

Impact Assessment in the CGIAR

-- Synopsis --

Background

At its August and October 1994 meetings, the Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization Committee (PARC) of the CGIAR identified the need for more information on the impact of CGIAR activities on the goals of its mission. This need stems from donor requests for public awareness material in support of their resource mobilization efforts. Consequently, PARC established a Task Force on Impact Assessment with broad representation of the CGIAR: Iain MacGillivray (CIDA, Canada,) as chair, and Rob van den Berg (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands), Hans Gregersen (TAC member), Geoffrey Hawtin (Director General, IPGRI), Philip Pardey (Impact Assessment Expert, IFPRI), and Michael Collinson (Science Advisor, CGIAR Secretariat) as members.

In parallel to PARC, the Study Panel on CGIAR Long-Term Governance and Funding Structure (August-September 1994) emphasized the need for the CGIAR to improve the degree of impact achieved and the recognition thereof, to maintain credible output and performance measures and evaluation systems, and to mount a systemwide effort to develop systematic and continuous processes for impact assessment.

These views were supported by the Oversight Committee (September 1994) and by the CGIAR (ICW94), and were endorsed at the CGIAR Ministerial-Level Meeting (February 1995). The latter requested, *inter alia*, that the CGIAR "strengthen the assessment of its performance and impact by establishing an independent evaluation function reporting to the CGIAR as a whole". This was further elaborated upon in a discussion paper produced by the CGIAR Secretariat¹. Since then and following consultations including with the Chair and members of the Task Force on Impact Assessment, the CGIAR Chair proposed to set up an independent "CGIAR Impact Assessment Group"².

Assignment of the Task Force on Impact Assessment

Following the developments since October 1994, the terms of reference of the PARC Task Force were enlarged to encompass the broader range of impact assessment beyond donors' immediate public awareness needs, such as: 1) assessing what Centers currently are doing in impact assessment; 2) determining which impacts should be assessed and at what levels; 3) linking impact assessment with the issues of public awareness and resource mobilization; 4) developing a systematic and Systemwide process for impact assessment; and 5) proposing a mechanism for impact assessment in the system.

¹ "Strengthening Evaluations in the CGIAR: Needs and Options", Selcuk Ozgediz, March 1995.

² CGIAR Chair letter to Heads of Delegation, dated April 6, 1995.

The Task Force considered that each Center has a variety of products and a large number of clients. The comprehensive monitoring and measurement of impact for all products for all clients is prohibitively expensive. Each Center needs an impact assessment strategy which best satisfies its stakeholders' demands for evidence of effectiveness, and its own needs for least expensive feedback to future planning.

The Task Force further considered that the Centers' perspective needs to be supplemented at the System level to provide insight into the impact and effectiveness of the entire Group.

Action Program of the Task Force on Impact Assessment

The Task Force proceeded in two steps.

The first step consisted in a *consultants' study* aimed at starting the development of an impact assessment strategy to provide greater insights into CGIAR performance in a cost effective way. The terms of reference for the study included: (1) identification of the needs for, and strategic objectives of, impact assessment within the CGIAR at the Center and System levels; (2) an outline of the range of approaches useful to impact assessment in the CGIAR; (3) identification of the current roles and existing efforts of CGIAR entities in impact assessment; (4) current and future needs and objectives not now addressed at the CGIAR level, and approaches and methods of assessment useful to deal with these; and (5) key principles and some options for institutionalizing impact assessment within the CGIAR.

The study has been undertaken by Task Force member Philip Pardey, in collaboration with Julian Alston³. The consultants' study, an earlier paper on impact from the CGIAR Secretariat⁴, the latest version of Selcuk Ozgediz's paper referred to earlier, and the Task Force commentary which will include preliminary recommendations will be made available to MTM95 participants in advance of the meeting.

The Task Force will hold a *workshop* to promote active participation from all parties in the discussion of the consultants' report and Task Force proposed recommendations, which will be conveyed to the CGIAR during MTM95.

Areas of Emphasis in the Task Force Program of Work

Consistent with the emphasis by the Task Force in its work program, the workshop discussion will focus on two areas of impact assessment:

³ Department of Agricultural Economics, University of California at Davis.

