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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’s 15 Centers and describes Center performance on 24 specific attributes, and identifies how stakeholders view the performance of specific Centers on eight composite reputation drivers.

- A separate report has been prepared presenting 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.

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 Members represent 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 92 of this report for a detailed description of the stakeholders, and slide 100 for a thorough explanation of the sampling approach methodology.
Key Findings and Implications
Key Findings and Implications

- Stakeholders’ overall opinions of each of the 15 Centers are positive, with between six and eight in ten agreeing to some extent that the Centers do “an excellent job advancing sustainable agricultural development through research.”

- Each Center has an opportunity to improve their stakeholders’ perception of itself. In 14 of 15 cases, fewer than two in ten respondents award Centers with top performance marks (seven out of seven).

- GlobeScan’s driver analysis identifies specific strengths and opportunities for improvement for each individual Center. These vary extensively, so no single reputation strategy will apply to all Centers. Each Center must carefully consider its own unique stakeholder context and plan accordingly.

- Despite extensive variation in stakeholder perceptions of the different Centers, some patterns across Centers are observable.

- The most consistent pattern is the fact that every Center is well regarded for the quality and relevance of the research it conducts. Furthermore, for 12 of 15 Centers, research quality and relevance is the most powerful driver of the Centers’ overall perceived performance. The Centers should communicate confidently about their research capabilities to leverage the importance of this fundamentally important attribute.

- Not only serving global needs well, but also delivering to local and regional needs well is another attribute that positively drives perceptions of the Centers; serving global needs and more local needs are not seen as mutually exclusive.

- Overall, stakeholders believe that the Centers are executing their core missions well.
Key Findings and Implications

- While Centers perform strongly for what they do, how they do it appears to be detracting from their overall reputations much as is the case for the CGIAR overall.

- Drivers analysis identifies four themes that are important components of the reputations of five or more Centers, but where stakeholders believe that the Centers are underperforming somewhat. These include:
  - Partnership
  - Communication
  - Transparency
  - Human Resources

- Each of these opportunity areas are explored in the core of the report.

- While weaknesses in these areas are far from severe, it can be argued that these attributes, especially the first three, are crucial to the CGIAR’s model of collaboration and resource leveraging, and should therefore be addressed.

- Other GlobeScan research and global trends in many sectors indicate that transparency, partnership and communication are becoming increasingly important to stakeholders generally. As such, these findings may be more indicative of rising expectations than of deteriorating performance of the Centers.

- Stakeholder expectations and perceived performance in these and other areas should be monitored over time.
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers
Stakeholders were asked how much they agree or disagree that the individual CGIAR Centers with which they are most familiar do an excellent job advancing sustainable agricultural development through research. This variable is used throughout this report as an indicator of the overall “reputation” of the Centers. It is the dependent variable in the drivers analysis.

Agreement that individual Centers do excellent jobs at advancing sustainable agriculture development (i.e., the percentage of stakeholders who selected 5, 6, or 7 on a 7-point scale) ranges from 59 percent (IWMI) to 78 percent (WorldFish).

Stakeholders rate each of the 15 research Centers higher than the CGIAR as a whole (54%, see the CGIAR overall report). In fact, six of the 15 Centers are seen as doing an excellent job by at least seven in ten stakeholders.
Does an Excellent Job Advancing Sustainable Agriculture through Research

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Drivers of Perceptions of the CGIAR Centers’ Performance
Determining Reputation Drivers and Driver Importance

How Reputation Drivers are Derived

- Reputation drivers, i.e., drivers of perceived performance, are derived through an aggregated analysis of how stakeholders rate a Center on a set of consistent reputation attributes.
- Analyzing the results in aggregate allows us to validly compare the ensuing reputation drivers from one Center to the next, yet still be reflective of Center differences by measuring the relative importance of the reputation drivers for each Center.
- Results are analyzed using Principal Component Analysis (PCA), a statistical technique that groups survey responses according to the underlying patterns of how people answer each performance question.
- PCA serves two main functions: 1) it helps reveal underlying response patterns and 2) it reduces a large number of individual ratings on reputation attributes to a smaller and more manageable set of drivers. Those attributes that fall within the same driver tend to ‘fit’ the same mental space in how people have assessed the Center.
- Note that if the rating of the Center on a particular attribute were to change in the future, then it will also impact ratings on the other attributes within that driver.
Determining Reputation Drivers and Driver Importance

