be improved through communications with universities, although this group is less influential than others.

• Advanced research institutes, which will likely be easier for the CGIAR to reach given the shared function with the CGIAR, are also critical of the CGIAR. These organizations can be best reached through national research institutes, and CSOs.

• In sum, improving CGIAR’s reputation among CSOs should have a multiplier effect on the views of other stakeholders.
Key Findings and Implications

• Partners value and benefit from the collaboration with the CGIAR and the network it connects them with. At the same time, related attributes like the coordination of activities across different Centers and the quality of partnership are seen as weaknesses of the CGIAR. Other concerns included excessive bureaucracy, the lack of funding, and relevance.

• The CGIAR is most respected for global excellence in research. This is borne out by drivers analysis which shows below that the CGIAR’s “effective research for achieving food security and poverty reduction most drives” the CGIAR’s reputation for excellence.

• Members of the CGIAR and Partners have somewhat differing opinions of the CGIAR. Members are more positive about the CGIAR’s work than Partners, and are almost twice as likely as Partners to think that the performance of the CGIAR has improved over the past five years.

• A gap exists between where stakeholders believe the work of the CGIAR is currently focused on the research-development continuum and where it should be focused. Stakeholders would like the CGIAR to invest more effort into the development and implementation of products derived from the research. The Gap is more pronounced among stakeholders in Asia Pacific, CWANA and Sub-Saharan Africa, suggestive of some underlying tension among stakeholders’ expectations of the CGIAR.
Perceived Performance of the CGIAR
**Perceived Performance of the CGIAR**

- A majority of stakeholders (54%) agree (i.e., 5, 6, or 7 on a 7-point scale) that the CGIAR does an excellent job advancing sustainable agriculture through research. Only 12 percent disagree with the statement, while 20 percent neither agree nor disagree.

- Members are more likely than Partners to think that the CGIAR does an excellent job (61% “agree” vs 52% “agree”, respectively).

- When asked to what extent the CGIAR’s performance has improved over the past five years, one-third (32%) think it has improved. A further three in ten (28%) do not think performance has changed, and two in ten (18%) think the CGIAR’s performance has declined since 2001.

- Members are more likely than Partners to have seen an improvement in performance over the past five years (50% vs 29%, respectively), however both groups equally think performance of the CGIAR has not changed (31% vs 28%, respectively).
The CGIAR Does an Excellent Job Advancing Sustainable Agriculture through Research

2006

The white space in this chart represents “DK/NA.”
Perceived Performance of the CGIAR Over the Past Five Years

2006

- Improved (5+6+7)
- Performance has not changed (4)
- Declined (1+2+3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Performance has not changed</th>
<th>Declined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The white space in this chart represents “DK/NA.”
Relative Importance of the Drivers of the CGIAR’s Reputation

• The relative importance of the ten drivers of reputation is derived through regression analysis and uses the dependent variable of the extent to which stakeholders agree or disagree that “the CGIAR does an excellent job advancing sustainable agricultural development through research.”

• Drivers that receive above average ratings stand to have a greater impact on reputation than those drivers at the bottom. However, drivers that are rated below average in terms of importance, are not unimportant, but less important to the CGIAR’s reputation.

• The drivers that are the most important to the CGIAR’s stakeholders are ones that relate to the organization’s purpose and client service: efficacy of research, responsiveness to stakeholder needs, efficiency, and serving regional and global needs. The importance of these service-related attributes reflects where stakeholders would like to see the CGIAR’s focus to be in the future—moving toward development assistance and less on basic research.

• Less important drivers of the CGIAR’s reputation include those drivers that describe how the organization operates. Demonstrating accountability, considering stakeholders’ needs in decision making, and being transparent are areas that have less of an impact on the CGIAR’s reputation. These remain important considerations for the CGIAR because stakeholders believe that the organization performs relatively poorly on these attributes.
Drivers of the CGIAR’s Reputation

• Results of the driver analysis are illustrated on a two-dimensional grid, where the horizontal axis represents mean frequency scores for CGIAR’s performance on the specific attributes. The vertical axis, labeled Derived Importance, uses regression values. The grid is divided into four quadrants, based on the mean score of all attributes on each dimension.

• **Key Strengths:** Drivers in this quadrant are important reputation drivers of the CGIAR and areas where the CGIAR is seen as performing well. Also spontaneously mentioned as greatest strengths, stakeholders rate the CGIAR as performing particularly well on producing effective scientific research that has a purpose, and serving global needs. Being responsive to the needs of stakeholders and serving local needs are also key strengths of the CGIAR.

• **Focus:** Operating efficiently is among the drivers that are most important to the CGIAR’s reputation. However, stakeholders give the organization below average performance ratings for this. When asked what the CGIAR’s weaknesses are and areas where the CGIAR can improve, coordinating activities and collaborations, funding, and organizing and prioritizing research are commonly mentioned by stakeholders. Future strategies should address the gaps in perceived efficiency in order to prevent any reputation shortcomings in the future.
Drivers of the CGIAR’s Reputation

- **Opportunities:** Drivers in this quadrant are areas that are less important to stakeholders’ views of the CGIAR’s reputation, and areas for which the CGIAR receives below average performance ratings. Decision making, considering stakeholders’ needs, and ensuring the process is fair and clear are areas where the CGIAR currently has opportunities to improve performance before they have a greater impact on overall reputation.

- **Maintain:** The CGIAR is viewed as performing well on making information available about internal processes and being accountable for all actions and decisions. However, these are not as important as other drivers in overall reputation. By maintaining performance in these areas, the CGIAR will be well positioned as transparency and accountability increase in importance among stakeholders.
Quadrant Analysis: Importance of the Reputation Drivers vs the CGIAR’s Performance

Focus
Drivers in this quadrant are important reputation drivers but on which stakeholders give the CGIAR below average performance ratings. Any reputation strategy must address the drivers situated in this quadrant.

Drivers in this quadrant are important reputation drivers and the CGIAR is rated relatively well on them compared to other drivers. It is on these drivers that the CGIAR can best leverage its current performance.

Key Strengths
Drivers in this quadrant are important reputation drivers but on which the CGIAR gets above average performance ratings. While these drivers may not presently have much of an impact on reputation, they can serve as positioning differentiators and may potentially grow.

At this point in time, drivers in this quadrant are neither deemed important nor given strong performance ratings. It is important not to ignore these drivers, however, as any rise in importance could quickly shift the issues into the Focus quadrant. Appropriate strategies will need to be developed to manage and/or monitor these issues.

