

a

**IFAD**

**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Executive Board – Eighty-eighth Session**

Rome, 13-14 September 2006

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE PRESIDENT**

TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD ON A PROPOSED

**GRANT UNDER THE COUNTRY-SPECIFIC GRANTS WINDOW**

TO THE

**INTERNATIONAL RICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE (IRRI)**

FOR THE

**PROGRAMME FOR ACCELERATING AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY  
ADOPTION TO ENHANCE RURAL LIVELIHOODS IN DISADVANTAGED  
DISTRICTS OF INDIA**

**For: Approval**

---

## **Note to Executive Board Directors**

This document is submitted for approval by the Executive Board.

To make the best use of time available at Executive Board sessions, Directors are invited to contact the following focal point with any technical questions about this document before the session.

### **Ganesh Thapa**

Regional Economist

tel.: +39-06-5459-2098

e-mail: [g.thapa@ifad.org](mailto:g.thapa@ifad.org)

Queries regarding the dispatch of documentation for this session should be addressed to:

### **Deirdre McGrenra**

Governing Bodies Officer

tel.: +39-06-5459-2374

e-mail: [d.mcgrenra@ifad.org](mailto:d.mcgrenra@ifad.org)

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>I. BACKGROUND</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. RATIONALE AND RELEVANCE TO IFAD</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III. PROPOSED PROGRAMME</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IV. KEY PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>V. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND BENEFITS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>VI. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>VII. INDICATIVE COSTS AND FINANCING</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>VIII. RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
<b>I. LIST OF 150 DISADVANTAGED DISTRICTS SELECTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. PROPOSED PROCESSING STEPS AND SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE CONSORTIA PROPOSALS UNDER COMPONENT 3 OF NAIP AND THE IFAD GRANT FACILITY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. GOVERNANCE MECHANISM FOR NAIP IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV. LOGFRAME</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>V. PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>10</b>



**ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

IARC	International Agricultural Research Centre
ICAR	Indian Council of Agricultural Research
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
NAIP	National Agricultural Innovation Project (World Bank)
PIU	project implementation unit

**RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**

It is recommended that the Executive Board approve the recommendation as contained in paragraph 19.

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF IFAD  
TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD ON A PROPOSED  
GRANT UNDER THE COUNTRY-SPECIFIC GRANTS WINDOW  
TO THE  
INTERNATIONAL RICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE (IRRI)  
FOR THE  
PROGRAMME FOR ACCELERATING AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY ADOPTION  
TO ENHANCE RURAL LIVELIHOODS IN DISADVANTAGED DISTRICTS OF INDIA**

I submit the following report and recommendation on a proposed grant to the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) for the Programme for Accelerating Agricultural Technology Adoption to Enhance Rural Livelihoods in Disadvantaged Districts of India in the amount of US\$1.0 million for a three-year period.

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. Major public investments in irrigation programmes and technology improvements by the Government of India over the last three decades have resulted in substantial increases in agricultural production leading to food self-sufficiency. The major contributor to this growth has been the expanded production of rice and wheat, the two most important food crops of the country. The sector has also diversified, particularly in horticulture and animal husbandry.
2. Despite this progress, however, in more recent years, agricultural performance has weakened in many parts of the country. There is considerable regional variation in the performance of agriculture and a need to accelerate overall growth in the agricultural sector, especially in rainfed areas, which account for nearly 70% of the agricultural land and where the majority of India's rural poor live.
3. Future efforts to accelerate growth in the sector will need to look for increases in productivity, profitability and competitiveness. In this process, the national agricultural research and extension system will play an important role. To support the development of agriculture, the World Bank is assisting India with a new project, the National Agricultural Innovation Project (NAIP), which will help India to exploit its considerable technological opportunities. The goal of NAIP is to contribute to the sustainable transformation of the Indian agricultural sector in support of poverty reduction and income-generation by accelerating the collaborative development and application of agricultural innovations among public research organizations, farmers, the private sector and other stakeholders.

