Annual Review - Summary Sheet

This Summary Sheet captures the headlines on programme performance, agreed actions and learning over the course of the review period. It should be attached to all subsequent reviews to build a complete picture of actions and learning throughout the life of the programme.

Title: Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition

Programme Value: £4,780,000	**Review Date: 11/11/15**

Programme Code: 203202	**Start Date: 01/11/14**	**End Date: 31/10/19**

Summary of Programme Performance

Year	2015							
Programme Score	A							
Risk Rating	M							

Summary of progress and lessons learnt since last review

The independent Executive Secretariat for GODAN has made good progress since January 2015. It has:
- delivered a strong performance at major international open data events and other key events;
- expanded the partner network from 121 to 153;
- co-written, published and communicated two advocacy papers;
- successfully delivered the inception report.

It is too early to tell the outcome and impact of these activities but the momentum building behind GODAN initiative, in terms of partner engagement, is promising. An important moment will be the 2016 GODAN summit (planned for September 2016), where the current momentum will hopefully bear fruit in terms of tangible commitments and deliverables from a wide range of partners.

An important milestone for the GODAN project will be the start of component 2, the research and capacity building component. Good progress has been made on this during the year. An invitation to tender was released during the year and DFID expects to be able to announce the successful supplier in early 2016.

Summary of recommendations for the next year

- The GODAN secretariat to keep up the good progress that has been made since the beginning of 2015.
- The GODAN secretariat to continue its preparations for the 2016 GODAN summit.
- The GODAN secretariat to develop a partner survey to track outcome level indicators.
- GODAN secretariat and DFID to finalise the logframe, vfm indicators and risk register by end of 2015 calendar year.

A. Introduction and Context (1 page)

DevTracker Link to Business Case:	**Business Case**
DevTracker Link to Log frame:	**Logframe**

What support will the UK provide?

The **Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition (GODAN)** initiative is a partnership of national governments, non-governmental, international and private sector organisations that have committed to a joint vision to supports the proactive sharing of open data to make information about agriculture and nutrition available, accessible and usable to deal with the urgent challenges in agriculture and nutrition (see www.godan.info).

The UK will provide funding of up to £4.8 million over five years (November 2014-October 2019) in support of the GODAN initiative. This was officially launched by the Secretary of State at the Open Government Partnership (OGP) Summit in October 2013. Provision of funding to GODAN alongside other funding partners including the governments of the United States and Netherlands will enable:

(i) Core funding to the establishment of an independent Executive Secretariat for GODAN. This will focus on increased coordination, mapping, impact documentation, knowledge management and advocacy amongst partners active in the international agricultural/nutritional open data space. It will be co-funded by several other interested parties (currently the United States and Netherlands governments, CABI and the U.N. Food & Agriculture Organisation)

(ii) Commissioning of a suite of agricultural/nutritional open data research and capacity-building programmes which will be labelled as a UK-specific contribution to GODAN objectives

(iii) Procurement of two independent evaluations and other ongoing monitoring activities to allow for independent assessment and lesson-learning from GODAN funding investments.

Why is UK support required?

"The world is witnessing the growth of a global movement facilitated by technology and social media and fuelled by information – one that contains enormous potential to create more accountable, efficient, responsive, and effective governments and businesses, and to spur economic growth. Open data sit at the heart of this global movement. Access to data allows individuals and organizations to develop new insights and innovations that can improve the lives of others and help to improve the flow of information within and between countries. While governments and businesses collect a wide range of data, they do not always share these data in ways that are easily discoverable, useable, or understandable by the public. This is a missed opportunity"[1].

Parallel to the global open data trend, another global challenge is emerging- how to achieve a sustainable increase in agricultural productivity, needed to help the world address the joint challenges of feeding a global population forecast to grow to over 9 billion people by 2050, of adapting to climate change and of reducing the environmental footprint of agriculture? There is also a need to promote food and nutrition security and to promote economic growth and rural development. Addressing the food security challenge is urgent and encompasses several dimensions including increasing food production, improving human health including better nutrition and diet and reducing waste and losses.

GODAN was established by the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States in 2013 to address both the challenges and opportunities at the intersection of these open data, agriculture and

---

[1] Cabinet Office (2013) G8 Open Data Charter and Technical Annex
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/open-data-charter/g8-open-data-charter-and-technical-annex

nutrition communities. Whilst the UK and US governments have taken the strategic lead in development of GODAN to date, we are keen to build upon the commitments of new partners to upscale our efforts.