- Each reputation driver is named by studying its component attributes, to determine the underlying pattern linking them together.
- GlobeScan did not select which attributes should belong in each driver, but instead statistically derived the composition of each driver through Principal Components Analysis (PCA).
- The eight reputation drivers and the corresponding attributes that comprise each driver are detailed on the following slide.
- Note: the first attribute presented in each driver is the ‘leading’ attribute. It is the most influential attribute within the driver.
The Reputation Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver Name</th>
<th>Driver Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research addresses current/relevant agricultural challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research leads to significant improvement in agriculture practices/policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducts innovative research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipates new challenges / research needs well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Shares credit for project success with Partners involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involves Partners in important decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff are responsive to the needs of Partners/clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communicates effectively through events, websites, publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff communicate effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The right people and information are easily accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Complete/accurate information available about internal processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal decision making is fair and understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates accountability for all actions/decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Focus</td>
<td>Serves local needs well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serves regional needs well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Hires/retains excellent staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>Does not duplicate efforts in other research institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Committed to increasing diversity in senior positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight reputation drivers were identified that each of the 15 Centers’ reputation can be measured against.
Drivers of Centers’ Reputation: Importance

• The relative importance of the reputation drivers are derived through correlation/regression analysis using factors, or variables that are shown to relate to each other through principal components analysis, as independent variables.

• Note that some drivers (or factors) contain only one variable. “Originality,” for example, is made up of responses to statement “[center X] does not duplicate efforts underway in other research institutions” only. Please refer to the table on the preceding slide for list of variables (in order of importance) that constitute each factor or driver.

• The dependent variable used in the analysis is the extent to which each Center’s surveyed stakeholders agree that the Center “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 a Center’s reputation than others.
Relative Importance of Drivers

- The relative importance of each of the drivers was calculated for each of the individual Centers. While the resulting hierarchy of drivers varies by Center and is reported in subsequent slides, some patterns across Centers are clear.

- For 12 of the 15 Centers, Research is the most powerful driver of Center reputation. In order of importance, this driver includes being current and relevant, resulting in significant improvements in agriculture practices and policies, innovating, and foreseeing future research challenges and needs.

- Serving the Regional Context is also among the most important drivers for most Centers. This driver involves serving both local and regional needs well. It is important to note that this driver does not include serving global needs well. Please see the slide below entitled A Note on Geographic Context.

- Generally, Diversity in senior positions and Originality (i.e., not duplicating research underway in other organizations) are two drivers that are less important to Centers’ reputation.
A Note on Geographic Context

• The CGIAR’s mandate is to produce global public goods.
• The factor analysis found that “serving global needs well” is an attribute that, while closely aligned with perceptions regarding the quality and relevance of the Centers’ research, did not naturally group with the other factors used in the drivers analysis. This is probably because serving global needs is fundamental to what the Centers do; it is taken for granted.
• Serving regional needs well and serving local needs well, however, are attributes that naturally formed a factor that was found to positively drive stakeholder perceptions of overall Center performance.
• To better understand stakeholders’ opinions of how the Centers are serving societal needs at various geographic scale and its impact on overall perceptions, GlobeScan conducted a separate correlation analysis using overall perceptions of Center performance as the dependent variable and the three individual variables pertaining to service at the global, regional and local levels as independent variables.
• Serving needs at each of the geographic scales was found to significantly drive positive perceptions of the Centers in roughly equal amounts; none of the three variables was found to be consistently more powerful than the others in explaining variation in overall perceptions of the Centers. Furthermore, views on serving needs at various scales are closely correlated. Stakeholders do not view serving global and local needs well as mutually exclusive.
• In sum, belief that the Centers serve needs at multiple scales well is an important driver of positive perceptions of the Centers. Stakeholders appear to want the Centers to produce global public goods but that have local utility and applicability.
Quadrant Analysis

- Results of the driver analysis for each Center 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.