Opportunities
Drivers in this quadrant are relatively less important than other drivers, but on which the CGIAR gets above average performance ratings. While these drivers may not presently have much of an impact on reputation, they can serve as positioning differentiators and may potentially grow.

Maintain
Drivers of the CGIAR’s Reputation for Advancing Sustainable Agriculture

2006

[Diagram showing a matrix with axes labeled 'Focus' and 'Derived Importance' on the vertical axis and 'Key Strengths' on the horizontal axis. The key strengths include 'Efficacy of research', 'Responsiveness', 'Serving regional needs', 'Serving global needs', 'Accountability', 'Maintaining'. The matrix also shows points for 'Serving local needs', 'Fair and clear decision-making', 'Consideration of stakeholder needs', and 'Transparency' within the matrix.]
Relative Importance of Drivers of CGIAR’s Reputation in Helping Stakeholders Achieve Objectives

- To examine CGIAR’s reputation from a client-centric perspective, GlobeScan also analyzed the drivers of the extent to which stakeholders think that “the CGIAR assists your organization achieve its objectives.”

- The CGIAR’s overall reputation and reputation for helping respondents achieve their objectives are viewed quite differently by stakeholders. Whereas overall reputation is driven by research, the CGIAR’s reputation in helping stakeholders is driven more by accountability and transparency of activities, budgets, internal processes and objectives. Meaningful research and responding to needs also remain important, however.

- Less important drivers of the CGIAR’s reputation for helping stakeholders’ organizations are attributes such as fair and clear decision-making, considering stakeholders’ views, operating efficiently, and serving global and local needs.
Drivers of the CGIAR’s Reputation in Helping Organizations Achieve Objectives

- **Key Strengths**: Drivers in this quadrant are important reputation drivers and areas where the CGIAR is seen as performing well. Making information available on its internal processes, budgets, activities, responding to the needs of Partners and clients, effectively produces purposeful research, demonstrates accountability for its actions, and serving regional needs are areas where the CGIAR excels at helping stakeholders achieve their objectives.

- **Focus**: The CGIAR is not seen as performing below average on any attribute that is among the most important drivers of stakeholder perceptions.

- **Opportunities**: The CGIAR has opportunities to improve performance on operating efficiently, fair and clear decision-making, and serving local needs. Performance in these areas plays less of a role in the CGIAR’s reputation. However, improving performance will only enhance the organization’s reputation in the future if these drivers increase in importance.

- **Maintain**: Serving global needs is an area where the CGIAR is performing very well. However, this has the least influence on how stakeholders view the CGIAR in helping them achieve their own organizations’ objectives.
Drivers of the CGIAR’s Reputation in Helping Organizations Achieve Objectives

2006

- Focus
  - Serving local needs
  - Fair and clear decision-making
  - Efficiency
- Key Strengths
  - Transparency
  - Responsiveness
  - Accountability
  - Efficacy of research
  - Serving regional needs
  - Consideration of stakeholder needs
  - Serving global needs

-derived importance

-performance
The Research-Development Continuum
The Research-Development Continuum

• Stakeholders were asked to indicate on a scale of one to seven, where one represents “basic research” and seven represents the provision of support to end-users “development assistance”, where they think the CGIAR’s current focus is located on the Research-Development Continuum.

• On average, stakeholders perceive that the CGIAR’s current focus is in the middle of the continuum (3.97), suggesting an equal split between basic research and development assistance.

• When asked where the CGIAR’s focus should be, on average, stakeholders tend more toward the development end of the scale (4.56).

• Partners are more inclined than Members to prefer that the CGIAR’s focus be closer to the development assistance end of the Continuum.
The Research-Development Continuum

Perceived Focus vs Preferred Focus, 2006

Perceived current focus of the CGIAR

Basic research (1)

2 3 4

Development assistance to end-user (7)

Preferred focus of the CGIAR

Average of all respondents

Average of Members

Average of Partners
The Channels of Influence
Influence Mapping: Objectives

- Influence Maps are used to understand the relationships between the various stakeholders, in terms of the similarity or dissimilarity of their views of CGIAR and their level of influence on one another.

- By finding out “who is talking to whom,” we can identify:
  - The ongoing stakeholder dialogues in which the CGIAR should aim to engage
  - The “easier-to-reach” stakeholder groups that may provide useful channels for communication with “harder-to-reach” groups
Influence Mapping: Method

- Influence mapping is an analytical technique that combines results of questions related to influential sources of information about the CGIAR, respondents’ influence objectives, and communication between groups of respondents. It provides a visual summary of the main relationships between key stakeholder groups.

- The first step of the mapping is the positioning of the stakeholder groups based on their ratings of the CGIAR’s performance on the specific attributes measured. A second dimension—the extent to which multilateral organizations are perceived to influence the reputation of the CGIAR—was also found to spatially differentiate respondents. The proximity of stakeholder groups reflects the similarity of their views.

- Generally, groups of respondents on the right-hand side of the map have more positive views of the CGIAR than those on the left. Groups toward the top of the page think that multilateral organizations are more influential than those on the bottom.

NOTE: the model is qualitative and reflective of views of the surveyed sample. Data should be treated as indicative rather than definitive.
How to Read the Influence Map

- **Map background and positioning of the “bubbles”:** Stakeholder groups (aka “bubbles”) are positioned on the map according to their views of CGIAR’s performance on a number of specific attributes and the perceived level of influence that multilateral organizations have on the reputation of the CGIAR. Distances between groups on the map reflect the similarity/dissimilarity of their views.

- **Bubble size:** The sizes of the stakeholder groups on the map are determined by the *total* frequency with which they are mentioned as influencing stakeholder perceptions of the CGIAR.

- **Bubble shade:** The shading of the stakeholder groups represents the frequency with which each group mentions *itself* as an influencer of stakeholder views of the CGIAR - in other words, how strongly a stakeholder group is influenced by itself, or “endemic influence”.
How to Read the Influence Map, Cont’d.

• Arrow direction and color:
  – The arrows on the map represent two-way interactions between surveyed stakeholder groups. The direction of the arrows indicate the main flow of influence between the groups (the net direction of influence) – in other words, which of the two groups influences the other more.
  – The shading of the arrows represents the strength of the net influence (i.e., how strongly one group influences another). A darker shade means that there is a strong imbalance: the flow of influence is very strongly in one direction rather than the other. A lighter shade shows that interactions are more bidirectional.