The GODAN Executive Secretariat will help build international momentum and facilitate lesson-learning, impact documentation and common advocacy messages amongst GODAN partners, but is not an implementation body with operational funding to run its own programmes. This is to ensure it does not compete with the activities of its members.

There are still many unanswered research questions about (agricultural and nutritional) open data activities, including how best to stimulate user engagement with open data as well as to enhance accessibility and availability; how to ensure that the 'digital divide' between those who do and don't have access to technology doesn't exacerbate inequalities; how to reconcile issues of open data with data privacy etc. It is for these reasons that the UK (DFID) will also fund additional research and capacity-building activities and projects in the agricultural/nutritional open data space.

UK support for GODAN is aligned with the UK's objectives on open data.
- The UK is a lead steward of the International Open Data Charter. This consists of six key principles, namely, that government data must be: 1) Open by Default; 2) Timely and Comprehensive; 3) Accessible and Usable; 4) Comparable and Interoperable; 5) For Improved Governance and Citizen Engagement; 6) For Inclusive Development and Innovation.
- The UK is an anchor member of the Global Partnership on Sustainable Development Data, which includes a commitment by the UK to Open Data and to organising a 2016 GODAN summit. (http://www.data4sdgs.org/commitments/)

B: PERFORMANCE AND CONCLUSIONS (1-2 pages)

Annual outcome assessment

The intended **outcome** of the project is an open agricultural and nutritional data ecosystem that facilitates increased use of agricultural and nutritional open data for enhanced accountability and transparency, improved service delivery, innovation and economic growth.

There are two outcome indicators:

1. Number of partner/stakeholder initiatives that use agricultural and nutritional open data to deliver (a) accountability, (b) better policy making, (c) improved operational efficiency, (d) new businesses and business innovation and (e) research discoveries;
2. Survey score for effective agriculture and nutrition open data strategies and policies adopted internationally and by partners.

These indicators have no milestones for this point in the project. This was expected for the following reasons:
- The first component of the GODAN programme, the GODAN secretariat, has only just completed its Inception phase.
- Measuring the impact/outcome of open data projects is challenging and is an area of active enquiry. Part of the second component GODAN will look at impact methodologies.
- The GODAN secretariat will set up a survey of GODAN partners and repository of case studies, tools and papers to measure the outcomes. A baseline questionnaire has been implemented but the annual survey and repository are still to be implemented.
- Component 2, the research and capacity building component has yet to start. It is due to start in early 2016. When the second component is underway there is likely to be an extra outcome indicator.
- Component 3, the independent evaluation of components one and two has yet to start.

Overall output score and description

The overall output score is an A, i.e. outputs met expectations.

All of the indicators under the two outputs are meeting their milestones and are scoring an A.

Key lessons

What has worked well?

The GODAN secretariat have been well prepared and put in a strong performance at major international events and this has played an important role in raising the international profile of the GODAN initiative, recruiting new partners and allowing for coordination between existing partners.

The GODAN secretariat has successfully delivered an inception report. This was a key output for the secretariat. Further details and links to the quested documents can be found when reporting progress under output 2.3.

Key actions

See the '**Summary of recommendations for the next year'** section on the summary sheet

Has the logframe been updated since the last review?

This is the first Annual Review. The logframe was developed as part of the inception phase for the GODAN secretariat. The logframe was developed with a focus on component 1 of the GODAN programme as this is the only component that is currently being implemented. Appropriate output measures have been developed for component 1. Further work is required to finalise the outcome measures for component 1 as well as agreeing future milestones for the output indicators. This work will be done during November 2015. Also, while consideration has been made for how the logframe will accommodate component 2 and component 3, the logframe will need to be updated when these components begin.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	Mobilizing key actors to collaborate and commit to actions that will lead to a strengthening of the open agricultural and nutritional data ecosystem in developing countries.			
Output number per LF	1		**Output Score**	*A*
Risk:	*Medium*		Impact weighting (%):	70
Risk revised since last AR?	*N/A*		Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	*N/A*

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
Number of major and other key agriculture and nutrition open data events organised or significantly contributed to by the GODAN secretariat.	3 major events 4 other key events	3 major events 4 other key events
Number of GODAN partners recruited	150 partners as of end of October 2015	153 Partners
Number of new products or services developed through agricultural/nutritional open data hackathons or innovation schemes.	1	1

Key Points

This output is key to the success of the GODAN initiative. Catalysing the collaboration and engagement of a large and influential partner group is critical to achieving a strong open data ecosystem.