**II. RATIONALE AND RELEVANCE TO IFAD**

4. At the request of the World Bank and with the support of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), IFAD is considering the provision of a grant to finance the participation of International Agricultural Research Centres (IARCs), primarily the centres of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, in conjunction with Component 3 of NAIP. The core objective of Component 3 of NAIP is to contribute to improvements in the incomes and well-being of farm families in mainly rainfed, hill, mountain, dryland and coastal districts that have been left behind in economic development. The proposed IFAD grant (US\$1 million over three years) will complement the estimated financing of US\$73 million to be provided by the World Bank and the Government of India over six years for Component 3 of NAIP. This project was developed in close consultation with

ICAR, the World Bank, four IFAD-financed investment projects, farmer groups, state agricultural universities and NGOs. A targeted collaboration of IFAD with the World Bank and ICAR will strengthen the thrust of the country programme towards innovations and leverage the outcomes of a large investment by the World Bank to broaden the technological options available to the poor.

5. The focus of IFAD's support will be to facilitate access to the international experience and best practices so as to accelerate the adoption and transfer of technology to improve the livelihoods of the poor. This will be achieved by encouraging different organizations in both the public and the private sectors with the capacity to address specific livelihood issues to collaborate through the formation of multidisciplinary and multi-institutional partnerships (consortia) to deal with the constraints faced by the poor in increasing the productivity, profitability and sustainability of agricultural production systems. Thus, the consortia will bring together farmers and other client groups, agricultural service providers in research and extension, international research centres, private sector companies involved in input provision, processing and marketing, NGOs, ongoing agricultural development projects, etc. to address constraints on improved livelihoods in a holistic and integrated manner. These objectives of NAIP and, more specifically, of Component 3, are consistent with IFAD's Strategic Framework objective of enhancing the access of the rural poor to agricultural technologies. It is also in line with the strategic thrust of IFAD's regional strategy for Asia and the Pacific, which emphasizes the development of technological options for small farmers in less favoured areas.

### III. PROPOSED PROGRAMME

6. The main objective of the grant will be to accelerate the identification, validation and dissemination of productivity-enhancing and resource-conserving agricultural technologies. The main focus of the programme's interventions will be the resource poor, including small and marginal farmers, the landless, women and the socially excluded, in selected disadvantaged districts of the country identified by the Planning Commission of India, which also include districts covered by IFAD-financed projects in India (Appendix I). The programme will contribute to objective 2 of IFAD's Strategic Framework (enhancing the rural poor's access to technologies) and objective 1 of IFAD's grant policy (promoting pro-poor innovations).

7. The proposed grant facility will be for three years. The first year will focus on organizing consortia in selected disadvantaged districts in different agroecologies for community-level research and the matching of prototype technologies and other interventions with priority needs identified by farmers based on participatory rural assessment, key information surveys, focus-group discussions and participatory needs and opportunity assessment. This process will also identify the specific support to be sought from selected international institutions. On-farm adaptation and validation of selected technologies will proceed in earnest in the second year, followed by the multi-location demonstration of promising technologies, including at sites in districts participating in IFAD-financed loan projects.

### IV. KEY PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES

8. While the exact nature of the inputs required from international institutions will emerge during the preparation phase, past experience suggests that funding from the IFAD grant will be required to finance costs associated with personnel, technical support and capacity-building activities, including training, workshops and meetings. Discussions with centre representatives of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research and national institutions have identified the following potential areas where participation by international institutions could add value:

- inputs based on the social sciences (socio-economic assessment, policy and institutional analysis, impact evaluation, monitoring and evaluation, etc.), which is a weakness of the national system;



- capacity-building in selected areas of the social and life sciences (tools, techniques and processes, including participatory approaches);
- knowledge-sharing based on global experiences in the life and social sciences, including an increasing understanding of institutional models to link smallholders to agribusiness;
- the introduction of innovations from other countries for modification and testing in the target areas of different consortia;
- facilitating inter-institutional collaboration; and
- the performance of a catalytic role in accelerating technological change to improve the livelihoods of the poor.