• Arrow width: The width of the arrow represents the volume of communication between groups – in other words, how much interaction there is between the groups. A thick arrow means there is a lot of interaction.
The Channels of Influence on the Reputation of the CGIAR

Circle size
indicates overall influence based on all mentions
A lot of influence
Not much influence
Gradation indicates amount of endemic influence

Arrow Color
indicates strength of influence
Strong
Weak

Direction
indicates direction of influence between groups

Width of line indicates overall volume of communication
not much communication
a lot of communication
The Channels of Influence: Overall Findings

- Civil society organizations (CSOs) are a crucial audience for the CGIAR. They have the greatest influence on CGIAR’s reputation, and are more critical of the CGIAR’s performance. They are also less likely than others to be influenced by other groups. Improving the reputation of the CGIAR among CSOs and providing them with reasons to communicate positively with other types of organizations about the CGIAR should induce a multiplier effect.

- Multilateral organizations and governments, which include CGIAR Members who participated in the survey, as well as regional organizations have more positive perceptions of the CGIAR’s performance, but as individual groups, they are less influential.

- Research organizations, including advanced research institutes (ARIs), universities and national research institutes each have average views of the CGIAR and are moderately influential with regard to its reputation.
Strategic Implications of the Influence Map

• Stakeholder groups are not only targets for CGIAR communications, but also potential channels through which the CGIAR may reach other stakeholder groups, including those with whom direct relationships are difficult to achieve. The views of one group may be affected by communicating with another group. Given that multilateral organizations (which may include the CGIAR itself) have less influence on the reputation of the CGIAR, it is important for the CGIAR to communicate with groups that do have an influence on others’ views.

• The stakeholder groups that may be used as channels to reach other stakeholder groups are summarized on the following slides.
### Strategic Implications of the Influence Map, Cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To influence…</th>
<th>Use…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Other friendly CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilateral organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional organizations</td>
<td>Other regional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National research institutes and ARIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilateral organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral organizations</td>
<td>National research institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Strategic Implications of the Influence Map, Cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To influence…</th>
<th>Use…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National research institutes</td>
<td>Other national research institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIs</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National research institutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communications
Stakeholders were asked to rate the CGIAR’s effectiveness in communicating its message to a variety of audiences. One-half of stakeholders each think the CGIAR communicates its message effectively to science professionals (50%), respondents’ own organization (49%), and development professionals (46%). One-third of stakeholders (36%) think that the CGIAR effectively communicates its message to policy makers.

Only one-quarter of stakeholders (23%) think that the CGIAR communicates its message effectively to the informed public. Four in ten (43%) think that the CGIAR is ineffective in its communication with this group.

Stakeholders were asked which specific sources they would most likely access if they needed accurate information on the CGIAR. Online sources such as Center-specific websites (60%) and the CGIAR’s website (57%) are, by far, the most preferred sources of information on the CGIAR and its activities.

When asked what organizations are the most influential in determining the CGIAR’s reputation, Stakeholders think that NARIs (33%) and multilateral organizations (25%) are the most influential. Specifically, the World Bank (21%) and the FAO (13%) are also viewed as influential by more stakeholders than any other organization.

When asked what type of organization they would contact for accurate information on the CGIAR, NARIs (25%), multilaterals (19%), the FAO (15%), national governments (13%), and universities in industrialized countries (12%) are the most mentioned sources.
The CGIAR’s Effectiveness in Communicating Its Message to Selected Groups

“Effective (4+5)” vs “Ineffective (1+2),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ineffective (1+2)</th>
<th>Effective (4+5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science professionals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s organization</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development professionals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed public</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preferred Sources for Information on the CGIAR and Its Activities

Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Websites of individual CGIAR Centers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR website</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reports from CGIAR Centers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific journals/publications</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR annual report</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CGIAR Centers’ publications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CGIAR publications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct/personal contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications from non-CGIAR research centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University websites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites of non-CGIAR research centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizations Most Influential in Determining the CGIAR’s Overall Reputation

Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006 – Part 1

- National
  - Nat’l agricultural research inst.: 33
  - Regional/sub-regional organization: 12
  - Other country gov’t: 11
  - National government: 10

- Multilateral
  - Multilaterals (total): 25
  - World Bank: 21
  - FAO: 13

- UARI
  - Universities in developing countries: 8
  - Advanced Research Inst. in industrialized countries: 7
  - International agricultural research centers: 7
  - Universities in industrialized countries: 7
  - Advanced Research Inst. in developing countries: 5
Organizations Most Influential in Determining the CGIAR’s Overall Reputation

Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006 – Part 2
Preferred Sources for Information or Advice on the CGIAR

Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006 – Part 1

- National
  - National agricultural research institute: 25
  - National government: 13
  - Regional/Sub-regional organization: 11
  - Other country government: 5

- Multilateral
  - Multilaterals (total): 19
    - FAO: 15
    - World Bank: 8

- UARI
  - Universities in industrialized countries: 12
  - International agricultural research centers: 9
  - Universities in developing countries: 8
  - Advanced Research Inst. in industrialized countries: 7
  - Advanced Research Inst. in developing countries: 6
Preferred Sources for Information or Advice on the CGIAR

Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006 – Part 2

- **Civil**
  - International NGOs: 8
  - NGOs in developing countries: 5
  - Farm organizations: 3
  - NGOs in industrialized countries: 2

- **Media**
  - Media (print): 1
  - Media (radio): 0
  - Media (TV): 0

- **Other**
  - Foundation: 7
  - Other: 3
  - Private sector: 3
The CGIAR’s Strengths and Weaknesses (Unprompted)
The CGIAR’s Strengths and Weaknesses

• Partners were asked to name the most important ways their organization benefits from its association with the CGIAR. Collaborative research projects (32%) is seen as the most important benefit, followed by the CGIAR’s network of partners (23%), access to new science and research (22%), access to and exchange of germplasm and genetic material (19%), and financial support and funding (17%).

• The top benefits also vary by Partner type – National/Regional and Other stakeholders think the most important benefit is access to germplasm, while Civil stakeholders appreciate the network of partners. UARIs benefit most from collaborative research projects.

• Stakeholders were asked what they see as the CGIAR’s greatest strengths. Being a leader in research (29%) and having a global reach and network (27%) are seen as the CGIAR’s top two strengths. Experience (17%), germplasm breeding (15%), and helping developing countries (12%) round out the top five.
The CGIAR’s Strengths and Weaknesses

- When asked what they saw as the CGIAR’s greatest weaknesses, one-quarter of stakeholders each think that the coordination of activities across Centers and external organizations (23%) and funding shortages (23%) are the CGIAR’s greatest weaknesses, followed by bureaucracy (14%) and a lack of focus on relevant issues and priorities (14%).