Indicator 1.1. The GODAN programme has met expectations for this indicator.

The first indicator is probably the output that represents most of the secretariat's efforts. This is because open data events provide an opportunity for communicating with partners through email, newletters, godan.info and social media and for communicating with external audiences. Therefore, this is an important method for enthusing, engaging and coordinating partners, for growing the partner network and for raising the GODAN initiative's profile.

The GODAN secretariat have made significant contributions at 3 major events over the past year. These are:
- International Open Data Conference, in May in Ottawa;
- African Open Data Conference, in August in Dar Es Salaam;
- Open Government Partnership Summit, in October in Mexico City.

Both the IODC and AODC had well attended sessions dedicated to GODAN. These sessions were successful in creating interest both in current partners and in new organisations. For example after the IODC there was an increase in the number of new partners.

The IODC also served as the launch of the well received GODAN/ODI discussion paper "How can we improve agriculture, food and nutrition with open data?".

The GODAN secretariat also organised/contributed to four other key events:
1.   Wageningen Meetings
2.   Global Forum for Innovation in Agriculture, Abu Dhabi
3.   Financing For Development, Addis Ababa
4.   2nd International Workshop, The Hague

These events were successful in bringing partners together to network and discuss important challenges for the future of the GODAN initiative and raising awareness about the importance of open data to agriculture and nutrition to an external audience.

The GODAN programme achieved expectations on the number of events that were organised or contributed to. In addition, the performance of the secretariat at these events was strong.

Indicator 1.2 The GODAN programme has met expectations for this indicator.

The GODAN programme slightly exceeded expectations on the number of new GODAN partners recruited. The GODAN partner network reached 153 partners (3 more than expected) by the end of October 2015 from a start point of 121 partners in January 2015. The list of partners can be found on the GODAN website (http://www.godan.info/).

Indicator 1.3 The GODAN programme has met expectations for this indicator.

The GODAN programme met expectations on new products/services developed. At the Wageningen meeting The Croptimizer (now known as Boerenbunder - https://boerenbunder.nl/) was developed. The idea was developed and taken up by Anne Bruinsma's from HackwerkAdvies and she received funding from the Dutch Government.

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Recommendations

The GODAN secretariat to keep up the good progress that has been made since the beginning of 2015.

Output Title	Collecting & compiling tools, stories, case studies, and papers that equip key actors to strengthen the open agricultural and nutritional data ecosystem in developing countries		
Output number per LF	2	**Output Score**	*A*
Risk:	*Low*	Impact weighting (%):	30
Risk revised since last AR?	*Y/N*	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	*Y/N*

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
Creating an effective repository of tools, stories, case studies and papers.	Baseline Questionnaire completed for every new partner.	Baseline Questionnaire completed for every new partner.
Number of advocacy focused policy-relevant papers produced or commissioned by the secretariat.	2	2
Communication and governance of the secretariat.	Inception report delivered successfully	Inception report delivered successfully

Key Points

Indicator 2.1. The GODAN programme has met expectations for this indicator.

GODAN has mapped its partners geographically and by activity through use of a baseline questionnaire sent to each, following sign-up. The responses provide insight to the partner organizations, their location and the focus of their work. This facilitates partner attendance and involvement at events and will form a key part of building a repository of tools, stories, case studies and papers.

The website will also become a repository for research and topic-specific resources of relevance to existing and prospective members. This is planned for 2016.

Indicator 2.2. The GODAN programme has met expectations for this indicator.

The expectation was that the GODAN programme would lead to two advocacy focused policy-relevant papers.

The GODAN/ODI discussion paper 'How can we improve agriculture, food and nutrition with open data?' which demonstrates the impact that open data can achieve in the agriculture and nutrition sectors through a showcase of 14 diverse use cases was published in May 2015.

The GODAN/CTA/Alterra working paper "Open Data and Smallholder Food and Nutritional Security", which provides an overview of the current and potential use of open data in the context of smallholder farming, was published in February 2015.

Both can be found on the GODAN website.

Indicator 2.3. The GODAN programme has met expectations for this indicator.