⁴ "The Impact of the International Agricultural Research Centers: Measurement, Quantification, and Interpretation", M. Collinson and E. Tollens, July 1994.

- ◆ the impact assessment *strategy* and *methodology*:
 - expectations from and limitations to impact assessment, i.e. the intrinsic uncertain character of research;
 - impact assessment strategies from the perspective of donors, Centers, national agricultural research system (NARS), and the CGIAR system; and,
 - impact measurement and attribution issues in the main areas of work of the CGIAR, i.e. productivity, sustainability, policy, and institution building.

- ◆ the optimal *organizational structure* for effective and efficient System impact assessment:
 - the allocation of responsibilities for impact assessment among existing actors (centers, TAC) and other actors (such as NARS and the CGIAR Impact Assessment Group);
 - linkages between the various actors;
 - a mechanism for priority setting of System-level impact assessments; and
 - the establishment of a central data bank on impact and information flow.

Venue of the Workshop

The workshop will be held in the Crystal Room of the Grand Regency Hotel, Nairobi, Kenya, on Saturday May 20, 1995 (2:00 PM - 5:30 PM) and Sunday May 21, 1995 (9:00 AM - 12:00 PM).

**CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
PUBLIC AWARENESS AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE**

TASK FORCE ON IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PROVISIONAL PROGRAM OF A WORKSHOP ON IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**Crystal Room, Grand Regency Hotel
Nairobi, Kenya**

SATURDAY MAY 20 and SUNDAY MAY 21, 1995

Saturday May 20, 1995

2.00 PM Welcome, Objectives and Organization of the Workshop :

Robert Herdt, Rockefeller Foundation, Workshop Chair

2.15 Strategic Perspectives on Enhancing Impact Assessment in the CGIAR

Philip Pardey, Task Force member and consultant

**Discussants: Paul Egger, Swiss Development Cooperation
James Ryan, ICRISAT (to be confirmed),
National Agricultural Research System Representative
(name to be confirmed)**

Floor discussion

3:45 Coffee break

4.00 Measurement Issues in Impact Assessment

Introduction by Panel, chaired by Robert Herdt:

**Thomas Walker, CIP -- Productivity
Anne-Marie Izac, ICRAF -- Sustainability
Douglas Horton, ISNAR -- Institution Building
Philip Pardey, IFPRI -- Policy**

Floor discussion

5.20 Closing Summary

Robert Herdt, Workshop Chair

Sunday May 21, 1995

9.00 AM Introduction to Organizational Issues in CGIAR Impact Assessment

Robert Herdt, Workshop Chair

9.05 Presentation of a Possible Institutional Model for System Impact Assessment

Iain MacGillivray , Chair, Task Force on Impact Assessment

Discussants:

***Priority Setting and Resource Allocation Perspective:*
Donald Winkelmann, TAC Chair**

***Accountability Perspective:*
Michel Petit, Chair, Finance Committee**

***Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization Perspective:*
Per Pinstруп-Andersen, Chair, PARC**

Floor discussion

10:15 Coffee break

10:30 Task Force Views on Selected Topics

Expectations and Limitations of Impact Assessment, Division of Responsibilities in a Systemwide Institutional Impact Assessment Model, Central Gathering of Impact Assessment Information and Flow of Information, Priority Setting of System Impact Assessment Activities.

Chair: Robert Herdt

**Panel: Iain MacGillivray, Geoffrey Hawtin, Rob van den Berg,
Philip Pardey, Michael Collinson**

Floor discussion

11:45 Summing up and Formulation of Conclusions

Robert Herdt, Workshop Chair

12:00 PM Closing of the Workshop

**CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
PUBLIC AWARENESS AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE**

TASK FORCE ON IMPACT ASSESSMENT

-- Interim Commentary and Working Conclusions --

Introduction

In November of 1994, the Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization Committee (PARC) formally established a Task Force on Impact Assessment (IA) with terms of reference (TORs) to: 1) assess what Centers currently are doing in impact assessment; 2) determine which impacts should be assessed and at what levels; 3) link impact assessment with the issues of public awareness and resource mobilization; 4) develop a systematic and Systemwide process for IA; and, 5) propose a mechanism for IA in the system.

