

# Field testing an econometric conceptual framework for innovation platform impact assessment

Jean-Joseph CADILHON, Agricultural Economist, Policy Trade and Value Chains Program, ILRI – j.cadilhon@cgiar.org

## Context

ILRI has been establishing IPs as equitable, dynamic spaces designed to bring heterogeneous actors together to exchange knowledge and take action to solve a common problem

Methods to assess the impact of IPs have mainly used qualitative methods or cost-benefit analysis

There are no previous examples of using quantitative econometric tools to evaluate the impact of innovation platforms

## Field research methodology

Collect data on IP 'structure' elements through structured interviews of IP facilitators or secretariat

Refer to the IP's objectives as determined by its members to identify 'performance' elements

Conduct focus groups of IP members to identify:

- Field-relevant statements to characterize elements of IP 'conduct' and 'performance'
- Locally relevant thresholds for a five-point indicator of wealth
- Qualitative narratives to illustrate the conceptual framework

Individual survey of IP members to collect individual 'structure' elements and rank their agreement with statements characterizing 'conduct' and 'performance' on 5-rank Likert scale

## Building blocks for the conceptual framework

1. Overall elegant logic from the structure-conduct-performance model of markets
2. Concepts of new institutional economics to make sense of real-life markets
3. Elements of marketing research to characterize the relationships between IP members
4. Marketing and development literature to identify statements that characterize the different elements of IP 'conduct' and 'performance'

## Elements of a conceptual framework to monitor and evaluate the impact of innovation platforms on value chains development

'Structure'	'Conduct'	'Performance'
<p><b>IP 'structure'</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership composition</li> <li>• Decision making process</li> <li>• Committees</li> <li>• Source of funding</li> <li>• Staff availability</li> <li>• Legal and regulatory framework</li> </ul> <p><b>Individual 'structure'</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of chain stakeholder</li> <li>• Gender</li> <li>• Level of education</li> <li>• Indicator of wealth</li> <li>• Cultural norms</li> </ul>	<p>Information sharing</p> <p>Communication</p> <p>Coordination</p> <p>Joint planning</p> <p>Trust</p>	<p><b>Value chain 'performance'</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy</li> <li>• Collective promotion</li> <li>• Joint quality standards</li> <li>• Research &amp; development</li> <li>• Capacity building</li> <li>• Market information</li> <li>• Arbitration of chain conflict</li> <li>• Limit transaction costs</li> <li>• Setting concerted marketing objectives</li> </ul> <p><b>Other objectives set by IP</b></p>

## Data analysis methodology

- Multiple regression analyses to identify statistically significant relationships between elements of the conceptual framework
- Principal component factor analysis to find the best statements that encompass 'conduct' and 'performance' elements
- Content analysis of qualitative data to triangulate results from econometric analysis

## Current partners

- Volta2 project (SNV, CSIR-ARI)
- CRP Policies institutions and markets
- CRP HumidTropics

## Call for further collaboration

More partners welcome to field-test the conceptual framework in their local setting

## 3 strategic lessons on:

### Delivering science

1. More robust results expected from information triangulation
2. First attempt to evaluate IPs with quantitative method
3. Scientific research with high impact & publication potential

### Developing capacity

1. ILRI research fellows will obtain their MSc degree
2. Local field partners will get more familiar with IP evaluation methods
3. IP members will become aware of the importance of evaluating their activities

### Influencing decisions

1. IP facilitators can invest their scarce resources on facilitating elements that most affect IP performance
2. Evidence to beneficiaries that IPs work
3. Evidence to donors that IPs are a good investment to reach outcomes