9. In terms of areas for technological intervention, consultations with ICAR and other stakeholders have highlighted the following common themes that have potential to improve the livelihoods of the poor in different agroecologies:

- the critical importance of promoting technologies and management practices for the sustainable use of soil and water resources;
- a better understanding of and greater attention to the gender dimension of different interventions, especially to reduce drudgery;
- the diversification of production systems (agroforestry, horticulture, fisheries, livestock, organic farming, agriculture-based off-farm activities, rural tourism), with animal agriculture playing an important role in the livelihoods of the poor, especially the landless;
- better access to markets and marketing arrangements;
- value addition through improved post-harvest management systems, including processing;
- the need to improve the robustness of the proposed interventions against changing climate and pests; and
- the need to adapt the proposed interventions to seasonal labour demand, as well as the food needs of the poor.

#### V. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND BENEFITS

10. The **expected outputs** of the programme include:

- the establishment of an environment for the validation of technologies through community-based, decentralized farmer participatory research using the consortia approach;
- the participatory assessment of farmers' demands for technologies at the systems level for each site and recommendation of a package of technologies for adaptation or validation;
- the accelerated adoption of improved technologies through linkages with development agencies, especially IFAD-funded projects; and

- the enhancement of the capacity of selected stakeholders in socio-economic assessment and analytical tools and techniques.

11. **Benefits** of the proposed interventions are expected to include:

- the participation by the poor in deciding on priorities and selecting technological options based on increased information flows and an enhanced capacity to evaluate advice;
- the strengthening of partnerships for development and the dissemination of technologies targeted at disadvantaged areas involving key stakeholders, including farmers, the public research system, the private sector, NGOs and development agencies and projects;
- the improved availability of information for policy reforms to address the underresourced areas of research of relevance to the poor, including women, tribal population, e.g. dryland farming, livestock, integrated management systems, etc.;
- the increased availability and demonstration of improved technologies that increase productivity, reduce the cost of production, enhance the sustainable use of natural resources, especially land and water, and improve the livelihoods of resource-poor households; and
- capacity-building among public research institutions and increased collaboration with the private sector in product development, skill exchange and the transfer of knowledge to farming communities.

12. IFAD may consider funding for a follow-up phase based on the successful completion of the grant.

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

13. The International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) will be the main implementing agency of this grant. It will have the responsibility of coordinating the activities to be financed under the grant facility, ensuring timely inputs from participating international institutions and promoting inter-institutional learning. IRRI has a long experience in coordinating similar externally aided projects involving more than one international centre and it has a strong technical team in the country. Key governance and management systems, including procedures for approval of the proposals agreed under NAIP for the implementation of Component 3, will also apply to the IFAD grant facility. Accordingly, the information summarized below reflects the process outlined in the project appraisal document of NAIP and is summarized in Appendix II.

14. The choice of lead institutions will be influenced by the districts to be covered under the programme. The institutions covering the north-eastern, eastern and low-rainfall areas of western and central Indian agroecologies will play an important role in developing the initial proposals because many of the disadvantaged districts in the Planning Commission list are located in the states covered by these agroecologies.

15. It is planned that consortia partners, to be identified during the preparation phase, will come from public institutions, the private sector, NGOs and representatives of farming communities, including farmer producer groups. Many of the consortia will also include representatives of IFAD-financed loan projects as they are located in disadvantaged districts and will provide ready access to farming communities that have been mobilized to participate in social and economic development activities. In addition, these projects can also facilitate access to on-farm experimental sites and the mainstreaming of successful interventions.

16. The grant facility will be supervised by the World Bank as a part of its regular supervision of NAIP. The governance mechanism for NAIP implementation is shown in Appendix III. As a part of this work, the World Bank will also maintain oversight on the quality of the inputs being provided by international institutions. The findings and recommendations deriving from the supervision work will be shared with IFAD. If considered necessary, IFAD will field missions in collaboration with ICAR and IRRI to supervise the work of various centres of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research in grant-funded activities. A letter will be exchanged between ICAR and IFAD with the objective of defining the role of ICAR, which is the main responsible agency for NAIP, in relation to the grant funding made available by the Fund.