- The scales of the x and y axes for each of the 15 grids have been held constant for comparison across Centers. For example, Centers for which the drivers are plotted more to the right side of the grid are perceived to be performing well relative to other Centers. Similarly, Centers whose drivers fall toward the top of the grid have reputations that are more strongly driven by the attributes within the factors.

- By comparing how a Center performs on a set of attributes vs how important those attributes really are to reputation, the quadrant analysis provides strategic insight into the strengths and weaknesses of each Center. The following slide describes how to interpret each quadrant.
Quadrant Analysis: Importance of the Reputation Drivers vs Centers’ Performance

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

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

Opportunities
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.

Maintain
Drivers in this quadrant are relatively less important than other drivers, but on which the Center receives above average performance ratings. While these drivers may not presently have a large impact on reputation, they can serve as positioning differentiators and may potentially grow in importance.
Quadrant Analysis: Overall Findings

- Importantly, the Research driver consistently appears in the Key Strengths quadrant across all Centers. It is an area that is both important to stakeholders, and one where each individual Center is seen as performing well on. The overall CGIAR report also shows that being a leader in research is the CGIAR’s greatest strength. The CGIAR is seen as delivering on its core mission.

- Regional Focus (i.e., Serves local and regional needs) is also seen as a key strength consistently across ten Centers. However, Regional Focus appears in the Focus quadrant for IPGRI and IWMI, suggesting an area where improved performance on serving regional and local needs could improve the two Centers’ reputations.

- Also appearing in the Focus quadrant for some Centers are Communication, Partnership, Human Resources, and Transparency. Generally, these are the drivers that require the most strategic attention.

- As noted in the overall CGIAR report, stakeholders think that the CGIAR can improve on collaboration with external organizations and research partnerships. It is therefore important for those Centers where the Partnership and/or Communication driver appears in the Focus quadrant (i.e., CIAT, CIFOR, CIMMYT, ICRAF, IFPRI, WARDA, and WorldFish) to address perceived performance shortcomings.
Quadrant Analysis: Overall Findings, Cont’d

- The Human Resources (HR) driver (i.e., hires and retains excellent employees) falls into the Focus quadrant for five Centers: CIP, ICARDA, ICRISAT, IITA, and WARDA. Future strategies of these Center’s should address hiring practices, staff turnover and competencies, as this driver is a relatively important driver of these Centers’ reputations.

- Transparency and Originality are reputation drivers that commonly appear in the bottom left quadrant as Opportunities. For these Centers, these drivers are less important than others in terms of reputation and are areas where performance is below average. Because these drivers are currently less important, Centers have the opportunity to improve on accountability, transparency of information and decision making, and innovative research, as these drivers have the potential of becoming more important in the future.

- The Diversity driver often appears in the bottom right quadrant, labeled Maintain. Drivers in this quadrant are areas where the Center is seen as performing above average, but are less important to a Center’s reputation. In this case, Centers such as CIAT, CIFOR, CIP, ICRAF, IFPRI, ILRI, and IWMI receive relatively high performance ratings for increasing diversity in senior positions. Centers should continue current efforts in this area.

- Overall, variation among Centers is more common than similarity. It must be emphasized that each Center’s reputation status is unique and their own strategies should reflect this.
Summary of Quadrant Analysis

This chart indicates which quadrant each attribute falls into for each Center.
# Summary of Quadrant Analysis Par Two

Number of Centers with Drivers in Each Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Strengths</th>
<th>Maintain</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Focus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table shows the number of centers with drivers in each quadrant for key strengths and focus areas.
Implications

• Each Center’s reputation strategy must be tailored to its own unique stakeholder audience. Nonetheless, the drivers analysis reveals some insight that does apply across the Group.

• All of the Centers’ core missions are perceived to be well executed. Research, especially research relevance, is considered to be a key strength of each.

• Nonetheless, each Center is perceived to have weaknesses in at least one area.

• In all but a few cases, drivers that appear in the Focus quadrant do so by a slight measure only. However, there are clear opportunities for improvement in these areas that could increase a number of Center’s overall performance scores.