The Inception report was delivered successfully. This included:

- Establishing the Secretariat : The Secretariat has now been established in Wallingford in the UK, with additional staff in Leusden in the Netherlands and in Rome. The Executive Director took up his post on September 1.
- Recruiting of ambassadors - GODAN's first formal ambassador is Dr. Meng for CAAS in China who has a programme of engagements planned around Chinese institutes for GODAN. Also note informal ambassadors for GODAN Secretary Woteki in the US and Deputy Chief Scientist Tim Wheeler in the UK have played a siugnificant role.
- Preparation of materials : A range of materials has been produced which includes the publication of the GODAN/ODI discussion paper and development of a range of communications materials used in partner engagements and events.
- Holding a GODAN partner meeting : The first GODAN partner meeting was held in the Netherlands, January 2015. A second GODAN partner meeting was held May 2015 immediately prior to 2015 International Open Data Conference (IODC) in Canada. Finally, a third GODAN partner meeting was held in Tanzania on the margins of the Africa Open Data Conference (AODC) in September 2015. The presentations from these conferences can be found at http://www.godan.info/publications/presentations/ .
- A clearly described theory of change for GODAN Secretariat activities, demonstrating how the activities of the Secretariat will lead to impact; assessment of existing evidence; suggested approach and relevant hypotheses: This is detailed in the GODAN Theory of Change document, which is part of the inception report package.
- An Advocacy and Influencing Strategy (including governments, private sector and others) and demonstration of engagement with civil society through advocacy and community mobilisation groups.
- Developed plans for website development using open source tools where feasible and including an outline of existing plans/approaches to linking to relevant datasets including relevant standards.
- Developed a monitoring and evaluation framework, including a log-frame. An initial version of the logframe is complete but it will need to be updated in November 2015 and then again when the other GODAN components begin.
- Established a detailed workplan and budget for year one and an indicative budget/workplan for other years to include priority focal countries and activities.

- A gender mainstreaming approach, clearly outlining an approach to reducing gender inequality, acknowledging gender-related differences in need.

6.1
Gender_Mainstreamir

- Establish an ethics policy and ethical clearance protocols : The GODAN Secretariat seeks to operate in an open and transparent way and to publish information about our funding streams and our partners and to communicate the results of surveys, the outcomes of workshops and the activities surrounding GODAN events on our website. The GODAN Secretariat has been rated by Transparify as a "very transparent organization".
- Established a risk register to identify and proactively manage delivery, fiduciary and reputational risks.
- Detailed arrangements for leadership, management and any sub-contracting arrangements of the Secretariat.

The inception report materials are quested under the following link and will be made available at a later date on the GODAN website - http://www.godan.info/ :

SOMultiLink.vso

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Recommendations

1. The GODAN secretariat to develop the baseline questionnaire into a partner survey to track outcome level indicators.

2. GODAN secretariat and DFID to finalise the logframe by end November 2015.

D: VALUE FOR MONEY & FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE (1 page)

Key cost drivers and performance

The key cost drivers on the delivery of the project continue to be aligned with the following three funding components and related activities. However, currently only component one is being implemented. Components two and three have yet to start.

Component one - £2,460,000 in support of establishment of an independent Executive Secretariat for GODAN. This will be co-funded by several other interested parties (currently a minimum of the governments of the United States and the Netherlands, CABI and the U.N. Food & Agriculture Organisation). The main costs drivers will be Secretariat Core Activities, Monitoring and Evaluation, Strategic Communications and Management.

Component two - £2.080,000 to commission a suite of agricultural/nutritional open data research and capacity-building programmes which will be labelled as a UK-specific contribution to GODAN objectives. This is being funded solely by the UK government although co-funding options remain feasible in future. The key cost related activities behind this budget are Research and Capacity Building, Monitoring and Evaluation, Research Uptake and Management and associated consultant fees and expenses.

Component three - £240,000 in support of procurement of two independent evaluations and other ongoing monitoring activities to allow for independent assessment and lesson-learning from GODAN funding investments. The main cost drivers here would be consultants fees and expenses.

An additional £3m extension for upscaling GODAN activities in a phase 2 may be considered in outer years with approval to lengthen the programme and adjust activities and approach, to be based on progress of the activities and spend rates, evidence of continued need and findings of the independent evaluations in 2017/18.

VfM performance compared to the original VfM proposition in the business case

Measuring value for money for Open Data is challenging, in part because a significant part of the value proposition is qualitative in nature (e.g. the value of greater citizen engagement with government or value of data preservation) and activities are unpredictable and opportunistic.

The metrics proposed in the Business Case to assess value for money with respect to the economy, efficiency and effectiveness dimensions are outlined below.

Economy (how to ensure we buy inputs of the appropriate quality at the right price? E.g. staff, suppliers, consulltants, raw materials and capital)

- The business case was reviewed and approved by the UK Government Digital Service (GDS) and DFID's DG Corporate Performance to ensure compliance with the Government design principles, use of AGILE[2] methodologies, to benchmark cost of salaries and capital investment and utilisation of previous infrastructural investments and to promote use of open source tools and software where feasible).