17. The implementing agency will provide IFAD with a six-monthly and a yearly progress report on the activities financed by the grant facility. The grant facility will be subjected to two major reviews to be carried out jointly by ICAR, the World Bank and IFAD. The first will be at the time of the mid-term review of the grant facility and the second around the time of completion of the grant. The logical framework, along with monitoring indicators, is given in Appendix IV.

#### VII. INDICATIVE COSTS AND FINANCING

18. The three-year IFAD grant of US\$1 million will be incremental to the estimated cost of Component 3 of US\$73 million (including contingencies and taxes) to be financed by the World Bank and the Government over six years. The World Bank-Government cost estimate is based on the provision of support for 20 consortia, at an average cost of US\$3.6 million, covering six districts with two blocks per district. The specific activities to be financed through the IFAD grant will include personnel costs; technical support, including travel; capacity building support, including training, workshops and meetings not covered by World Bank-Government contributions; and the incremental administrative and management costs of IRRI. All other activities to be financed under NAIP by the World Bank and the Government will complement the IFAD investment under the grant facility. The total cost of NAIP to be financed by the World Bank and the Government is shown in Appendix IV.

#### Indicative Costs (three years, amounts in US\$)

Budget Line Item	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Grant coordination and logistical support	50 000	25 000	25 000	100 000
Expert consultations and technical backstopping	250 000	200 000	170 000	620 000
Capacity-building, including workshops	100 000	45 000	25 000	170 000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>400 000</b>	<b>270 000</b>	<b>220 000</b>	<b>890 000</b>
Overhead costs	35 000	35 000	40 000	110 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>435 000</b>	<b>305 000</b>	<b>260 000</b>	<b>1 000 000</b>

**VIII. RECOMMENDATION**

19. I recommend that the Executive Board approve the proposed grant in terms of the following resolution:

RESOLVED: that the Fund, in order to finance, in part, the Programme for Accelerating Agricultural Technology Adoption to Enhance Rural Livelihoods in Disadvantaged Districts of India, shall make a grant not exceeding one million United States dollars (US\$1,000,000) to the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) for a three-year programme upon such terms and conditions as shall be substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented to the Executive Board in this Report and Recommendation of the President.

Lennart Båge  
President

APPENDIX I

**LIST OF 150 DISADVANTAGED DISTRICTS SELECTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA<sup>a</sup>**

State	Districts
Andhra Pradesh	Adilabad, Mahbubnagar, Rangareddy, Khammam, Warangal, Nalgonda, Anantpur, Cudappah
Arunachal Pradesh	Upper Subansiri
Assam	Kokrajhar, North Cachar Hills, Karbi Anglong, Dhemaji, North Lakhmipur
Bihar	Araria, Vaishali, Gaya Madhubani, Muzaffarpur, Nawadah, Samstipur, Sheohar, Katihar, Jamui, Lakhisarai, Monghyr, Purnea, Supaul, Darbhanga
Chhattisgarh	Bastar, Dantewada, Kanker, Korias, Sarguja, Jaspur, Dhamtari, Raigarh, Bilaspur, Rajnandgaon
Gujarat	Dangs, Dohad, Panch Mahals, Sabarkantha, Narmada, Banaskantha
Haryana	Satyamev Puram
Himachal Pradesh	Chamba
Jammu & Kashmir	Doda, Kupwara
Jharkhand	Saraikela, Singhbhum West, Godda, Simdega, Gumla, Chatra, Garhwa, Palamau, Lalehur, Lohardagga, Dumka, Jamtara, Sehebganj, Pakur
Karnataka	Chitradurga, Davanagere, Bidar
Kerala	Wayanad
Madhya Pradesh	Jhabua, Mandla, Umaria, Shahdol, Barwani, Khargone, Shivpuri, Sidhi, Tikamgarh, Balaghat, Chattarpur, Betul, Khandwa, Seopur, Dhar
Maharashtra	Gadchiroli, Gondya, Chandrapur, Dhule, Nandurbar, Hingoli, Nanded, Aurangabad, Ahemdnagar, Yawatmal, Bhandara
Manipur	Tamenlong
Meghalaya	South Garo Hills
Mizoram	Siaha
Nagaland	Mon
Orissa	Koraput, Malkangiri, Nabarangpur, Rayagada, Mayurbhanj, Sundergarh, Keonjhar, Phulbani, Boudh, Nuapada, Kalahandi, Sambalpur, Ganjam, Deogarh, Jharsuguda, Sonepur, Bolangir, Dhenkanal
Punjab	Hoshiarpur
Rajasthan	Banswara, Dungarpur, Udaipur, Sirohi, Karauli
Sikkim	North Sikkim
Tamil Nadu	Tiruvannamalia, South Arcot/Cuddalore, Villupuram, Nagapattinam
Tripura	Dhalai
Uttaranchal	Champawat, Tehri Garhwal
Uttar Pradesh	Sonabhadra, Unnao, Raebareli, Sitapur, Hardoi, Fatehpur, Lalitpur, Lakhmipur Kheri, Banda, Chitrakoot, Mirzapur, Kusunagar, Mahoba, Hamirpur, Barabanki
West Bengal	Purulia, Malda, West Midnapur, Bankura, West and North Dinajpur, Murshidabad