- When asked in what way the CGIAR needs to improve, collaboration with external organizations (16%) was named as the area in most need of improvement. Research collaboration and partnerships (10%) follows, along with organizing and addressing research priorities (9%), support (financial, logistical, technical) (8%), and management of the 15 Research Centers (7%).
How Respondent’s Organization Benefits from Partnership with the CGIAR

Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative research projects</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of partners</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to new science/research</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/exchange of germplasm/genetic material</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support/funding</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training courses/seminars</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps/sponsors students/grads</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to scientific equipment/material</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project coordination/consulting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise/experience</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/food/crop improvement programs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsample: Asked only to Partners (n=296)
### How Respondent’s Organization Benefits from Partnership with the CGIAR

**Top Five Reasons, by Partner Type, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/regional</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>UARI</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top reason</strong></td>
<td>Access/exchange of germplasm</td>
<td>Network of partners</td>
<td>Collaborative research projects</td>
<td>Access/exchange of germplasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second reason</strong></td>
<td>Collaborative research projects</td>
<td>Access to new science/research</td>
<td>Network of partners</td>
<td>Network of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third reason</strong></td>
<td>Financial support/funding</td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>Access to new science/research</td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth reason</strong></td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Financial support/funding</td>
<td>Helps/sponsors students and grads</td>
<td>Access to new science/research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth reason</strong></td>
<td>Training courses/seminars</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Financial support/funding / Training courses/seminars</td>
<td>Experience/expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsample: Asked only to Partners (n=296)
## The CGIAR’s Greatest Strengths

Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader in research</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global reach/network</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience/expertise</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germplasm breeding</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps developing countries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding/capacity building</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacts with local governments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent researchers/scientists</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes agriculture development/sustainability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The CGIAR’s Greatest Weaknesses

**Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of activities across Centers and external organizations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding shortage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of focus on relevant issues/priorities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition / duplication of research</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National problems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate technology transfer/implementation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts low quality research</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expenses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/regional issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Areas of Improvement for the CGIAR

Unprompted, Combined Mentions, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with external organizations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research collaboration/partnerships</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes-addresses research priorities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/logistical/technical support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Centers / governance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to needs of developing countries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/interaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more visible / increase activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal collaboration among Centers/donors/Science Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive/dynamic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stakeholder Perceptions 2006: Report on the CGIAR Overall
Perceived Performance of the CGIAR on Specific Attributes
Performance of the CGIAR on Specific Attributes

- Stakeholders were asked to rate the CGIAR’s performance on ten specific attributes relating to client service, transparency, operations, and serving geographic needs.

- Agreement that the CGIAR performs well on the attributes tested (i.e., 5, 6, or 7 on a 7-point scale) range from 26 percent for transparent internal decision-making processes, to 61 percent for effectively undertaking scientific research designed to achieve food security and reduce poverty.

- With the exception of serving local needs well (34%) and fair and transparent decision-making processes (26%), the CGIAR is seen as performing positively on all attributes by pluralities of at least four in ten stakeholders.
Performance of the CGIAR on Specific Attributes

- When the attributes are thematically combined, the CGIAR is rated the highest on the attributes relating to operations—effective undertaking of scientific research (61%) and operating efficiently (42%)—and lowest on those related to transparency—providing accurate information on internal processes (49%), demonstrating accountability for all actions and decisions (46%), and fair and understandable decision-making processes (26%).

- Members assign slightly higher performance ratings to the CGIAR than Partners do on most attributes, especially making complete and accurate information available on internal processes (59% vs 47%, respectively), taking the views of its Partners and clients into consideration in its decision making (54% vs 44%), being responsive to the needs of its Partners and clients (59% vs 51%), and fair and understandable decision-making processes (32% vs 24%).
The CGIAR’s Performance on Partnership Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is responsive to the needs of its partners and clients</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes the views of its partners and clients into consideration in its decision-making</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The CGIAR’s Performance on Transparency Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency Attribute</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes complete/accurate information available about internal processes / budgets / activities / objectives</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates accountability for all of its actions and decisions</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal decision-making processes are fair and well understood by others</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CGIAR’s Performance on Operational Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is effective in undertaking scientific research designed to achieve food security and reduce poverty</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates efficiently</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The CGIAR’s Performance on Geographical Needs Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

- **Serves global needs well**: Total 58, Members 59, Partners 58
- **Serves regional needs well**: Total 53, Members 50, Partners 54
- **Serves local needs well**: Total 34, Members 35, Partners 35
Description of Surveyed Stakeholders
Description of Surveyed Stakeholders

- Of the 348 CGIAR stakeholders who completed the online survey, 85 percent identify themselves as Partners of the CGIAR or one of its 15 Research Centers. The remaining 15 percent identify themselves as Members.

- One-half of Partners (51%; 43% overall), work in Universities and Advanced Research Institutes (UARIs), which includes universities in industrialized and developing countries, Advanced Research Institutes (ARIs), and International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs) other than CGIAR Centers.

- Three in ten Partners (34%; 29% overall) work in from National or Regional organizations such as National Agricultural Research Institutes (NARIs), governments, and Regional or Sub-Regional Organizations, while one in ten (11%; 9% overall) belong to Civil organizations such as Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), NGOs, Development Organizations, and Farm Organizations. Four percent of Partners (3% overall) come from other organizations such as the private sector.

- Two-thirds of Members (67%; 10% overall) belong to a national government, while one-quarter (27%; 4% overall) come from an International or Regional Organization, and 7 percent from a Foundation (1% overall).
Description of Surveyed Stakeholders

- On average, stakeholders collaborate with four CGIAR Centers, with the largest proportion (24%) saying they only collaborate with one Center.

- Members collaborate with more CGIAR Centers than Partners do (7.4 vs 3.5, respectively). However, 22 percent of Members do not know how many CGIAR centers their organization collaborates with, compared with only 13 percent of Partners.

- Similar proportions of respondents are in Asia/Pacific (27%), Sub-Saharan Africa (25%), and Europe (21%). Thirteen percent are in North America, while less than one in ten each are in South America (6%), Central and West Asia and North Africa (CWANA) (5%), and Central America and the Caribbean (2%).