The IA Task Force met twice to deliberate on the various issues covered by the TORs. The Task Force also commissioned a consultants' report on research evaluation requirements in the CGIAR. The following is the Task Force's commentary on the present state of its thinking, after input from the consultants' report, on the five topics covered in its TORs. It is prefaced by an overview of the needs for IA in the System.

Need for IA in the CGIAR System

CGIAR members have made it quite clear in various ways¹ that they want a clearer assessment of the impacts on world hunger and environmental degradation of the research and other activities carried out by the System's Centers. This need was most recently re-confirmed at the CGIAR Ministerial-Level meeting², held in Lucerne, Switzerland, in February 1995. CGIAR members see three applications for impact assessment information:

- justification of past research investment;
- public awareness and resource mobilization; and,
- priority setting for future resource allocation.

¹ At its August and October 1994 meetings, the PARC of the CGIAR identified the need for more information on the impact of CGIAR activities on the goals of its mission, mainly to meet donors' requests for public awareness material in support of their resource mobilization efforts. In parallel to PARC, the Study Panel on CGIAR Long-Term Governance and Funding Structure (August-September 1994) emphasized the need for the CGIAR to improve the degree of impact achieved and of recognition of that impact, to maintain credible output and performance measures and evaluation systems, and to mount a systemwide effort to develop systematic and continuous processes for impact assessment. These views were supported by the Oversight Committee (September 1994) and by the CGIAR (ICW94).

² The CGIAR Ministerial-Level meeting requested, *inter alia*, the CGIAR to "strengthen the assessment of its performance and impact by establishing an independent evaluation function reporting to the CGIAR as a whole".

Assumptions and anecdotal information on positive impacts have been used for decades to justify investments in the System. Much of the justification has been based on evidence of distant past achievements such as the Green Revolution, rather than on current examples of impacts. CGIAR members are now saying that an expanded effort in this area is needed: they see the information as crucial for justifying future funding requests in their own budget processes and for making the public more aware of the contributions of CGIAR Centers.

Centers have long recognized the need for impact assessment activity, both as a means of explaining the contributions they make to CGIAR goals, but also as a source of input into their internal budget formulation and allocation processes.

Ex ante IA - or an assessment of the likely future impacts of current or planned investments - is needed as an input in making decisions that help to improve allocative efficiency in the System. Some Centers used this in the development of their Medium Terms Plans (MTP), and at the System level priority setting falls within the responsibility of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Performance monitoring is undertaken in a selective way at the Centers who use a variety of methods – including adoption studies and farmer or other beneficiary assessments -- to assess the effectiveness, and consequently adjust, their on-going program activities. At the System level it is managed by the external review mechanism under the responsibility of TAC for program matters, and the CGIAR Secretariat for management matters. External reviews monitor the processes that the Centers have in place for various functions, including impact assessment.

Ex post IA - or an assessment of the impacts of past investments in research and in other activities is done at most Centers, usually on selected projects and programs with an eye to donor interest in such information. Currently there is no mechanism for *ex post* impact assessment at the System level and it is this gap that the new function or group will fill. The consultants' report stresses the need for impact assessment based on economic surplus models, and includes discussion of the use of such models in a priority setting framework. This commentary deals mainly with its use in raising public awareness and resource mobilization.

What are Centers currently doing in IA?

The main assessment of the impacts of the work of scientists on science is through peer review and is evidenced by citations by other scientists. While the Task Force recognizes this important point, in what follows, the focus is on the impacts of research in the System on its ultimate objectives - hunger and poverty alleviation, and the reduction of environmental degradation.

IA activities in the System are focused at present in the Centers, close to where the research has been carried out. A number of Centers have been doing impact assessments for some time. The consultants' report (see Section 5) outlines ongoing work at the Centers and notes the priority setting work managed in the TAC Secretariat. IA is not yet a

systematic activity in most Centers, partly because it is a time consuming, expensive activity if done properly. It also takes away the time of social scientists from other crucial research functions in the Centers.