<sup>a</sup> Based on three criteria: agricultural productivity per worker, agricultural wage rate and scheduled caste and tribe population.

Within these 150 districts, there are large numbers of potentially rewarding research and development opportunities for consortia on livelihood improvement. In order for the NAIP support under this component to be well focused, a procedure has been developed more precisely to identify areas where consortium activities are eligible for funding by means of an integrated livelihood index. The integrated livelihood index is based on six sub-indices, each with a number of relevant parameters. The six sub-indices are:

**Infrastructure index.** This includes the percentage of inhabited villages having different types of communication facilities, the percentage of inhabited villages having poor approach roads, the percentage of villages not linked by roads, the percentage of inhabited villages having post and

## APPENDIX I

telegraph offices and telephone connections, and the percentage of villages having different government development programmes or schemes.

**Agricultural status index.** This includes the per hectare productivity of rice, wheat, pulses, oilseeds, cotton, sugarcane, fruits and vegetables. Other parameters included are the per animal productivity of meat, milk and eggs. Cropping, irrigation and fertilizer intensity are also considered.

**Nutritional status index.** This includes the consumption of rice, wheat, cereals, pulses, eggs, fish, milk and milk products per capita.

**Economic status index.** The parameters are per capita income and the percentage of the population living below the poverty line.

**Health and sanitation status index.** The indicators considered are per capita expenditure on health, water supply, sanitation and family welfare, and the health sector infrastructure in the district.

**Food availability status.** The parameters included are the per capita availability of rice, wheat, pulses, oilseeds, sugarcane, fruits, vegetables, meat, milk and eggs.