- Respondents, on average, tend to be male and have more than 25 years experience in the field of Agriculture; they are most inclined to cite their area of specialization as agricultural sciences.

- With the exception of the WorldFish Center (n=23) and WARDA (n=25), at least 52 stakeholders rated each Center. Respondents are the most familiar with CIMMYT, as 120 (35% of all stakeholders) rated this Center.
Surveyed Stakeholders’ Relationship with the CGIAR

Members vs Partners, 2006

- **Members** (n=52)
  - University and Advanced Research Institutes: 15
  - Country government: 10
  - International/Regional Foundation: 4
  - Others: 1

- **Partners** (n=296)
  - University and Advanced Research Institutes: 85
  - National/Regional: 43
  - Civil: 29
  - Other: 9

*Universities and Advanced Research Institutes*
### Number of CGIAR Centers Currently Collaborating With

By Relationship with the CGIAR, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average number of Centers</th>
<th>0-1 Centers</th>
<th>2-5 Centers</th>
<th>6-10 Centers</th>
<th>11-15 Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of Surveyed Stakeholders

#### 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Pacific</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and West Asia and North Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America / Caribbean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 25 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sciences</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics/biotechnology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry/agro-forestry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents per CGIAR Center

By Relationship with the CGIAR, 2006 – Part 1

- CIAT (n=89)
  - Members: 17
  - Partners: 83

- CIFOR (n=50)
  - Members: 22
  - Partners: 78

- CIMMYT (n=120)
  - Members: 23
  - Partners: 77

- CIP (n=59)
  - Members: 27
  - Partners: 73

- ICARDA (n=62)
  - Members: 19
  - Partners: 81

- ICRAF (n=76)
  - Members: 13
  - Partners: 87

- ICRISAT (n=97)
  - Members: 8
  - Partners: 92

- IFPRI (n=77)
  - Members: 22
  - Partners: 78
Respondents per CGIAR Center

By Relationship with the CGIAR, 2006 – Part 2

- IITA (n=81)
  - Members: 10
  - Partners: 90

- ILRI (n=55)
  - Members: 9
  - Partners: 91

- IPGRI (n=67)
  - Members: 25
  - Partners: 75

- IRRI (n=89)
  - Members: 20
  - Partners: 80

- IWMI (n=52)
  - Members: 17
  - Partners: 83

- WARD (n=25)
  - Members: 20
  - Partners: 80

- WorldFish (n=23)
  - Members: 17
  - Partners: 83
Detailed Methodology
Detailed Methodology

The CGIAR provided GlobeScan with the necessary information needed to draw a stratified random sample of collaborators (Partners) of the CGIAR and its 15 Centers. This information included:

- Lists of collaborators and Most Strategic Partners (MSPs) for each Center
- A report from a previous survey

With data provided by the CGIAR, GlobeScan categorized Partner organizations into four categories:

- National/Regional – National Agricultural Research Institutions, governments, Regional and Sub-Regional Organizations
- Civil – Community Service Organizations, Development Organizations, NGOs
- Universities and Advanced Research Centers (UARIs) – Universities, Advance Research Institutes, International Advanced Research Centers (IARCs)
- Other – Private sector, other organizations
Detailed Methodology

- The sampling approach addressed three elements of the CGIAR’s stakeholder make-up.
  - All Members and Donors would be contacted to evaluate the CGIAR and the research Centers they are most familiar with.
  - All Partners previously identified by each Center as a Most Strategic Partner (MSP) would be contacted to evaluate the CGIAR and the Centers they are most familiar with.
  - Each Center’s remaining Partners would be randomly sampled based on the actual distribution of Partners by organization type and 60 would be chosen to evaluate the CGIAR and the Centers they are most familiar with.
- The CGIAR provided GlobeScan with contact information for all Members and Donors. All were contacted for participation.
### Detailed Methodology

- Based on the data provided by the CGIAR outlining how many collaborators each Center has, GlobeScan calculated each Center’s distribution of Partner type based on the four new categories. (Note: ICARDA’s sample distribution was updated during the process to account for National/Regional collaborations that were lacking in the original list of collaborations supplied).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Total # collaborators*</th>
<th>National &amp; Regional</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>UARI</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Collaborators</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td># Collaborators</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td># Collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>149 28%</td>
<td>135 25%</td>
<td>183 34%</td>
<td>70 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>65 29%</td>
<td>51 22%</td>
<td>70 31%</td>
<td>42 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>46 40%</td>
<td>6 5%</td>
<td>62 53%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>184 46%</td>
<td>87 22%</td>
<td>112 28%</td>
<td>17 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICARDA**</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6 55%</td>
<td>10 10%</td>
<td>86 30%</td>
<td>2 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRAF</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>29 17%</td>
<td>36 21%</td>
<td>99 57%</td>
<td>11 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRISAT</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>39 38%</td>
<td>13 13%</td>
<td>42 41%</td>
<td>9 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39 41%</td>
<td>15 16%</td>
<td>32 33%</td>
<td>10 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>35 38%</td>
<td>7 8%</td>
<td>49 53%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>99 35%</td>
<td>34 12%</td>
<td>113 40%</td>
<td>37 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>178 50%</td>
<td>53 15%</td>
<td>101 28%</td>
<td>24 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRRI</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>283 48%</td>
<td>34 6%</td>
<td>236 40%</td>
<td>38 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWMI</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>48 43%</td>
<td>17 15%</td>
<td>44 39%</td>
<td>3 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14 41%</td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td>17 50%</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldFish</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>109 39%</td>
<td>54 19%</td>
<td>104 37%</td>
<td>16 6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of collaborators that Centers reported to the CGIAR in previous research

**Sample proportions updated by ICARDA to reflect actual distribution**
Detailed Methodology

- From a list of 4,873 collaborations recently assembled for the SC Secretariat's Collaborator Survey, 13 Center-specific lists were generated. WARDA and CIMMYT sent separate lists of collaborations to GlobeScan, with 186 additional collaborations.

- The CGIAR also provided lists of approximately 10 to 20 Partners that each Center previously identified as Most Strategic Partners (MSPs), with the intention that all MSPs would be contacted to participate in the study. Each Center’s MSP’s were removed from its list of collaborations, as were any CGIAR Centers, or organizations that are also Members/Donors to avoid contacting duplicate organizations or the same individual more than once.

