

**Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research  
(CGIAR)**

**Guidelines for the Reporting of Performance Indicators  
for CGIAR Centers  
(2006 data)**



**Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat  
January, 11 2007**

# Guidelines for the Reporting of Performance Indicators for CGIAR Centers (2006 data)

## Introduction

The CGIAR Performance Measurement System has been continuously refined in the past two years and now has become a regular feature in the CGIAR Monitoring & Evaluation structure. Indicators that did not yield reliable information were dropped and new ones were added, while aiming at decreasing burden to Centers resulting from this annual performance measurement instrument.

The PM system measures Center performance along three dimensions:

- Results
- Potential to perform
- Stakeholder Perceptions

The system provides Centers a tool to better understand their own performance and demonstrate accountability, which is very much welcomed by CGIAR Members. In addition it is used as an input in CGIAR member fund allocation decisions.

Moreover, the reporting of performance results has also become a standard section in the CGIAR Annual Report and in most Center Annual Reports.

## Part 1: General Information

### 1. Timeline for 2007 PM exercise

<b>Timeline for 2007 PM exercise</b>	
January 11	Launch of the 2006 PM process, including instructions and definitions of indicators
February 15	Launch of new on-line data collection system
March 17	Deadline for Center reporting on PM indicators
March 19	Assessment and data verification starts
March 26-30	SC meeting – discussion of PM findings
May 15/16	Discussion of initial results by ExCo
May	Data verification completed
June	Online report made available to Members and Centers

## **2. New PM Database**

A new PM database is being developed in collaboration with the IT group at ICARDA. The system, which will be more advanced and more user-friendly than what we had in the past, will be made accessible for data entry on **February 15**. Some of the key new features are:

- an off-line tool that enables you to input the data off-line and then upload it to system later,
- tools to preserve formatting of text,
- instant results report generation function,
- section for upload of supporting evidence material,
- direct upload of the finance data from the CGIAR Finance Information System (FIS).

## **3. Submission of evidence material supporting the performance measures**

The CGIAR Performance Measurement System is based on self-assessment by Centers, verified through a mechanism managed by an external expert in collaboration with the CGIAR Internal Audit Unit.

Centers are requested to submit the core part of the evidence supporting the reported performance data at the time of reporting. This will be indicated next to the indicator description. At the request of the Internal Audit Unit evidence material for selected indicators (e.g. output targets, governance checklist) may be requested on a sample basis after completion of the reporting. This material can be uploaded to the PM database at that time or already earlier (if desired by the Center).

## Part 2: Description of Indicators

### I. Indicators of Results

#### ***Element 1: Outputs***

##### **Indicator 1: % MTP output targets achieved in 2006**

**Definition: Output and Output Target**

- **Outputs** are the products of research with a defined time line, contributing to reaching the MTP project (and thus the Center's and CGIAR goals) by offering solutions to problems identified during the MTP planning process.
- **Output Targets** are the annual deliverables, defined by quantity and type, expected in a specific year and contributing to achieving the MTP Project Outputs. Output targets are deliverables in the following categories: materials, policy strategies, practices, capacity, and other kinds of knowledge.

Centers are requested to report on achievement in 2006 of the annual output targets set in MTP 2006-2008. The PM report is to cover all MTP projects and outputs listed in MTP 2006-2008. For each MTP project please list the outputs and output targets and indicate whether the target was achieved, or not. Partial achievement is not considered. You can provide text explaining exceptional reasons for not achieving output targets, such as termination of the activity. If the outputs and output targets have significantly changed from those planned, provide an explanation for the new output targets reported. The supplementary document should include only information that is essential for explaining changes.

The performance indicator, percentage of output targets achieved, will be calculated by the data collection system.