- A competitive procurement process was used to drive value for money and commercial advantage including negotiation on any management overheads.

- Number of additional co-funders buying into GODAN activities. The Secretariat activities are being co-financed in cash and in kind by other development partners which limits DFID's financial inputs.

---

[2] https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/agile

- Economies of scale achieved through enhanced collaboration with existing open data initiatives. At last count the GODAN initiative has 150 partners. These partners represent a significant amplification of the GODAN initiative's ability to advocate and deliver datasets, innovation and capacity building.

- Reductions in costs of digitising, cleaning and geocoding major national datasets by open data collaboration and application of new coding and data processing techniques. This is something that is envisioned to occur at a future date.

Efficiency (e.g how well do we or our agents convert inputs into outputs and results? How do we ensure sufficient quality and quantity of outputs?)

These can only be measured once the partner survey is in place and completed. This due to be ready in time for the next Annual Review.

- Two independent evaluations of GODAN activities

- Number of new additional GODAN partner signatories

- Number of governments and private sector entities releasing new datasets of value to the agricultural and nutritional communities

- Number of existing open data initiatives choosing to focus on agricultural and nutritional datasets as a sectoral starting point to open data strategies

- Examples of open data 'quick win' interventions that (i) demonstrate proof of concept and potential for upscale and (ii) attract further support and government approval to upscale or institutionalise

- Number of citizens and intermediaries expressing confidence to engage with open data

- Number of research papers published in open access, peer-reviewed journals.

- Number of new methodologies developed

Effectiveness (e.g. how well are the outputs from an intervention achieving the desired outcome on poverty reduction? Note we do not exercise direct control over outcomes)

These can only be measured once the partner survey is in place and completed. This due to be ready in time for the next Annual Review.

- Value of closed datasets 'opened up' in each 12 month period

- Value of new businesses created using open data of relevance to the agricultural and nutritional communities.

- Number of independently-verified evidence based case studies of environmental, economic or social impact of open data investments

- Number of documented instances of enhanced accountability/transparency, improved service delivery or enhanced innovation due to opening up agricultural/nutritional datasets.

- Demonstrable use of GODAN-documented lessons and good practices utilised in design of new open data initiatives for and by the rural and urban poor.(evidence of user demand)

Vfm will be achieved through regular oversight meetings, DFID representation on the GODAN Secretariat Steering Committee, a break clause after the inception phase as well as an independent evaluation towards the end of year four.

A quantitative Cost Benefit Analysis with sensitivity analysis is not viable given the nature of the programme.

Assessment of whether the programme continues to represent value for money

Yes it does. The theory of change and value for money presented in the GODAN business case still hold.

Quality of financial management

DFID funds for the GODAN Secretariat (component one) are being successfully disbursed through a Delegated Cooperation Agreement (DCA) with the US government Department of Agriculture (USDA). DFID is likely to frontload our spend for the Secretariat as many current co-funding offers are for provision of in-kind support. This will help to ensure rapid establishment and immediate activities although funds will not be disbursed in advance of need. USDA will ensure regular scrutiny of invoices and submit an annual financial statement as at 30 September confirming the DFID funds received and expended for the project, including any fund balance. This statement will be certified by the USDA financial office and submitted to DFID by the 31 March. They will also produce the annual USDA Agency Financial Report which will include an independent auditors report as at 30 September and likewise submit this to DFID by the 31 March.

Advice from DFID's Risk and Control team has confirmed that no due diligence assessment is needed on the US government as the level of financial risk and fraud is low. However, it is expected that the US government will have conducted their own version of due diligence assessment on the successful bidder for the Secretariat prior to disbursement of funds to ensure they have sufficient financial controls and procedures in place.

For the Research and Capacity Building Programme (component two), funds will be disbursed through a direct Contract with a Supplier. Detailed financial and technical reporting requirements will also be developed during a six month inception phase. Payment will be linked to annual financial and progress reports and an annual independent financial audit report. These will be determined as part of the conditions of the Contract. Payments will be linked to achievements of pre-agreed milestones. RED will approve and release payments in line with DFID requirements based on narrative progress reporting on evidence of achievement

For the Programme funding stream and for the independent evaluations, a due diligence assessment which will include financial management controls will be undertaken of the successful supplier as per standard Procurement and Commercial Department processes for competitive research and evaluation procurement.*.*

Date of last narrative financial report	First financial statement from USDA is due March 2016
Date of last audited annual statement	First audited report from USDA is due March 2016

E: RISK (½ page)

Overall risk rating: Medium

Overview of programme risk

As part of the GODAN secretariat's inception report they produced a risk register. It identifies 23 risks with mitigating actions under 5 headings (see risk register).