If IA were to be recognized as a formal requirement in the System, and one that all Centers would participate in as a matter of course, then it would necessarily become an additional budget item for all Centers, which would provide social science expertise in addition to that needed for on-going research. The Task Force endorses this incremental need: it is concerned that past IA activity has removed skilled social science capacity from participation in the research process itself, because additional resources were not made available. While it is desirable to have scientists involved with the assessment of the impacts of their work, a balance is needed. Centers need to avoid taking them away from their main research responsibilities for too much of their time. This can result both in reduced productivity and dissatisfaction on the part of the scientists.

Which Impacts should be Assessed and at What Levels

The Task Force recognizes full well that funds and expertise are scarce and limited for IA work. Thus, choices have to be made.

The Task Force notes that if there is to be true independence and transparency in the IA function in the System, there are bound to be negative results, i.e. investments that have not had positive impacts justifying their funding. These "dry holes" are to be expected, as uncertainty is the nature of research. But "dry holes" should not, and do not, wait to be discovered by *ex post* impact assessment. Effective performance monitoring controls the continued funding for such applications. Research managers who monitor effectively will be redirecting the research effort, seeking answers from new sources. The penalty for "dry holes" will be higher research costs and a longer timescale to solutions.

The fact that a project within a larger program has not had measurable positive impacts on food production or other economic measure of benefit does not necessarily mean that the research (or other activity) *per se* was not worth undertaking. Negative results can be as valuable as positive ones in the long sweep of science, as they rule out options and other ones replace those.

With regard to which impacts should be given priority for *ex post* assessment, the logical conclusion is that it should be given to the most important programs - those with the likely greatest positive "values". Similarly, programs that use the most resources should have higher priority than those that use limited resources. The Task Force recognizes that certain types of impacts are easier to assess than others. For example, the impacts of commodity research are easier to assess than those of sustainability, policy or social science research. However, ease of assessment/measurement should not be the main guide for choice of priorities.

With regard to levels at which impacts should be assessed, the Task Force recognizes that assessment of impacts at the project or narrow activity level is expensive

and difficult to interpret. The Task Force concludes that *ex post* impact assessment at any lower level than the broad program level should have very low priority.

The Task Force consultants' report provides a useful, in-depth discussion of types of impacts and appropriate levels for assessment (see Section 2). Based on that report and its own deliberations, the Task Force suggests that those assigned responsibility for impact assessment activity, whether at the System or at the Center level, should give priority to:

a) defining and estimating the impacts that appear intuitively to be the relatively most important, positive ones of the Center or System -- though not necessarily the easiest to assess; and

b) assessing those impacts in relation to some measure of total costs associated with the program or Center in which the research having impact was done (or is being done).

As an example, the main impacts of a given Center's work might be compared to the total cost of running that Center. If results are positive (in terms of whatever criteria are chosen for judgment), then one can conclude, based on the assumptions and estimates used, that those key achievements have produced enough positive impact to justify the funding of the Center. If results are negative (in terms of the criteria chosen) then it will be a challenge for assessors to elaborate benefits in terms of other criteria as part of a review of the value of the program.

The Task Force believes that this selective, pragmatic approach is a useful way to initiate work on IA. It is an approach used by several Centers: CIAT, CIMMYT and more recently CIP are examples. One could eventually aggregate impact assessment results across Centers. However, the Task Force cautions that there is a significant danger in attempting to aggregate information to attempt a system wide analysis until IA is done on a consistent basis across Centers.

How does Impact Assessment Link to Issues of Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization?

Both *ex post* and *ex ante* impact assessment work can provide input for public awareness and resource mobilization activities. Such results will only be useful in these activities if the information comes from credible sources and if it is provided in the broader context within which the impacts occur; this relates both to the attribution problem, e.g. Centers vs. NARS, to the issue raised above regarding the value of negative results in the broader sweep of science, and to several other key context issues.

At the System level there is a notable gap in capacity for *ex post* impact assessment. It is this gap which the new function or group will fill. Again, and for the same reasons, the Task Force believes that the group will need to adopt a selective, pragmatic approach in what it undertakes.

In terms of public awareness and resource mobilization a number of strategic purposes may guide the selection of IA work and its focus. The study of CGIAR performance at the country level is one particularly attractive strategy: How has the System as a whole benefited one country ?