## APPENDIX II

**PROPOSED PROCESSING STEPS AND SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE CONSORTIA PROPOSALS  
UNDER COMPONENT 3 OF NAIP AND THE IFAD GRANT FACILITY<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Steps/Activity</b>	<b>Action</b>
Identification of lead institutions	The project implementation unit (PIU) of NAIP, in consultation with partners in the national agricultural research system, is to identify lead institutions to cover key agroecologies in disadvantaged areas and to publicize objectives, the target group, the approach (guiding principles) and the broad areas to be covered under Component 3.
Invitation to form consortia and to develop a concept note	PIU is to invite lead institutions to: (i) identify potential partners of consortia to undertake research in the agroecology area to be covered; (ii) develop a concept note to address the priority needs of farmers identified through a rapid rural appraisal exercise; and (iii) propose the critical inputs needed from selected IARCs that will add value to the proposal and cannot be easily obtained from national partners. Around five proposals to be financed in the first batch through the sponsored research mechanism are to be invited and processed at the same time.
Evaluation of the concept note	Each concept note will be examined by three peer reviewers and the technical advisory group. Each note will be graded as excellent, very good, good, or unsatisfactory in relation to prescribed criteria (see table). The proceedings of the technical advisory group meeting on the concept note will be discussed in the research advisory committee meeting, where the decision on the note's approval or rejection will be taken.
Release of seed money for the development of the full proposal	For approved concept notes, financial support will be made available from NAIP for the development of a full project proposal. This grant may cover the cost of holding a planning workshop, including travel allowances and daily subsistence allowances, the cost of logistic support for project development and the cost of quick pilot studies such as socio-economic assessments to identify the priority needs of farming communities. Seed funds will be released to the institutes of the consortia leaders. IARCs participating in the consortia will be invited to participate in the preparation of the full proposals and, where appropriate, help with socio-economic assessment and the matching of priority needs with the potential technologies to be validated or developed. IFAD grant funds can be used to finance participation by IARCs. A two-day course will be organized for the benefit of consortia leaders to explain in great detail the requirements and the expectations of the full proposals.
The development of full proposals	A project development workshop will be convened by each consortium leader and involve all potential partners, including IARCs. The workshop's objective will be to refine and develop the consortium proposal and delineate the contributions of each partner. In drafting the project proposal, the team will make a critical assessment of the capabilities of each partner, the proposed technical programme and funding requirements. Training needs at various levels will also be assessed. Participants will also be briefed on the structure and goals of NAIP, funding arrangements, monitoring and evaluation indicators, procurement and financial management rules and environmental and social safeguard measures.
The submission of full proposals	Each consortium leader will compile proceedings of the workshop that will include comments and suggestions given by various participants for modification, improvement and strengthening of the proposal. The final version of the proposal in electronic form will be forwarded by the consortium leader to PIU.

<sup>a</sup> Source: Adapted from information contained in Annex 4 of the NAIP Project Appraisal Document.

## APPENDIX II

Steps/Activity	Action
The evaluation and approval of full proposals	<p>Full proposals will be evaluated on their expected socio-economic and environmental impacts, their degree of inclusion of stakeholders and their multiplier or replication potential. The criteria also include the strength of proposals with respect to monitoring and evaluation, the impact assessment framework, knowledge management and capacity-building. A third set of criteria concerns the strength of the partners in the consortia. A fourth set of criteria concerns the scientific merit of the proposals. Here, the Component 3 technical advisory group will look for logic, evidence of the ability to address high-priority problems, innovation, critical gaps and the needs felt. A fifth set of criteria would cover the degree of ownership and control of the strategic research steps by the rural communities concerned (choice of the relevant questions and topics, definition of methodology, the establishment of protocols, the selection of validation criteria and dissemination pathways and the use of results).</p> <p>PIU will scrutinize each proposal with particular reference to the technical programme, its relevance to Component 3 and the reasonability of the demands made and the overlaps, if any, based on the criteria for evaluation, and it will prepare an information note for the research advisory committee meeting. The finance and procurement officer of PIU-NAIP will examine each proposal from his respective angle. PIU will send each full proposal to five peer reviewers (preferably three should be the same reviewers who examined the concept note). The peer reviewers will examine the suitability of the entire proposal on the basis of all the criteria and submit their report within 30 days from the date of receipt of the complete proposal. A team comprising the PIU member concerned, along with at least two members of the Component 3 technical advisory group, may make a site visit to the consortium lead centre. Finally, the national coordinator concerned will prepare a package (including referee reports) for the consideration of the technical advisory group, which will prepare a recommendation for the research advisory committee.</p> <p>Each proposal, along with the package prepared by PIU and the recommendations of the Component 3 technical advisory group, will be discussed by the research advisory committee for approval. The consortia leaders of rejected proposals will be duly informed, and the comments obtained through the review process will be provided. If this concerns the first round, the consortia leaders will be invited to revise and resubmit their proposals for consideration during the second round.</p>