**Note:**

- This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of aligning the PM output targets with those defined in the corresponding MTP. In the initial alignment year (PM reporting of 2005 achievements) Centers were advised that several output targets listed were not considered acceptable because they were either process related, descriptions of on-going activity, outcomes, *ex post* impact studies or quantities of publications. In the PM for 2006, Centers should include only output targets from MTP 2006-2008 planned for 2006 that describe deliverable research and capacity building achievements.
- For a clearer definition of each of the output categories: Materials refer to all biological materials and knowledge that adds value to them; not to documents. Policy strategies refer to analysis and information that is aimed to be used for policy decision making. Practices include tools, methods and processes that intended for use in research, breeding, policy work, extension, demonstration, and evaluation in the field. Capacity strengthening includes training and other instruction aimed at enhancing individual capacity, training materials and resources, and interventions that are aimed at enhancing institutional capacity. Other kinds of knowledge include knowledge and data that are the deliverable research achievements and do not belong to any of the other categories.

- Completed *ex post* impact studies should be reported under the Impacts indicator 3A: *ex post* impact assessment studies.

## **Element 2: Outcomes**

### **Definition: Outcome**

Outcome is the external use, adoption, or influence of a Center output(s) (e.g. by partners, stakeholders, clients).

Centers are requested to report on the **five (5) most significant outcomes in 2006** resulting from outputs that the Center produced in 2003-2005. The outcomes can be specific to a particular annual output achievement or to overall outputs from a Project as specified in the MTP. Each outcome report must be supported by evidence of credible documentation from either the Center or target user.

For each outcome description please provide (in 300 words maximum):

- An outcome statement
- What output(s) resulted in the outcome and in which MTP was the output first identified?
- Who used/adopted or was influenced by the output? Identify the kinds of people or entities affected and their location by country.
- How was the output used or adopted? What was the nature of the influence of the output?
- What is the evidence for this outcome? Specifically, what kind of data were collected or study was conducted? Who collected the data and/or conducted the study?

The performance indicator score measured by the Science Council (SC) is based on the following criteria:

- Criterion 1: Of the five cases, how many are truly outcomes? Each case is scored 1 if it is an outcome and if there is a verifiable source for it, and 0 if not. Total possible score for this item = 5.
- Criterion 2: Of the cases that scored “1” on Criterion 1, how many have been clearly and specifically articulated? Each case that scored “1” in the first item is scored “1” on this item if it meets the criterion and “0” if it does not. The cases that scored 0 on Criterion 1 will get a 0 on Criterion 2. Total possible score for this item = 5.

### ***Element 3: Impacts***

**Definition: Impact**

Impacts are the longer range social, environmental and economic benefits that are consistent with CGIAR goals and the center's mission and objectives.

**Indicator 3A: SC/SPIA rating of Overall Impact Assessment Performance**

Centers are requested to report information on the overall Impact Assessment Performance on three main areas that the SC will use as the criteria for scoring the reports:

- (1) ex-post Impact Assessment (epIA) studies / advancement of epIA methods,
- (2) Building an impact assessment culture at the Center,
- (3) Communication / dissemination and capacity enhancement.

**Please fill out the checklist in annex 2.**

**Indicator 3B: SC/SPIA rating of two Center impact studies carried out in the period 2003-05 for rigor**

Information for this indicator is collected once every three years. The indicator rating will remain the same as last year and you do not need to provide new information for it.

## **II. Indicators of Potential to Perform**

### ***Element 4: Quality and Relevance of Current Research***

This element includes three publication indicators, where the first two indicators (4A and B) both measure number of peer-reviewed publications but are differentiating two groups of publications - peer-reviewed publications published in journals listed in the Thomson Scientific/ISI and those that are not (e.g. books and other peer-reviewed articles).

#### **Indicator 4A: Number of peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2006 (excluding articles published in journals listed in the Thomson Scientific/ ISI)**

Please report the number of all peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2006.

##### **Requested Evidence Material:**

- List of publications (with full citation and consecutive numbering), including (i) name of Center scientist(s) who authored or co-authored, (ii) year of publication, (iii) title of publication, volume number, journal name, pages.
- List of scientists included in the denominator (FTE) indicating their status (e.g. IRS, RRS NRS). Please also include a description of your indicator computation.

##### **Guidelines for measuring the number of peer-reviewed publications**

- This should include publications strictly published in 2006. Do not include manuscripts in press or published during the previous year but omitted from the previous year's list
- The journals or book series should have an editorial board and clear review procedures (feedback from technical editors);
- Peer-reviewed publications other than journals should include i) books either written or edited by IARC staff<sup>1</sup>; ii) chapters in books and conference compilation documents where these have been formally published and externally refereed; iii) monographs only when they are formally published and externally refereed.