8.1 Riskregister.vso

These can be summarised as internal and external risks. Internal risks include financial and organisational problems within the secretariat that prevent the secretariat from performing the activities required to deliver the programme results. External risks include international and partner inertia that prevent the secretariat's activities from resulting the successful programme results.

A selection of some of the key risks and mitigating actions are as follows:

- Risk: GODAN secretariat is understrength and therefore unable to deliver the full range of required activities.
  - o Mitigating actions: A network of collaborators, champions, specialists and CABI staff will be maintained and called upon to backstop until a recruitment process has been completed. Additionally Donors participating though staff resource allocation will do their best to identify a replacement.
- Risk: Low levels of external engagement and inertia amongst partners means that despite the GODAN secretariat's actions results are not achieved.
  - o Mitigating actions: Regular and efficient communication with donors and the partner network. Strong contribution to high profile events. Design working groups to bring partners closer together. This is a key part of the secretariat's work.
- Risk: Secretariat unable to deliver workplan with current funding.
  - o Mitigating actions: Regular monitoring of progress against milestones, outcome, impact targets for both funding and delivery of the workplan. Regular monitoring of progress against milestones and financial targets. Schedule quarterly meeting to discuss detail of workplans. Accounts are audited and published (including to IATI standards). GODAN staff work within CABI business policy frameworks and code of conduct.

Outstanding actions from risk assessment

None

F: COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS (½ page)

Delivery against planned timeframe

Project delivery is on track with agreed timescales

Performance of partnership (s)

The organisations responsible for hosting the multi donor-funded Secretariat and for managing the DFID-funded Research & Capacity-building programme will each be wholly and solely responsible for delivering against specific funding streams/components which will be managed through separate agreements with each to allow for the maximum amount of clarity and accountability for both DFID and each relationship.

GODAN Secretariat (CABI)- component one

As a lead donor, we are satisfied with our overall level of dialogue and working relationship with our partner United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) on this project. UK funding is being disbursed through a Delegated Cooperation Agreement (DCA) with USDA, who as the lead donor, have successfully procured a host organisation (CABI)[3] to be the GODAN Secretariat. CABI were selected via a limited open completion with assurance from USDA that standard DFID requirements such as due diligence, fiduciary risk and digital spending controls are incorporated into the procurement processes. DFID were alos involved in design of the ToRs for the call for proposals as well as selection criteria for assessment. DFID staff were involved in the final proposal selection process and once the preferred bidder for the Secretariat had been decided the final proposal was passed to the UK Government Digital Service (GDS) and DFID's Digital team for additional review. A commercial due diligence assessment was conducted of the Secretariat host (CABI) and any steps necessary undertaken to strengthen their capabilities or fiduciary systems have identified and implemented.

In addition to the UK and the US, other funders are expected to participate in a formal joint funding arrangement. DFID has a seat on the Executive (Steering Committee) with strategic oversight of the Secretariat including both a supporting and challenge function. Beneficiaries will be represented in the governance of the GODAN Secretariat through leading technical working groups in areas of particular technical interest as well as through a potential 'user' seat on the Executive Committee. The proposed workplans of the Secretariat need to be approved by the Executive Committee on an annual basis.

Research & Capacity-building programme – component two

UK funding will be disbursed through a competitive procurement process, resulting in a Contract with a Key Supplier. Oversight of the Programme will be as per standard DFID programme management processes. Milestones linked to satisfactory completion and timely dissemination of annual results will be included in the logframe outputs. A detailed annual technical and financial report will be required as part of the reporting process. Co-funding opportunities will explored with other likely donors.

Monitoring and Evaluation - component three

The two independent evaluations will be procured centrally through a competitive procurement process, drawing upon the advice and appropriate instruments of PCD and RED's Evaluation Advisor. Final payment will be dependent upon satisfactory and timely completion of the evaluations including relevant quality-assurance mechanisms.