• Four drivers fall in the Focus quadrant for five or more Centers:
  • Partnership
  • Communication
  • Transparency
  • Human Resources

• As found for the CGIAR overall, these attributes relate more to how the Centers do their job than to what they do, but the attributes are fundamental to the CGIAR’s model for leveraging resources and improving relevance through collaboration.
Implications: Communication

• Communication falls into the Focus quadrant for seven Centers, and for all but one of the seven, only marginally. Given that communication is inherently related to other drivers requiring strategic focus, especially Partnership and Transparency, improving communications from Centers could improve perceptions of the Centers in these other important areas.

• The analysis reveals that the most important element of the Communications driver is the extent to which the Center “communicates effectively through events, websites and publications.” The Center’s website is likely most important, as stakeholders indicate that websites are among the most important trustworthy sources of information for them.

• Given that Partnership is another important driver, it is probable that personal communications are also crucial. Indeed, how effectively staff communicate is statistically the second most important component of the Communications driver.
Implications: Transparency

- Transparency is shown to be an area in need of focus for five Centers.
- Specifically and in order of importance, transparency involves ensuring that complete and accurate information about a Center’s internal processes, budgets, activities and objectives is readily made available, that internal decision-making is fair and well understood, and that the Center demonstrates accountability for all actions and decisions.
- Of the three specific attributes, perhaps the easiest to improve is the most important; Center’s should first focus their efforts on making information available.
- In all sectors, transparency has become more important to organizations and stakeholders alike. This research suggests that this is true for the CGIAR as well.
- Indeed, for all other 10 Centers, Transparency falls into the Opportunity quadrant, where performance is seen to be below average, but where performance is not of above average importance in driving reputation.
- Transparency is more likely to increase in importance than to decrease in the coming years. Center performance in this area should be monitored over time.
Implications: Partnership

- For five Centers, Partnership scores as an area in need of focus. For five others, it falls into the Opportunity quadrant.
- Partnership is viewed by stakeholders as sharing credit for success, involving partners in important decision making, and the responsiveness of Center staff to the needs of partners and clients.
- Since the CGIAR depends on collaborative leverage for conducting research and producing public goods, the quality of partnerships is crucial to the Center's ability to attract the best partners; being effective partners is probably very important to the Centers’ sustainability.
- Centers that are perceived to under-perform in this area may consider engaging their respective stakeholders to best understand how to improve partnerships with and among them.
Implications: Human Resources

- The Human Resources driver contains only one attribute, i.e., the extent to which stakeholders agree that the Center “hires and retains excellent staff.” Human Resources is located in the Focus quadrants of five Centers, but only marginally for four of the five.

- Across the other ten Centers, stakeholder perceptions of performance on Human Resources vary, with the driver occurring in all three other quadrants.

- Of the four drivers on which the preceding analysis has focused, Human Resources could be considered to be the lowest priority for strategic attention.
Drivers of Each CGIAR Centers’ Reputation
CIAT: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
CIFOR: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note: For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
CIMMYT: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
CIP: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
ICARDA: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
ICRAF: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
ICRISAT: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
IITA: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
ILRI: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note: For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
IPGRI: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
IRRI: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

2006

Note: For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
IWMI: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

Note: For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
WARDA: Perceived Performance vs Derived Importance

Note: For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
Note:
For an explanation of what attributes constitute each of the factors plotted on this grid, please see slide 15.
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Specific Attributes: Frequencies
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Specific Attributes

• Stakeholders were asked to rate the performance of the Centers with which they are most familiar on 24 specific attributes.

• These attributes naturally group into 8 themes, largely based on factor analysis:
  • Research quality
  • Partnership
  • Communication
  • Transparency, Regional context
  • Human resources
  • Originality
  • Diversity

• Stakeholders give generally positive ratings to the Centers on most attributes.