**No other publications** should be included in this category such as working papers, internal series, reprints etc.

- Only ONE entry of each paper per Center is permitted. Where there are multiple authors including ones from different Centers then both Centers may count the paper in their submissions
- When staff joins an institute during the year in question, publications from their previous employment may be counted as long as they are relevant to the work of the CGIAR. Likewise for staff leaving an institute all appropriate 2006 publications may be counted.
- Publications resulting from work fully funded by the Center, but written by a non-Center staff can be included, but then the person must be also included in the scientist count

<sup>1</sup> In the case of IARC staff acting as both editors and authors of chapters in an edited book, the book itself would count as one publication (if it had been externally peer reviewed) and each chapter with an IARC author would count separately.

**Indicator 4B: Number of peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2006 that are published in journals listed in Thomson Scientific/ISI**

Please report the number of peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2006 that are published in journals listed in the Thomson Scientific/ISI Master Journal List (database of 8700 peer-reviewed journals). The list can be found at

<http://www.thomsonscientific.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=master>

**Requested Evidence Material:**

- List of publications (with consecutive numbering), including (i) name of Center scientist(s) who authored or co-authored, (ii) year of publication, (iii) title of publication, volume number, journal name, pages.
- the list of scientists included in the denominator (FTE) indicating their status (IRS, RRS, NRS etc.). Please also include a description of your indicator computation.

**Follow the guidelines for measuring the number of peer-reviewed publications given above when applicable. For calculating the number of scientists, please use the definition in Annex 1**

**Indicator 4 C: Percentage of scientific papers that are published with developing country partners in refereed journals, conference and workshop proceedings in 2006**

For calculating Indicator 4C use those publications listed in Indicator 4A and B and add those published in international newsletters and other scientific series, and papers presented at formal conferences and workshops with external attendance. Do not include internal presentations. The publications considered co-authored must clearly articulate the formal authorship including the authors who are NARS based. Indicate the percentage of publications which have NARS based co-authors within the total list.

**Requested Evidence Material:**

List of all publications (with full citation and consecutive numbering) falling under this category, indicating the developing country partner(s) among the authors of the publication. Please also include a description of your indicator computation.

## ***Element 5: Institutional Health***

### **GOVERNANCE**

#### **Indicator 5A: Score on governance checklist**

Please complete the checklist in Annex 3 for your Center. Also keep available for verification purposes supporting documents such as Board profile, policy documents, excerpts of Board minutes and resolutions.

#### **Indicator 5B: Assessment of Board statements**

Please submit a short statement [max. 500 words] describing **up to two** most important actions taken by the Board in 2006 aimed at improving Board oversight (e.g. action to improve program oversight, financial oversight or any major initiative on improving Center governance) and expected impact from this action.

A peer-review panel composed of three external members will assess the submissions in terms of relevance/merit and the anticipated impact of the actions taken.

**Supporting Evidence material:** Please also indicate/attach a verifiable source for the actions described.

### **CULTURE OF LEARNING AND CHANGE**

#### **Indicator 5C: Score on culture of learning and change checklist**

Please complete the checklist in Annex 4 for your Center.

### **DIVERSITY**

#### **Indicator 5D:      **Gender diversity goals: Does your Center have Board-approved gender diversity goals?    YES/NO****

The following evidence material should be kept available: Reference to the Board meeting at which the goals were approved, and the text of the relevant Board resolution or equivalent.

#### **Indicator 5E:      **Percentage of women in management (Percent of management positions, either research or****

**non-research, occupied by women as of 31. December 2006).**

**Requested Evidence Material:**

- List of all staff members in management positions, including names, titles and gender.

**Definition:** “Management position” includes Director General, Deputy Directors General, Directors of major programs/divisions and senior heads of administration if they report directly to the DG.