- It creates opportunities to show potential, new developing country members why they should join the CGIAR.
- It creates opportunities to court bilateral donors by focusing on developing countries which are pillars of their own ODA. Evidence of strong country level impact may persuade them to increase their CGIAR contribution -- or less positively perhaps, not to reduce them. Furthermore, it might encourage these countries to invest more in the NARS of the countries of interest.
- It offers opportunities to work with NARS -- thereby alleviating the difficult problem of attribution -- and, by the level of economic benefit shown, to persuade the authorities of the developing country (e.g. the Ministry of Finance) to invest in domestic agricultural research.

This third opportunity could be particularly valuable in developing countries with major ecoregional initiatives as a way of drawing senior ministries into the ecoregional program at the policy level. Likewise, the demonstration of beneficial spill-over of CGIAR work in donor countries may enhance CGIAR's attractiveness for senior officials in these countries.

Although not specifically requested to do so by the PARC, the Task Force, particularly through its consultants' report, also deals with the question of how impact assessment links to issues of allocative efficiency. Centers have to not only carry out such assessments, but also develop effective means for actually infusing their results into their program planning.

Over time, such impact assessment activities should become a regular part of all Centers' programs.

This issue of impact assessments for allocative efficiency is important in the System, particularly for Center planning activities. Improved allocative efficiency can ultimately result in positive impacts on public awareness and resource mobilization, particularly if the improved efficiency leads to greater human impacts for a given dollar budget. The consultants' report covers this topic in some detail.

The Task Force agrees on the need for rigor and a core of hard information to build up confidence in the System and its work. It needs to be said, however, that full economic surplus modeling requires extensive data and normally represents a significant investment of professional time and operating budget.

Thus, it is clear that less sophisticated and less ambitious methods have significant value for PARC purposes. A striking example comes from CIAT; by adding several questions to the annual survey of the Department of Statistics in Rwanda in 1993, CIAT

was able to state with confidence that 450,000 Rwandan families were growing improved climbing beans based on CIAT material. Such information can be equally robust, perhaps even more so than full analysis, but it is also less comprehensive.

Thus the Task Force sees the need for a balance between economic surplus models for impact assessment and more descriptive assessments of success and indicators of progress. Other such dimensions include:

- Improvement in the situation in survey or casestudy households.
- Adoption by farmers of soil conservation measures.
- Differential effects on the livelihoods of men and women in communities.
- Aggregate impacts on production.
- Measurements of the extent of genetic diversity conserved.

As material for PARC purposes these have a high level of appeal. As the consultants' report points out, such information can be an intermediate output from full economic analysis. The Task Force would add that circumstances will often warrant less sophisticated analytical methods because of the greater coverage to be achieved due to their lower costs.

What type of Systematic and Systemwide Process Should be Developed?

The Task Force concluded that there is need for expanded impact assessment work in the System in a number of different areas. Figure 1 provides an initial attempt to identifying the roles of, and the overall impact assessment process needed in, the CGIAR System. The cells in this figure will be dealt with in more detail in the Task Force's progress report.

In this regard, the recent development of systemwide programs and initiatives provides a new opportunity to conduct impact assessment on themes or thrusts, cutting across activities of several Centers (and partner institutions).

What Type of Mechanism Would Best Serve the Needs of the System

Given the widespread needs and roles for impact assessment in the System, as indicated in figure 1, the Task Force concludes that a hierarchy of mechanisms will be needed in the System, with the brunt of actual impact assessment work remaining in the Centers.

Such a hierarchy might include, as suggested by the CGIAR Chair, in his letter to Heads of Delegations, dated April 6, 1995, an independent, system level mechanism, or

Such a hierarchy might include, as suggested by the CGIAR Chair, in his letter to Heads of Delegations, dated April 6, 1995, an independent, system level mechanism, or "CGIAR Impact Assessment Group" (IAG) to "provide focused leadership, guidance, oversight and support to *ex post* impact assessment activities throughout the System." In addition, such a Group might have the role of providing guidance and support to Centers in *ex ante* impact assessment work. The general functions of an IAG are given in the Chairman's April 6 letter. The Task Force endorses the role for the IAG, namely, that it would be asked to:

- provide oversight and guidance to *ex post* impact assessment activities within the CGIAR, including the area of impact assessment methodologies, and recommend appropriate CGIAR or Center action;
- generate, or ensure the generation of, comprehensive and up to date information on the impact of the CGIAR as a System in close collaboration with the Centers, TAC and partner institutions;
- facilitate the strengthening of the System's impact assessment capabilities.