• However, this positivism is somewhat restrained. On average, between just 5 to 20 percent of stakeholders give the Centers top ratings (i.e., 7 on a 7-point scale) on the attributes.
Research Attributes
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Research Attributes

- Across the five “Research” attributes (i.e., anticipates new challenges, conducts innovative research, delivers high quality research at low cost, addresses current needs, and research leads to significant improvement in agricultural policies and practice), the average percentage of respondents rating individual Centers positively (i.e., 5, 6, or 7 on a 7-point scale) ranges from 43.4 (IWMI) to 63.6 (CIFOR and CIP).
- Of the Research attributes, each Center receives the lowest performance ratings on delivering high quality research at the lowest possible cost.
- Out of the five attributes that relate to Research, agreement that the individual Centers produce research that addresses current agricultural challenges is the highest in eight of the 15 Centers: CIFOR, ICRAF, IFPRI, IITA, IPGRI (tied with anticipates new challenges), IWMI, WARDA, WorldFish (tied with research leads to significant improvement in agriculture practices and policies).
### Perceptions of Centers’ Performance on Research Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>CIAT</th>
<th>CIFOR</th>
<th>CIMMYT</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>ICARDA</th>
<th>ICRAF</th>
<th>ICRISAT</th>
<th>IFPRI</th>
<th>IITA</th>
<th>IRI</th>
<th>IPGRI</th>
<th>IRRI</th>
<th>IWMI</th>
<th>WARDA</th>
<th>WorldFish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average performance on ‘Research’</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>63.60</td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>63.60</td>
<td>47.20</td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>59.80</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>59.40</td>
<td>52.80</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>52.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipates new challenges / research needs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts innovative research</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers high quality research at low cost</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research addresses current/relevant agricultural challenges</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research leads to significant improvement in agriculture practices/policies</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conducts Research That Addresses the Most Current and Relevant Agricultural Challenges

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Produce Research That Results in Significant Improvements in Agriculture Practices and Policies

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Conducts Innovative Research

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Anticipates New Challenges and Research Needs

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Delivers High Quality Research at the Lowest Possible Cost

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Partnership Attributes
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Partnership Attributes

• Agreement that Centers perform well on Partnership attributes (i.e., facilitates access to the best knowledge, involves Partners in important decision making, shares credit for projects with Partners, staff are responsive to the needs of Partners and clients, understands and shares priorities of Partners and clients) ranges from 43.2 percent (WARDA) to 66.6 percent (IPGRI).

• Across all Centers, involving Partners in important decision making receives the lowest performance ratings of the Partnership attributes. Agreement ranges from 32 percent (ICRAF) to 55 percent (CIFOR). This finding reflects the fact that collaboration and partnership are the most frequently identified areas in which stakeholders believe that the CGIAR most needs to improve.
# Perceptions of Centers' Performance on Partnership Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>CIAT</th>
<th>CIFOR</th>
<th>CIMMYT</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>ICARDA</th>
<th>ICRAF</th>
<th>ICRISAT</th>
<th>IFPRI</th>
<th>IITA</th>
<th>ILRI</th>
<th>IPGRI</th>
<th>IRRI</th>
<th>IWMI</th>
<th>WARDA</th>
<th>WorldFish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average performance on 'Partnership'</td>
<td>52.80</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td>48.40</td>
<td>62.20</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>49.60</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>43.20</td>
<td>51.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates access to the best available knowledge</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves Partners in important decision making</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares credit for project success with Partners involved</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are responsive to the needs of Partners/clients</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands/shares priorities of Partners/clients</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shares Credit for the Success of Projects with the Partners That Were Involved

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Fully and Meaningfully Involves Its Partners in Important Decision Making

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Staff Are Responsive to the Needs of Partners and Clients

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006

[Bar chart showing the percentage of responses for different organizations, with categories for strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, and average.]
Understands and Shares the Priorities of Partners and Other Clients of the Center

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Facilitates Access to the Best Available Knowledge

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006

---

The chart shows the distribution of agreement levels across various stakeholders. The categories are:
- **Strongly agree (7)**
- **Agree (6)**
- **Somewhat agree (5)**

The bars represent different organizations, such as CIAT, CIFOR, CIMMYT, CI, ICARDA, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IITA, ILRI, IPRG, IRRI, IWMI, WARDA, and WorldFish.