**Indicator 5F:      **IRS Nationality concentration: Percentage of internationally-recruited staff that come from the top two countries represented in the IRS staff nationality list for the Center(as of December 31, 2006). Please also indicate the Nationality.****

**Requested Evidence Material:** List of IRS staff names and country of nationality

**Indicator 5G:      **Diversity in recency of PhDs: Percentage of scientists receiving their Ph.D. during the last five years (2002-2006).****

**Requested Evidence Material:**

Full list of scientists with PhD, indicating those who have received their PhD in the last 5 years and the name of the University granting the PhD and the year granted.

## ***Element 6: Financial Health***

Note: The data for all finance indicators will be directly extracted from the Finance Information System (FIS) after the completion of the peer-review exercise. Centers do not need to submit these data separately again.

### **Indicator 6A: Short term solvency (liquidity)**

This indicator is computed as (current assets plus long term investment minus current liabilities) divided by per day operating expenses excluding depreciation. Long term investments are included because they can be liquidated before term (at a cost of course) and as such form a potential part of the resources available to contribute to the debt-paying capability of a centre, which what this indicator seeks to measure. Only audited numbers and the final results from the peer-review exercise should be used.

### **Indicator 6B: Long-term financial stability (adequacy of reserves)**

This indicator is computed as unrestricted net assets less net fixed assets divided by per day operating expenses. Only audited numbers and the final results from the peer-review exercise should be used.

### **Indicator 6C: Efficiency of Operations (indirect cost ratio)**

This indicator, which is required by the accounting guidelines (FG2) to be computed and audited, is the ratio of indirect costs to direct costs (indirect costs divided by direct costs) expressed as a percentage. This ratio should be taken from the calculation of indirect cost rate schedule as reported in the audited financial statements.

### **Indicator 6D: Cash Management on Restricted Operations**

This indicator is computed as restricted donors accounts receivable divided by restricted donors accounts payable expressed as a ratio. The data for this computation should be taken from the notes on accounts receivable and accounts payable in the audited financial statements.

### **Indicator 6E: Audit Opinion**

This indicator is expressed in the Report of the Independent Auditors to the Board of Trustees of the Center. It is an authoritative opinion made by an auditor independent and external to the organization, on the fairness of the content and presentation of the financial statements being presented. This indicator is being piloted this year as the fifth indicator.

### **III. STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS**

In 2006, the CGIAR commissioned GlobeScan Inc., a global public opinion and stakeholder research firm, to study the perceptions of its key stakeholder groups. The full results have been made available in the 2005 Performance Measurement Report.

Data for this component of the PM System will be used for three years. A follow-up survey is tentatively scheduled for 2009.

The following are key indicators resulting from the survey:

- Partners perceptions about whether a Center “Does an excellent Job Advancing Sustainable Agriculture through Research”
- Quadrant analysis (strength, maintain, opportunities, and focus) results of drivers of Centers’ reputation: Research, Partnership, Global/Regional/ Local Focus, Communication, Transparency, Human Resources, Originality and Diversity

## **List of Annexes**

***Annex 1: Summary of Definitions***

***Annex 2: Checklist on Impact***

***Annex 3: Checklist on Governance***

***Annex 4: Checklist on Culture of Learning and Change***

## ***Annex 1 Summary of Definitions***

**Outputs** are the products of research with a defined time line, contributing to reaching the Center goals by offering solutions to problems identified during the planning process.

**Output Targets** are the annual deliverables, defined by quantity and type, expected in a specific year and contributing to achieving the MTP Project Outputs. Output targets are deliverables in the following categories: materials, policy strategies, practices, capacity, and other kinds of knowledge.

**Outcome** is the external use, adoption, or influence of a Center output(s) (e.g. by partners, stakeholders, clients).

**Impacts** are the longer range social, environmental and economic benefits that are consistent with CGIAR goals and the center's mission and objectives

### **Scientist**

Number of scientists should be counted in terms of **full time equivalents** (based on the staff list as of December, 31 2006) and should include the time of

- all internationally recruited staff contributing to Center and CP research in 2006, including also
  - Post-doc fellows and research fellow/associates (including externally funded positions),
  - visiting or honorary scientist,
  - part-time staff or joint positions (counted as 50%),
- regionally recruited staff with PhDs who are appointed as scientists, e.g. network coordinators, country representatives, senior breeders, etc.
- nationally or other regionally recruited staff, if the staff member is the first author or the only Center author of a peer-reviewed publication included in the publication count.