- Each Partner Type list was randomly sorted using the RAND function in excel, which assigns a random number to each case (i.e., collaboration). The collaborations were then sorted in descending order by the random number.
Detailed Methodology

- In order to achieve the intended response rate of at least 30 people per Center, the top 60 organizations in the list, in the respective proportions of the Partner Type, per Center, were selected to be in the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>National &amp; Regional</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>UARI</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICARDA</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRAF</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRISAT</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRI</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWMI</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDA</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldFish</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Methodology

• If an organization was randomly chosen more than once within a Center’s Partner Type sample list, the first case was kept, and the next organization in the random list was chosen to replace the duplicate.

• For some Centers, there were not enough collaborations in certain categories to fulfill the proportion requirements. In these special cases, GlobeScan split the difference among other categories, or if there were less than 60 collaborations in total, selected all eligible (i.e., not duplicates, MSPs, CGIAR Centers, or Members/donors) to be in the sample.

• The sample lists of organizations, along with the MSPs, were sent to each of the 15 Centers, where it was up to the Center to provide GlobeScan with contact information for one individual at the organization whom they believed is most knowledgeable about the Center (i.e., Name, job title, e-mail address, and telephone number).

• It was requested that contact lists be sent back to GlobeScan between April 18, 2006 and May 1, 2006. When lists were received they were checked for completeness.

• If contact information was incomplete or missing, lists were sent back to the Center along with extra organizations that were selected randomly, according to the sample proportion, until the full list was complete (Note: the final list did not reach GlobeScan from the Centers until June 23, 2006).
Detailed Methodology

- Some Centers sent additional organizations and contact information along with the sample lists. In these cases, missing contact information from the sample was replaced with these contacts, provided the organization appeared on the original list of collaborations for that Center. This was done when Centers had not sent complete lists.

- Duplicate contacts, that is where a Center provided contact information for more than one person at a given organization, were kept apart from the master sample list and were only contacted for participation when the response rate was low.

- When complete contact information was received by GlobeScan, e-mail addresses were forwarded to the CGIAR, who then sent preliminary e-mails from Francisco Reifschneider, Director of the CGIAR, informing stakeholders of the upcoming survey.

- Contact information for all of the Partners, MSPs, and Members were uploaded to Exact Target, an internet-based e-mailing program. This program identified and removed duplicate and problematic e-mail addresses from each of the lists (Note: Because organizations collaborate with more than one Center, some Centers identified the same individual. Removing duplications prevented them from being contacted more than once).
In total, 1,269 stakeholders (94 Member representatives and 1,175 Partners) were contacted to participate in the online survey from June 6, 2006 to June 30, 2006. Participants had the option to complete the survey in English, French, or Spanish.

Follow-up and reminder e-mails were sent to non-participating stakeholders at one to two week intervals and the survey closing date was extended from June 30 to July 16, 2006 to account for holidays, low response rates, and contact lists arriving late from some Centers.

Stakeholders from Centers with low participation rates were sent additional e-mails that had Center-specific information and were also translated into French to account for any language barriers.

The CGIAR followed-up with unresponsive Members on the telephone to increase participation.

Of the 1,269 stakeholders, 295 stakeholders were unreachable due to old or incorrect e-mail addresses meaning that only 77 percent of the stakeholders could be reached by the e-mail addresses provided by the Centers. Of the 974 that were reachable, 348 responded to the survey resulting in a 36 percent overall response rate.
## Detailed Methodology

**Contacted vs Responded, by Center List, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th># Contacted</th>
<th># Responded</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICARDA</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRAF</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRISAT</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRI</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWMI</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDAA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC (worldfish)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1269</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Methodology

- To provide each Center’s group of stakeholders with an equal voice, a weighting variable was calculated to equalize the sample size across each of the 15 Centers.
- In the analysis, the weighting variable was applied to the data for all questions in which respondents were ask to evaluate the CGIAR overall.
- To avoid distortion of results, the weighting variable was not applied to questions pertaining to influence and communications.
- Where multiple representatives from a given Member organization responded to the survey, responses were weighted down so that they only account for one observation per Member organization.
Questionnaire
1. The CGIAR is an association of 64 independent public and private sector members, including countries, with the World Bank, FAO, IFAD and UNDP as Co-sponsors. The CGIAR provides 15 international agricultural research centers with strategic guidance and finance assistance. Which one of the following best describes your organization’s relationship with the CGIAR and its Centers?

   A Member of the CGIAR

   A Partner of the CGIAR and one or more of its 15 Research Centers (i.e., an organization that collaborates with the CGIAR Centers by providing or contributing expertise or financial resources)

2. How many CGIAR Centers does your organization currently support or collaborate with?
3. Please select the type of organization that best describes the type of organization you work for.

**Partners**
- National agricultural research institute
- Government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other

**Members**
- Country government
- Foundation
- International or Regional organization
4. In which one of the following regions is your organization primarily based?
   - North America
   - Central America and the Caribbean
   - South America
   - Europe
   - Asia-Pacific
   - Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)
   - Central and West Asia and North Africa (CWANA)

5. Were you directly employed by the CGIAR or one of the CGIAR Centers (or contracted as a consultant to the CGIAR or the CGIAR Centers)…
   - Five years or less ago?
   - More than 5 years ago?
   - No, never been employed by the CGIAR or its Centers

6. To what extent does the CGIAR and its Centers assist you and your organization in achieving your objectives?
   - A great deal
   - A fair amount
   - Some
   - A little
   - None at all
Questionnaire

ASK ONLY TO PARTNERS IN Q1

7. What are the two most important ways in which your organization benefits from its association with the CGIAR and its Centers?

8. What do you see as the CGIAR's and its Centers' greatest strengths? Please enter up to two responses.

9. What do you think are the CGIAR's and its Centers' greatest weaknesses? Please enter up to two responses.

10. To better meet the needs of your organization, in what one way, if any, do the CGIAR and its Centers most need to improve? Please enter one response.