The data is sourced from a report by Globescan and stakeholder perceptions from 2006.
Communication Attributes
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Communication Attributes

• Compared with other attributes, CGIAR Centers are seen as performing reasonably well on attributes related to communication (i.e., communicates effectively through different media, staff communicate effectively, and accessibility of staff and information). On average, agreement ranges from 52 percent (IRRI) to 70 percent (CIFOR).
### Perceptions of Centers' Performance on Communication Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIAT</th>
<th>CIFOR</th>
<th>CIMMYT</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>ICARDA</th>
<th>ICRAG</th>
<th>ICRISAT</th>
<th>IFPRI</th>
<th>IITA</th>
<th>ILRI</th>
<th>IPGRI</th>
<th>IRRI</th>
<th>IWM</th>
<th>WARDA</th>
<th>WorldFish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average performance on</strong> <strong>‘Communication’</strong></td>
<td>61.67</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>64.67</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>55.67</td>
<td>64.33</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>75.33</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicates effectively through events, websites, publications</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff communicate effectively</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The right people and information are easily accessible</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communicates Effectively through Events, Websites, Newsletters, and Publications

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICARDA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRAF</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRI SAT</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRI</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWMI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDA</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldFish</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Average (62)
Staff, Team Members, and Delegates Communicate Very Effectively

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
The Right People and Information Are Easily Accessible

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Transparency Attributes
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Transparency Attributes

- Agreement that CGIAR Centers perform well on Transparency attributes (i.e., complete information about internal processes is available, demonstrates accountability for all actions, internal decision making is fair and well understood) is lower than any other group of attributes. The average of Transparency attributes ranges from 32 percent (IWMI) to 59 percent (IPGRI).
- With the exception of IPGRI (59%), CIFOR (43.67%), and CIP (43.33%), less than four in ten stakeholders, on average, agree that Centers perform well on Transparency attributes.
- On average, fair and transparent decision making receives some of the lowest ratings of all 24 attributes. Agreement on this attribute ranges from 16 percent (WARDA) to 47 percent (IPGRI).
Perceptions of Centers' Performance on Transparency Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIAT</th>
<th>CIFOR</th>
<th>CIMMYT</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>ICARDA</th>
<th>ICRAF</th>
<th>IRRI</th>
<th>ITA</th>
<th>ICRISAT</th>
<th>ILRI</th>
<th>IPGRI</th>
<th>IRRI</th>
<th>IWMI</th>
<th>WARDA</th>
<th>WorldFish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>37.67</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average performance on 'Transparency'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete/accurate information available about internal processes</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrates accountability for all actions/decisions</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Internal decision-making is fair and understood               | 32 | 32 | 26 | 26 | 31 | 25 | 29 | 26 | 27 | 22 | 47 | 37 | 26 | 16 | 35 |

Stakeholder Perceptions 2006: Center Report
Makes Complete and Accurate Information Available about Its Internal Processes

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Internal Decision-Making Processes Are Fair and Understood by Others

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Demonstrates Accountability for All of Its Actions and Decisions

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Regional Context Attributes
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Regional Context Attributes

• Agreement that Centers perform well on Regional Context attributes (i.e., serving global, regional, and local needs well) ranges from 34.67 percent (WARDA) to 68.67 percent (IPGRI).

• Serving local needs well is the lowest-rated Regional attribute for ten of the 15 Centers. Seven of the 15 Centers have the highest proportion of stakeholders agreeing that the Centers serve global needs well, while six Centers receive the highest scores on serving regional needs well.
### Perceptions Centers’ Performance on Regional Context Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIAT</th>
<th>CIFOR</th>
<th>CIMMYT</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>ICARDA</th>
<th>ICRAGF</th>
<th>ICRISAT</th>
<th>IFPRI</th>
<th>ITA</th>
<th>ILRI</th>
<th>IPGRI</th>
<th>IRRI</th>
<th>IWMI</th>
<th>WARDA</th>
<th>WorldFish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average performance</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>64.33</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>67.67</td>
<td>54.33</td>
<td>50.33</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>55.67</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>45.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on ‘Regional Context’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves global needs</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves local needs</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves regional</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stakeholder Perceptions 2006: Center Report*
Serves Global Needs Well