Excluded are managerial/administrative staff (DG, DDG, Director Finance, Director HR, Head of Training, Head of information technology and other wholly administrative regional representatives). **EXCEPTION**: if a managerial/administrative staff member published in 2006 and his/her publication is included in the calculation of indicator 4a/b or c, then the staff member must be included in the scientist count as well.

### **Internationally Recruited Staff (IRS)**

In the calculation of the number of International Recruited Staff, please include internationally recruited scientist and managerial/administrative staff **plus** Secondments, Postdocs that are funded externally who have been working at your Center for more than 6 month in 2006.

### **Senior Management Team**

The Senior Management team includes the DG, DDG, Directors of major programs/divisions, and senior heads of administration if they report directly to the DG.

## Annex 2: 3A Impact Indicator Proforma

### I. Criterion 1: epIA studies/Advancement of epIA methods (70%)

A. Please provide the full citation of all epIA studies<sup>1</sup> published in 2006 that attempt to assess major impacts attributed to your Center's work and provide summary information describing the main results/indicator(s) of impact.

Study #	Full citation	Main result/indicators of impact reported by the study (i.e., adoption, estimates of income effect, other effects, poverty impacts, environmental impacts, IRR, etc.) – max of 100 words for each study
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
.		
.		

---

<sup>1</sup>An epIA study refers to a published journal article, conference paper, book chapter (but not entire edited book), report or any other publication that has entered the public domain, which is not a revised version of an earlier submission.

B. For each completed ex-post IA study listed in I.A above, please provide the relevant information under each component (check the appropriate item)

Components	Study # (corresponding to the list in I.A)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<b>1. Publication venue</b> (check one)							
Refereed journal							
Book chapter							
Conference paper (includes proceedings)							
In-house publication (reviewed externally)							
In-house publication (not reviewed externally)							
Unpublished report							
<b>2. (Co-) authorship</b> (check one or more)							
with other CG Center scientists							
with NARS scientists							
with ARI scientists							
Center only scientists							
<b>3. EpIA coverage</b> (check at least one)							
commodity improvement							
NRM related							
policy related							
biodiversity related							
training/capacity building related							
other							
specify:							

Components	Study # (corresponding to the list in I.A)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<b>4. Distance down the impact pathway covered by the study</b> (check one or more)							
uptake/adoption (field surveys)							
influence (bibliometric/citation analysis, key informant surveys, etc.)							
intermediate impacts (improved yield/quality, lower risk, higher income, conserve resources, increase market access/efficiency, develop human capacity)							
ultimate impact (poverty, food security, environment)							
<b>5. Geographical breadth of impacts assessed by the study</b> (check one)							
single location within single country assessment							
multi-locations (regions) within single country assessment							
multiple countries (~ 2-5) assessment							
Global assessment (i.e., spread over several continents)							
<b>6. Advances in new methods/models for epIA embodied in the study</b> (check one or more)							
addresses non-economic impacts							
addresses differential effects (different target groups)							
addresses positive and negative effects							
addresses multiplier effects (other sectors)							
employs novel methods (combines quantitative & qualitative, participatory approaches, etc.)							
other methodological advances							
specify:							

C. Please provide an estimate of the following:

1. Annual budget/expenditures devoted to epIA work in your Center in 2006: US \$ \_\_\_\_\_

OR

2. Number of full time equivalent staff<sup>2</sup> devoted to epIA work in your Center in 2006: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>2</sup> Internationally and nationally recruited scientists and consultants, but not RAs. Applies only to those conducting IAs, not communicators and trainers.