## SCORING SYSTEM FOR CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS UNDER COMPONENT 3

Item	Weight	Score <sup>a</sup> (out of 10)	Weighted Score
1. Strength of lead institution and the partners (based on a site visit by a designated team)	0.10		
2. Scientific, technological and economic merits of the proposal	0.15		
3. Comprehensiveness of the targets fixed vis-à-vis the benchmarks	0.10		
4. Clarity and quantitative rigor of the benchmark and outcome indicators	0.10		
5. Ex-ante analysis of the likely impact on sociological, environmental and gender equity issues	0.05		
6. Gender equity issues	0.10		
7. Employment-generation, nutritional and income security and stability through diversification and enhancement of factor productivity	0.15		
8. Information and knowledge empowerment and sharing	0.10		
9. Post-project sustainability and horizontal spread of technology and knowledge and results documentation plan	0.05		
10. Relevance and reasonableness of demand for the items under different heads of expenditure and the respective costs	0.05		
11. Participatory development approach	0.05		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.00</b>		

<sup>a</sup> 1-3 unsatisfactory  
4-6 good  
7-8 very good  
9-10 excellent

### GOVERNANCE MECHANISM FOR NAIP IMPLEMENTATION<sup>a</sup>

NAIP includes a number of committees to oversee and guide the implementation of the project. These will also be applicable to the grant facility as a part of Component 3. Among the committees are:

- **National steering committee.** This committee, to be composed of key stakeholders in the national agricultural research system, will oversee all aspects of NAIP. The committee will set policies and provide guidance to ensure the timely achievement of the main goals of the project.
- **Research programme committee.** The main function of this committee will be to assess and select areas for grant funding for consortia under different components of NAIP, including Component 3.
- **Consortium advisory committees.** Each consortium will include a consortium advisory committee for setting priorities, local-level oversight, monitoring implementation and the approval of modifications in the programme during implementation.

The management of Component 3 will be the responsibility of the following committees and advisory groups:

- **Project management committee.** This committee will have direct executive responsibility for sanctioning proposed NAIP-financed activities and for the overall management of all activities related to NAIP, including monitoring and evaluation. The committee will **ensure** liaison with the subject-matter-related divisions of ICAR. The committee will be supported by PIU.
- **Project implementation unit.** Headed by the national director, PIU will be responsible for the coordination of NAIP and for facilitating NAIP implementation. PIU will include four national coordinators, one for each component. PIU also has experts in administration, finance, procurement, monitoring and evaluation, and social and environmental aspects.
- **Component 3 technical advisory group.** This group will be responsible for facilitating and synthesizing peer reviews of research proposals involving scientific and technical assessment for final consideration by the research programme committee. Group members will participate in the annual workshops and, with help from referees, evaluate consortia proposals to be supported under the component and assist in monitoring the progress and the quality of implementation, especially during mid-term reviews.
- **Consortium implementation committee.** The day-to-day coordination and management of the preparation, **implementation** and monitoring and evaluation of each consortium approved by the research programme committee, endorsed by the project management committee and established under Component 3 will be the responsibility of this committee, which includes representation from all the partners.

---

<sup>a</sup> Adapted from the NAIP Appraisal Report.

## APPENDIX IV

## LOGFRAME

<b>Objective Hierarchy</b>	<b>Key Performance Indicators and Targets</b>	<b>Monitoring Mechanisms and Information Sources</b>	<b>Assumptions and Risks</b>
<b>Overall goal</b>			
Contribute to sustained improvement in the incomes and well-being of poor farm families in the disadvantaged areas of India	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase agricultural innovations by project completion</li> <li>• Total agricultural output in the project districts</li> <li>• Average poverty level</li> <li>• Increased incomes among participating farm households</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline and evaluation surveys compared with non-project areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall economic and social situation remains stable</li> <li>• Government increases public investment in agriculture and introduces policy reforms to encourage private-sector participation in agricultural development</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose (Component 3 development objective)</b>			
Sustainable improvements in the livelihoods and food security of rural poor farmers in selected districts in the disadvantaged areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of empowered farmer groups engaged in identifying and implementing collaborative research</li> <li>• Number of technologies jointly tested and disseminated by consortia partners, including the target farmer groups</li> <li>• Increased production among participating farm households</li> <li>• Number of poor small farmers achieving food security</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project monitoring reports</li> <li>• IFAD-World Bank supervision reports, including assessment of: (a) progress of the consortia approach in involving IARCs and the target farmer groups; and (b) effectiveness of the technologies promoted in improving the livelihoods of the poor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibilities fully devolved to consortia by ICAR</li> <li>• Participating leading and partner public institutions show commitment to participatory approaches that empower poor farming communities and encourage participation by NGOs and the private sector</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX IV