To promote co-ordination and synergies between the first two components of the programme, the SRO will ensure regular and systematic conversation between the two lead organisations as well as participation in each other's showcasing and capacity-building activities wherever feasible. The possibility of more formal co-ordination meetings may be examined as part of the inception processes once both lead organisations are determined. A six-month inception phase for both components will be instigated to finalise detailed technical and financial reporting arrangements for each. This will also allow for an exit strategy should it cease to represent good value for money, veer too far from DFID strategic objectives or fail to deliver the expected results. The two evaluations will be commissioned in the penultimate year of each component to allow for sufficient time for intermediate results to emerge but to also allow for incorporation of lessons into the final years of the programme. This will also allow sufficient time for DFID staff to make a decision about whether or not to proceed to funding an additional phase two of the GODAN initiative.

Asset monitoring and control

As per its financial procedures, the GODAN Secretariat (CABI) maintains a physical inventory record of all fixed assets purchased by the Organisation. CABI can confirm that no equipment with an individual value in excess of £1000 has been purchased using DFID funds – need to verify with CABI.

---

[3] Secretariat Terms of Reference

G: CONDITIONALITY (½ page)

Update on partnership principles (if relevant)

Not applicable

H: MONITORING & EVALUATION (½ page)

Independent Evaluation

DFID will centrally procure an independent evaluation for the Secretariat, and Research and Capacity Building components of the programme in FY 2017/18 which will be the penultimate year of operations for both component one and two. Retaining control of this budget line centrally will enable DFID to take advantage of in-house procurement and evaluation expertise to enable quality-assured products and will also allow for a degree of independent verification of findings reported by the Secretariat host and successful commercial bidder for the research and capacity-building programme. This budget line will also be used to enable DFID staff (Data for Development team) to participate in regular monitoring missions, including but not restricted to annual reviews and annual meetings of the Secretariat steering committee as well as travel costs to participate in other relevant lesson-learning events and workshops organised by GODAN stakeholders.

Gender Considerations

The GODAN Secretariat must demonstrate due consideration of how activities of the GODAN Secretariat will seek to overcome the 'digital divide' and include marginalized and disadvantaged groups who may not have access to technology due to age, disability or gender. They are expected to demonstrate how Secretariat activities will reduce inequality, acknowledge gender-related differences in need and how it will seek to overcome unequal power relations and social exclusion…….

The GODAN secretariat has developed a gender mainstreaming approach, clearly outlining an approach to reducing gender inequality, acknowledging gender-related differences in need. This includes CABI's Project and Programme Gender Strategy and CABI's Workplace Gender Strategy, as well as referencing specific elements of CTA's Gender Strategy and DFID's Business Case: UK Support to the 'Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition' (GODAN) initiative.

Monitoring progress throughout the review period

The review process was conducted by Seb Mhatre (Senior Responsible Owner, Data for Development team) and was informed through regular communication with USDA, the GODAN secretariat and feedback from partners and other organisations in attendance at the International Open Data Conference and the African Open Data Conference.

Kenny Bambrick (Peer Reviewer, DFID Statistician)

This Annual Review was also informed by:

The GODAN Secretariat (CABI) inception report published in November 2015 (Quest number 5210647); Meetings conducted between DFID and the GODAN Secretariat (CABI) during the year;

Smart Guide

The Annual Review is part of a continuous process of review and improvement throughout the programme cycle. At each formal review, the performance and ongoing relevance of the programme are assessed with decisions taken by the spending team as to whether the programme should continue, be reset or stopped.

The Annual Review includes specific, time-bound recommendations for action, consistent with the key findings. These actions – which in the case of poor performance will include improvement measures – are elaborated in further detail in delivery plans. Teams should refer to the Smart Rules quality standards for annual reviews.

The Annual Review assesses and rates outputs using the following rating scale. ARIES and the separate programme scoring calculation sheet will calculate the overall output score taking account of the weightings and individual outputs scores

Description	Scale
Outputs substantially exceeded expectation	A++
Outputs moderately exceeded expectation	A+
Outputs met expectation	A
Outputs moderately did not meet expectation	B
Outputs substantially did not meet expectation	C

Teams should refer to the considerations below as a guide to completing the annual review template.

Summary Sheet

Complete the summary sheet with highlights of progress, lessons learnt and action on previous recommendations

Introduction and Context

Briefly outline the programme, expected results and contribution to the overall Operational Plan and DFID's international development objectives (including corporate results targets). Where the context supporting the intervention has changed from that outlined in the original programme documents explain what this will mean for UK support

B: Performance and conclusions

Annual Outcome Assessment
Brief assessment of whether we expect to achieve the outcome by the end of the programme

Overall Output Score and Description
Progress against the milestones and results achieved that were expected as at the time of this review.