The Task Force believes that such a function, using a Group operation with a prominent Chair, could be housed at a range of institutions where the Panel could be serviced. These include: TAC, with its secretariat servicing the IAG; in a wholly independent organization, perhaps a prominent university where the Panel Chair is a staff member; or, given the emphasis placed by the consultants on the need for a Systemwide database (which the Task Force fully supports), at IFPRI/ISNAR as a widening of their systemwide initiative on databases. Each has advantages and disadvantages, and the selection of an option will be determined by the relative weight given to criteria such as the need for closeness to the CGIAR strategy and priority setting and operations or, quite the opposite, the need for independence from these functions, or the closeness to Centers' research and related IA work. In the view of the Task Force ownership by the Centers of the option adopted will ensure an effective partnership. Whichever option is taken up will be heavily dependent on the Centers' cooperation.

In addition, the enhanced structure would include strengthened impact assessment capacity in the Centers, both *ex ante* and *ex post*, since most realistic assessments for planning purposes include elements of both. This capacity would have to be explicitly recognized by CGIAR members as an add-on expense and budget item for the Centers, in order to avoid seconding critically needed social science researchers from their crucial roles in the research programs themselves.

At some level - details remain to be worked out - there will be need for more explicit links with NARS to help support and strengthen IA capacity and activity in them. In a partnership situation, it will not help if only one partner develops expanded IA capacity. All partners need to work together in situations of joint funding/cost and joint outputs. The problems of attribution cannot be avoided unless partnership is carried over into the area of IA.

Concluding Comments

The discussion above provides an interim report from the PARC Task Force on IA. It provides some tentative conclusions based on the Task Force's work to date. The Nairobi Workshop on Impact Assessment will help provide constructive input into the report to be made by The Task Force Chair to the Mid-Term Meeting.

A number of crucial issues and details remain to be resolved and defined, including the logistics of the IAG, its location, the most appropriate way in which to provide it secretariat support, and its links to TAC, CGIAR committees, and to Centers. However, the Task Force feels certain that these details can be worked out smoothly and quickly.

Beyond this, the Task Force feels it important for its mission to provide some systematic discussion on the potential dangers of moving too quickly into expanded impact assessment work, particularly if the results of such assessments start to guide investment decisions. For example, Centers might focus on activities for which impacts are more easily estimated. Or they might focus on research for which they believe that immediate impacts will be higher, rather than focusing on long term objectives that provide greater overall benefits, but where impacts will not occur for some time. These aspects will further occupy Task Force members in the lead up to the Nairobi Workshop.

April 1995

FIGURE 1: Systemwide Roles and Processes for Impact Assessment

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY OR PROCESS	ROLES		
	SYSTEM LEVEL	CENTER LEVEL	NARS LEVEL
EX ANTE ASSESSMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Provide inputs for TAC Priority setting; > Provide information for justifying funding requests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Provide key information for planning programs and improving allocative efficiency; > Provide information to support center requests for funding; > Provide input in negotiations for cooperation and coordination with NARS and other centers; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Help NARS to develop improved planning mechanisms and results; > Provide help in developing national planning systems.
MONITORING AND EVALUATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Provide information for external reviews; > Provide information for on-going donor deliberations on progress in agricultural research and development; > Monitor agricultural performance and relate this to CGIAR activity; > Provide public awareness of the CGIAR and its accomplishments; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Provide centers with crucial information for redirecting priorities, programs, and budgets; > Establish on-going data sources for planning purposes; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Help NARS to develop improved on-going planning mechanisms and improved results; > Provide help in developing national planning systems.
EX POST ASSESSMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Justify investment in agricultural research, both at the national and international levels, both to NARS governments and donors; > Provide government with a view of the impacts of the CGIAR System at the country level; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Provide the center with a perspective on its past work; > Provide centers with information that is useful in dealing with its NARS counterparts and with donors; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Help NARS to develop the baseline data and process for IA (which is necessary in their own political contexts for funding).