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Serves Regional Needs Well

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006

---

Bar chart showing stakeholder perceptions for various institutions, with categories for Strongly agree (7), Agree (6), Somewhat agree (5), and Average (59).
Serves Local Needs Well

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Human Resources
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Human Resources

- Agreement that individual CGIAR Centers hire and retain excellent staff ranges from 36 percent (IITA and WARDA) to 61 percent (IPGRI). Most Centers are seen as performing well in the Human Resources area by at least four in ten stakeholders who rated them.
Hires and Retains Excellent Staff

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Originality Attributes

- The proportion of stakeholders who agree that Centers perform well on Originality attributes (i.e., helps Partners to be innovative, adapts quickly to new ways of thinking, and does not duplicate research underway in other institutions) ranges from 36 percent (WARDA) to 62.67 percent (IPGRI).
- For 12 of the 15 Centers, agreement is the lowest among Originality attributes for not duplicating efforts in other research institutions. When asked what the overall CGIAR’s weaknesses are, duplication is mentioned by 8 percent of stakeholders.
Perceptions of Centers’ Performance on Originality Attributes

“Agree (5+6+7),” 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIAT</th>
<th>CIFOR</th>
<th>CIMMYT</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>ICARDA</th>
<th>ICRAF</th>
<th>ICRI-SAT</th>
<th>IFPRI</th>
<th>IITA</th>
<th>ILRI</th>
<th>IPGRI</th>
<th>IRRI</th>
<th>IWMN</th>
<th>WARDA</th>
<th>WorldFish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average performance on ‘Originality’</td>
<td>51.33</td>
<td>54.67</td>
<td>45.33</td>
<td>56.33</td>
<td>44.67</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>62.67</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively helps Partners to be innovative</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts quickly to new ways of thinking about agriculture/development</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not duplicate efforts in other research institutions</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does Not Duplicate Efforts Underway in Other Research Institutions

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Actively Helps Partners and Others to Be Innovative

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Adapts Quickly to New Ways of Thinking about Agriculture and Development

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006
Diversity
Perceived Performance of CGIAR Centers on Diversity

- The proportion of stakeholders agreeing that CGIAR Centers are committed to increasing diversity in senior positions ranges from 27 percent (ICRISAT) to 66 percent (IPGRI). However, ten of the Centers receive between only 34 percent and 45 percent agreement.
Committed to Increasing Diversity in Senior Positions

“Agree (5+6+7),” by Center, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (7)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICARDA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRAF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRIAT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIRI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWMI</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRDA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldFish</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)
  - Country government: 10
  - International/Regional Foundation: 4
  - Other: 1

- Partners (n=296)
  - Members: 15
  - UARI*: 43
  - National/Regional: 29
  - Civil: 9
  - Other: 3

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

By Relationship with the CGIAR, 2006

Average number of Centers

Total
- One: 24
- 2–5: 44
- 6–10: 12
- 11–15: 8

Members
- One: 9
- 2–5: 27
- 6–10: 18
- 11–15: 24

Partners
- One: 27
- 2–5: 46
- 6–10: 10
- 11–15: 4
Description of Surveyed Stakeholders

2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of specialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWMi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldFish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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></td>
<td># Collaborators</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td># Collaborators</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT 537</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR 228</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT 116</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP 400</td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICARDA** 104</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRAF 175</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRISAT 103</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI 96</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITA 93</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI 283</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPGRI 356</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRRI 591</td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWMI 112</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDA 34</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldFish 283</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19%</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).
Detailed Methodology

• In total, 1,269 stakeholders (94 Members 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>WARDA</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

• In cases where more than one Member representative responded to the survey on behalf of a single Member, their responses were weighted down to equal one. Multiple representatives responded for a total of three Members.

• 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 asked to evaluate the CGIAR overall.

• To avoid distortion of results, the weighting variable was not applied to questions pertaining to influence and communications.
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?
Questionnaire

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
Questionnaire

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
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
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
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
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
Questionnaire

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
Questionnaire

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
Questionnaire

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:__________________________
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
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 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

[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.
Questionnaire

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?