Key lessons
Any key lessons you and your partners have learned from this programme
Have assumptions changed since design? Would you do differently if re-designing this programme?
How will you and your partners share the lessons learned more widely in your team, across DFID and externally

Key actions
Any further information on actions (not covered in Summary Sheet) including timelines for completion and team member responsible

Has the logframe been updated since the last review? What/if any are the key changes and what does this mean for the programme?

C: Detailed Output Scoring

Output
Set out the Output, Output Score

Score

Enter a rating using the rating scale A++ to C.

Impact Weighting (%)

Enter the %age number which cannot be less than 10%.

The figure here should match the Impact Weight currently shown on the logframe (and which will need to be entered on ARIES as part of loading the Annual Review for approval).

Revised since last Annual Review (Y/N).

Risk Rating

Risk Rating: Low/Medium/High

Enter Low, Medium or High

The Risk Rating here should match the Risk currently shown on the logframe (and which will need to be entered on ARIES as part of loading the Annual Review for approval).

Where the Risk for this Output been revised since the last review (or since inception, if this is the first review) or if the review identifies that it needs revision explain why, referring to section B Risk Assessmen

Key points

Summary of response to iprogrammessues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Recommendations

Repeat above for each Output.

D Value for Money and Financial Performance

Key cost drivers and performance

Consider the specific costs and cost drivers identified in the Business Case

Have there been changes from those identified in previous reviews or at programme approval. If so, why?

VfM performance compared to the original VfM proposition in the business case? Performance against vfm measures and any trigger points that were identified to track through the programme

Assessment of whether the programme continues to represent value for money?

Overall view on whether the programme is good value for money. If not, why, and what actions need to be taken?

Quality of Financial Management

Consider our best estimate of future costs against the current approved budget and forecasting profile

Have narrative and financial reporting requirements been adhered to. Include details of last report

Have auditing requirements been met. Include details of last report

E Risk

Output Risk Rating: L/M/H

Enter Low, Medium or High, taken from the overall Output risk score calculated in ARIES

Overview of Programme Risk

What are the changes to the overall risk environment/ context and why?

Review the key risks that affect the successful delivery of the expected results.

Are there any different or new mitigating actions that will be required to address these risks and whether the existing mitigating actions are directly addressing the identifiable risks?

Any additional checks and controls are required to ensure that UK funds are not lost, for example to fraud or corruption.

Outstanding actions from risk assessment

Describe outstanding actions from Due Diligence/ Fiduciary Risk Assessment/ Programme risk matrix

Describe follow up actions from departmental anti-corruption strategies to which Business Case assumptions and risk tolerances stand

F: Commercial Considerations

Delivery against planned timeframe. Y/N

Compare actual progress against the approved timescales in the Business Case. If timescales are off track provide an explanation including what this means for the cost of the programme and any remedial action.

Performance of partnership

How well are formal partnerships/ contracts working

Are we learning and applying lessons from partner experience

How could DFID be a more effective partner

Asset monitoring and control
Level of confidence in the management of programme assets, including information any monitoring or spot checks

G: Conditionality

Update on Partnership Principles and specific conditions.
For programmes for where it has been decided (when the programme was approved or at the last Annual Review) to use the PPs for management and monitoring, provide details on:

   a. Were there any concerns about the four Partnership Principles over the past year, including on human rights?

   b. If yes, what were they?

   c. Did you notify the government of our concerns?

   d. If Yes, what was the government response? Did it take remedial actions? If yes, explain how.

   e. If No, was disbursement suspended during the review period? Date suspended (dd/mm/yyyy)

   f. What were the consequences?

For all programmes, you should make a judgement on what role, if any, the Partnership Principles should play in the management and monitoring of the programme going forward. This applies even if when the BC was approved for this programme the PPs were not intended to play a role. Your decision may depend on the extent to which the delivery mechanism used by the programme works with the partner government and uses their systems.

H: Monitoring and Evaluation

Evidence and evaluation
Changes in evidence and implications for the programme
Where an evaluation is planned what progress has been made
How is the Theory of Change and the assumptions used in the programme design working out in practice in this programme? Are modifications to the programme design required?
Is there any new evidence available which challenges the programme design or rationale? How does the evidence from the implementation of this programme contribute to the wider evidence base? How is evidence disaggregated by sex and age, and by other variables?
Where an evaluation is planned set out what progress has been made.
Monitoring process throughout the review period.
Direct feedback you have had from stakeholders, including beneficiaries
Monitoring activities throughout review period (field visits, reviews, engagement etc)
The Annual Review process