11. Where would you say the CGIAR’s and its Centers’ focus is currently located on the Research-Development Continuum, where the top of the scale is pure or basic research and the bottom is the provision of direct support to end-users (e.g. farmers) for their development?
   1 - Basic research
   2
   3
   4
   5
   6
   7 - Development assistance to end-user
11b. Where do you think the CGIAR's focus as a whole SHOULD be located on the Research Development Continuum

1 - Basic research
2
3
4
5
6
7- Development assistance to end-user

12A. Please select up to three CIGAR Centers with which you are the most familiar

a) Most familiar:
b) Second most familiar:
c) Third most familiar:

CIAT - Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical; CIFOR - Center for International Forestry Research; CIMMYT - Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo; CIP - Centro Internacional de la Papal; CARDA - International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas; ICRAF - World Agroforestry Center; ICRISAT - International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics; IFPRI - International Food Policy Research Institute; IITA - International Institute of Tropical Agriculture; ILRI - International Livestock Research Institute; IPGRI - International Plant Genetic Resources Institute; IRRI - International Rice Research Institute; IWMI - International Water Management Institute; WARDA - Africa Rice Center; WorldFish Center
Questionnaire

ASK ONLY TO PARTNERS IN Q1

13. Please name up to three CGIAR-supported programs or projects with which you were directly involved in the past two years.

14. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree that each of the following does an excellent job advancing sustainable agricultural development through research.

Please use the seven-point scale provided where 1 means that you strongly disagree, 4 means that you neither agree nor disagree, and 7 means that you strongly agree.

- The CGIAR and its Centers
- Insert most familiar center in Q12A
- Insert second most familiar center in Q12A
- Insert third most familiar center in Q12A14

15. Now please indicate the extent to which you think the performance of each has improved or declined over the past five years.

Please use the 7-point scale provided where 1 means that performance has declined a great deal, 4 means that performance has not changed, and 7 means that performance has improved a great deal.

- The CGIAR and its Centers
- Insert most familiar center in Q12A
- Insert second most familiar center in Q12A
- Insert third most familiar center in Q12A
16. Next, with respect to the performance of the CGIAR as a whole (as a group of members supporting 15 international research Centers), please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

Please use the seven-point scale provided where 1 means that you strongly disagree, 4 means that you neither agree nor disagree, and 7 means that you strongly agree.

- The CGIAR is responsive to the needs of its partners and clients
- The CGIAR takes into consideration the views of partners and clients in its decision-making
- CGIAR demonstrates accountability for all of its actions and decisions
- CGIAR readily makes complete and accurate information available about its internal processes, budgets, activities, and objectives
- CGIAR’s internal decision-making processes are fair and well understood by others
- The CGIAR is effective in undertaking scientific research designed to achieve food security and reduce poverty
- CGIAR operates efficiently
- CGIAR serves local needs well
- CGIAR serves regional needs well
- CGIAR serves global needs well
Questionnaire

17. Earlier in this survey you indicated that you are most familiar with [center X]. Now please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about [insert most familiar center in Q12Aa].

Please use the seven-point scale provided where 1 means that you strongly disagree, 4 means that you neither agree nor disagree, and 7 means that you strongly agree.

The right people and information within [center X] are easily accessible
[center X] staff are responsive to the needs of partners and other clients of the center
[center X] conducts research that addresses the most current and relevant agricultural challenges
[center X] understands and shares the priorities of partners and other clients of the centers
[center X] conducts innovative research
[center X] actively helps its partners and others to be innovative
[center X] fully and meaningfully involves its partners in important decision making
[center X] shares credit for the success of projects with the partners that were involved
[center X] demonstrates accountability for all of its actions and decisions
[center X] readily makes complete and accurate information available about its internal processes, budgets, activities, and objectives
[center X] produces research that results in significant improvements in agricultural practices and/or policies
[center X] adapts quickly to new ways of thinking about agriculture and development
[center X]’s internal decision-making processes are fair and well understood by others
[center X] hires and retains excellent staff
[center X] serves local needs
[center X] serves regional needs
[center X] serves global needs
[center X] does not duplicate efforts underway in other research institutions
[center X] delivers high quality research at the lowest possible cost
[center X] facilitates access to the best available knowledge
[center X] is committed to increasing diversity (including the number of women) in senior positions
[center X] communicates effectively through events, its websites, newsletters and other general publications
[center X] staff, team members and delegates communicate very effectively on behalf of
[center X] anticipates new challenges and research needs well
Questionnaire

18. Earlier in this survey you indicated that you are second most familiar with [center Y]. Now please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about [insert second most familiar center in Q12Ab].

Please use the seven-point scale provided where 1 means that you strongly disagree, 4 means that you neither agree nor disagree, and 7 means that you strongly agree.

- The right people and information within [center Y] are easily accessible
- [center Y] staff are responsive to the needs of partners and other clients of the center
- [center Y] conducts research that addresses the most current and relevant agricultural challenges
- [center Y] understands and shares the priorities of partners and other clients of the centers
- [center Y] conducts innovative research
- [center Y] actively helps its partners and others to be innovative
- [center Y] fully and meaningfully involves its partners in important decision making
- [center Y] shares credit for the success of projects with the partners that were involved
- [center Y] demonstrates accountability for all of its actions and decisions
- [center Y] readily makes complete and accurate information available about its internal processes, budgets, activities, and objectives
- [center Y] produces research that results in significant improvements in agricultural practices and/or policies
- [center Y] adapts quickly to new ways of thinking about agriculture and development
- [center Y]’s internal decision-making processes are fair and well understood by others
- [center Y] hires and retains excellent staff
- [center Y] serves local needs
- [center Y] serves regional needs
- [center Y] serves global needs
- [center Y] does not duplicate efforts underway in other research institutions
- [center Y] delivers high quality research at the lowest possible cost
- [center Y] facilitates access to the best available knowledge
- [center Y] is committed to increasing diversity (including the number of women) in senior positions
- [center Y] communicates effectively through events, its websites, newsletters and other general publications
- [center Y] staff, team members and delegates communicate very effectively on behalf of
- [center Y] anticipates new challenges and research needs well
Questionnaire

19. Earlier in this survey you indicated that you are third most familiar with [center Z]. Now please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about [insert third most familiar center in Q12Ac].

Please use the seven-point scale provided where 1 means that you strongly disagree, 4 means that you neither agree nor disagree, and 7 means that you strongly agree.