Objective Hierarchy	Key Performance Indicators and Targets	Monitoring Mechanisms and Information Sources	Assumptions and Risks
<b>Component 3 outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1:</b> Successful facilitation of an enabling environment for the validation and dissemination of technologies through community-based decentralized farmer participatory research using the consortia approach and the participation of IARCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation of researchers in consortia in technology identification and validation with farmers and community-based organizations in selected sites</li> <li>• Changed attitudes and perceptions among public-sector research leaders and managers regarding partnership with farmers, NGOs and the private sector</li> <li>• Number of partnerships in place involving all the stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports and annual planning workshops</li> <li>• World Bank-IFAD supervision mission reports</li> <li>• Attitude survey among leaders research and managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The availability of active community-based organizations, NGOs and private-sector organizations at the project sites involved in agriculture</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2:</b> Participatory assessment of farmer demands for technologies at the systems level for each site and a package of technologies recommended for adaptation or validation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participatory rural appraisals and other participatory techniques applied with multidisciplinary teams and supporting documents prepared and disseminated for future reference and capacity-building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project progress reports</li> <li>• Guidelines and other supporting materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local communities provide full cooperation</li> <li>• Researchers and other development partners are committed to working in disadvantaged areas</li> </ul>
<b>Output 3:</b> Adoption of improved technologies are facilitated through linkages with development agencies, including IFAD loan projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of two technologies adopted by at least 30% of farmers in the loan project districts included</li> <li>• Extent of spread of recommended technologies beyond pilot sites</li> <li>• The socially marginalized, including women and the landless, benefit from the increase in production</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline and end-of-project impact evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient quality resources are allocated by each consortium and NAIP to establish the baseline and evaluate impact</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX IV

<b>Objective Hierarchy</b>	<b>Key Performance Indicators and Targets</b>	<b>Monitoring Mechanisms and Information Sources</b>	<b>Assumptions and Risks</b>
<b>Output 4:</b> Enhanced capacity in public research institutions in socio-economic assessment using participatory tools and techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of training sessions and workshops held</li> <li>• Number of national agricultural research system collaborators allocating increased resources to socio-economic work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project progress report and end-of-project report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skilled personnel in the social sciences are available and retained within the public research system</li> </ul>

APPENDIX V

**PROJECT COSTS**  
**INDIA: NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION PROJECT**  
**(US\$ million)**

<b>Project Costs by Component and Subcomponent</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>Foreign</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>A. Strengthening ICAR</b>			
1. Information, communication and dissemination system	14.67	1.48	16.15
2. Business planning and development	7.41	1.46	8.87
3. Learning and capacity-building	1.88	1.84	3.72
4. Strengthening the national agricultural research system in policy and gender analysis	2.92	0.16	3.08
5. Remodelling the financial and procurement system	3.14	0.13	3.27
6. The project implementation unit	5.20	0.26	5.46
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>35.22</b>	<b>5.33</b>	<b>40.55</b>
<b>B. Sustainable improvement in the value chain</b>	<b>63.60</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>65.81</b>
<b>C. Collaborative research for livelihood improvement</b>	<b>62.86</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>63.56</b>
<b>D. Basic and strategic research</b>	<b>41.17</b>	<b>8.77</b>	<b>49.94</b>
<b>Total baseline costs</b>	<b>202.85</b>	<b>17.01</b>	<b>219.86</b>
Physical contingencies	0.82	0.03	0.85
Price contingencies	28.08	1.21	29.29
<b>Total project costs <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>231.75</b>	<b>18.25</b>	<b>250.00</b>
<b>Total financing required</b>	<b>181.75</b>	<b>18.25</b>	<b>200.00</b>

<sup>a</sup> Identifiable taxes and duties are US\$2.5 million, and the total project cost, net of taxes, is US\$247.5 million.