- The right people and information within [center Z] are easily accessible
- [center Z] staff are responsive to the needs of partners and other clients of the center
- [center Z] conducts research that addresses the most current and relevant agricultural challenges
- [center Z] understands and shares the priorities of partners and other clients of the centers
- [center Z] conducts innovative research
- [center Z] actively helps its partners and others to be innovative
- [center Z] fully and meaningfully involves its partners in important decision making
- [center Z] shares credit for the success of projects with the partners that were involved
- [center Z] demonstrates accountability for all of its actions and decisions
- [center Z] readily makes complete and accurate information available about its internal processes, budgets, activities, and objectives
- [center Z] produces research that results in significant improvements in agricultural practices and/or policies
- [center Z] adapts quickly to new ways of thinking about agriculture and development
- [center Z]’s internal decision-making processes are fair and well understood by others
- [center Z] hires and retains excellent staff
- [center Z] serves local needs
- [center Z] serves regional needs
- [center Z] serves global needs
- [center Z] does not duplicate efforts underway in other research institutions
- [center Z] delivers high quality research at the lowest possible cost
- [center Z] facilitates access to the best available knowledge
- [center Z] is committed to increasing diversity (including the number of women) in senior positions
- [center Z] communicates effectively through events, its websites, newsletters and other general publications
- [center Z] staff, team members and delegates communicate very effectively on behalf of
- [center Z] anticipates new challenges and research needs well
20. Which of the following information sources would you most likely access if you needed accurate information about the CGIAR, its Centers, and their activities?  

Please select up to two.
- The CGIAR website
- The CGIAR annual report
- Other CGIAR publications in print
- Websites of the individual CGIAR Centers
- Annual reports from the CGIAR Centers
- Other Center publications in print
- Scientific journals and publications
- University websites
- Websites of research centers that are not part of the CGIAR
- Publications from non-CGIAR research centers
- Other

21.1 Please name up to three organizations (other than the CGIAR itself) or types of organizations that you think are the most influential in determining CGIAR’s overall reputation.

Be as specific as you can.

Organization #1: __________________________
Questionnaire

So that we are certain of what type of organization this is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
Questionnaire

21.2 Please name up to three organizations (other than the CGIAR itself) or types of organizations that you think are the most influential in determining CGIAR’s overall reputation.

Be as specific as you can.
Organization #2: _______________________

So that we are certain of what type of organization this is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
21.3 Please name up to three organizations (other than the CGIAR itself) or types of organizations that you think are the most influential in determining CGIAR’s overall reputation. Be as specific as you can.

Organization #3: _________________________

So that we are certain of what type of organization this is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
Questionnaire

22.1 Now please name three organizations or types of organizations, apart from your own organization or the CGIAR and its Centers, that you would contact in your professional role if you needed an influential source of information or advice from a third party about the CGIAR and/or its activities. Be as specific as you can.

Organization #1: _______________________

So that we are certain of what type of organization this is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
22.2 Now please name three organizations or types of organizations, apart from your own organization or the CGIAR and its Centers, that you would contact in your professional role if you needed an influential source of information or advice from a third party about the CGIAR and/or its activities. Be as specific as you can.

Organization #2: ____________________________

So that we are certain of what type of organization this is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
22.3 Now please name three organizations or types of organizations, apart from your own organization or the CGIAR and its Centers, that you would contact in your professional role if you needed an influential source of information or advice from a third party about the CGIAR and/or its activities. **Be as specific as you can.**

Organization #3: ____________________________

So that we are certain of what type of organization this is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
23. Approximately how many times per year do you exchange communications, either face-to-face or electronically with [insert most influential organization in Q22] regarding the CGIAR and/or its activities

24.1 Please name three organizations or types of organizations, apart from your own, whose views of the CGIAR your own organization most influences. Please let us remind you that your answers will be kept strictly anonymous and not linked to you or your organization.

Please name specific organizations or groups.
Organization #1:_____________________

Organization #2:_____________________

Organization #3:_____________________


Questionnaire

So that we are certain of what type of organization that is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
Questionnaire

24.2 Please name three organizations or types of organizations, apart from your own, whose views of the CGIAR your own organization most influences. Please let us remind you that your answers will be kept strictly anonymous and not linked to you or your organization.

Please name specific organizations or groups.
Organization #2: ______________________

So that we are certain of what type of organization that is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
24.3 Please name three organizations or types of organizations, apart from your own, whose views of the CGIAR your own organization most influences. Please let us remind you that your answers will be kept strictly anonymous and not linked to you or your organization.

Please name specific organizations or groups.

Organization #3: _______________________

So that we are certain of what type of organization that is, please select the type of organization that best categorizes it.

- National agricultural research institute
- Your own government
- Another country’s government
- Regional organization or Sub-regional organization
- National NGO in a developing country
- National NGO in an industrialized country
- International NGO
- Producer Organization / Farmer association
- Foundation
- Private sector
- Multilateral organization
- Media (TV)
- Media (radio)
- Media (print)
- University in a developing country
- University in an industrialized country
- Advanced Research Institute in a developing country
- Advanced Research Institute in an industrialized country
- International agricultural research centers other than CGIAR Centers
- Other
25. How effective do you think the CGIAR and its Centers are in getting its messages across to each of the following?

a) Your own organization
   Not at all effective
   Not very effective
   Average
   Somewhat effective
   Very effective

b) Science professionals in other organizations

c) Policy makers

d) Development professionals

e) The informed public

26. Many participants in this survey work with more than just the (up to) three Centers evaluated in this survey. We strongly encourage you to take this opportunity to evaluate additional Centers. Would you be willing to take a few minutes to evaluate other Centers?

   Yes, I am familiar with additional CGIAR Centers and am willing to evaluate them
   Yes, I am familiar with additional CGIAR Centers but no, I am unable to evaluate them
   No, I am not familiar with additional CGIAR Centers
12B. Please select up to three CIGAR Centers with which you are the most familiar
   a) Most familiar:
   b) Second most familiar:
   c) Third most familiar:

CIAT - Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical; CIFOR - Center for International Forestry Research; CIMMYT - Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo; CIP - Centro Internacional de la Papa; CARDA - International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas; ICRAF - World Agroforestry Center; ICRISAT - International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics; IFPRI - International Food Policy Research Institute; IITA - International Institute of Tropical Agriculture; ILRI - International Livestock Research Institute; IPGRI - International Plant Genetic Resources Institute; IRRI - International Rice Research Institute; IWMI - International Water Management Institute; WARDA - Africa Rice Center; WorldFish Center

[Then ask Qs: 14b, 14c, 14d, 15b, 15c, 15d, 17, 18, 19, 26]
Continue with the cycle until all 15 centers have been evaluated or respondent indicates unwillingness or inability to evaluate further centers in Q26, and then proceed to Q27 through to the end of the survey.
27. Please indicate your gender below.
   Male
   Female

28. How many years of experience do you have working in the fields of agriculture, food production, development, or sustainability?

ASK ONLY IF YES IN Q31

32. Please enter your contact information in the spaces provided.
   E-mail address___________________________________.

33. Do you have any additional comments you would like to add anonymously?