**II. Criterion 2: Building an IA culture at the Center** (Indicate “*Not applicable*” if there is nothing to report under a particular heading)<sup>3</sup> (20%)

- A. Please provide a list of internal workshops convened by the Center’s impact assessment unit/specialists within the past year to help assess the expected impacts of planned and ongoing research of the Center (for each, describe the theme and number of Center participants)
- B. Please provide 2 examples of systematic evaluation of user relevance of Center research outputs produced within the past year such as early adoption/influence studies (max of 100 words for describing data collection, analysis, and major finding for each example)
- C. Please provide specific examples of how empirical ex-post impact assessment findings have been applied as a basis for quantitative ex-ante impact projections that contribute to the Center’s priority-setting procedures, or have been used to validate earlier ex-ante work. (max. of 100 words)
- D. Please provide specific examples of establishment of baseline studies to provide counterfactuals for future *epIA* (max. of 100 words)

**III. Criterion 3: Communication/dissemination and capacity enhancement (10%)**

- A. Please specify how the findings of epIAs have been disseminated in 2006 (Indicate “*Not applicable*” if there is nothing to report under a particular heading):
- 1. Number of epIA briefs published(not general M&E briefs):
  - 2. Dissemination of epIA findings in popular media (number of stories published):

---

<sup>3</sup> It is not expected that centers will have undertaken activity in all subcomponents listed under Criteria 2 and 3, but the list nevertheless needs to be comprehensive so all relevant information is reported.

3. Dissemination of major IA findings through the Center website/IA webpage (indicate number of hits/visits/downloads of IA related reports/articles ):
4. Any other method of dissemination of epIA findings used in 2006:

B. Please specify your Center's efforts in building capacity in IA in 2006 (Indicate "*Not applicable*" if there is nothing to report under a particular heading):

1. Number of IA related conferences/workshops conducted for external audiences in 2006 (e.g., NARS scientists):  
(Please attach list of events)
2. Number of IA related training materials developed:  
(Please attach list)
3. Number of IA visiting specialists from a NARS hosted:
4. Any other IA related capacity building efforts in 2006 (max of 100 words):

**IV.** Please list/describe any other impact-related activity or outcome of 2006 that you believe warrants consideration in this exercise but is not covered in any previous criteria/questions (max of 100 words)..... (Modifier to overall score)

## **Annex 3: Governance checklist for 2006**

### **Composition and Structure (as of December 31, 2006)**

5A-1) What is the percent of Board leadership (Chair, Vice Chair and Standing Committee Chairs) with developing country origin?<sup>4</sup>

- 0%     1-20%     21-40%     41-60%     over 60%

5A-2) What percent of Board membership positions are occupied by women?

- 0%     1-20%     21-40%     41-60%     over 60%

5A-3) What percent of Board membership positions are occupied by individuals whose organizations are either direct recipients of Center funds OR whose organization are contributors to the CGIAR (and the Board member is in direct line responsibility of CGIAR funds)?

- 0-10%     11-20%     21-30%     31-40%     over 51%

5A-4) How many Board members have professional qualification in financial management?<sup>5</sup>

- 0                     1                     2                     3 or more

5A-5) How many Board members have professional expertise in corporate, non-profit or public governance?<sup>6</sup>

- 0-1                     2-3                     4-5                     6 or more

5A-6) Is the Center Director General a member of the Nominating Committee?

- YES                     NO

### **Board Practice**

5A-7) Have all new Board members (who started their terms in 2005 or 2006)

- attended a CGIAR Board Orientation Program?                     YES                     NO

---

<sup>4</sup> This includes all countries that are in the current DAC list of ODA recipients  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/43/51/35832713.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> “professional qualification in financial management” means that a Board member should have (1) a recognized professional qualification in finance (preferably CPA, CA or equivalent), AND (2) have substantive experience in directly managing significant financial matters in the public or private sector.

<sup>6</sup> “professional expertise in corporate, non-profit or public governance” means that a Board member should either (1) have a recognized professional qualification in corporate, non-profit/public governance, or (2) have undergone a major special training in corporate/non-profit/public governance, or (3) have substantial experience in directly leading an institution in the public or private sector.

- attended a comprehensive<sup>7</sup> center-specific orientation program?  YES  NO

5A-8) Has the Board conducted a self-assessment in 2006?

YES  NO

5A-9) Was the full Board engaged in the annual performance assessment of the Board Chair?

YES, the full Board  Yes, less than the full Board  NO

5A-10) Is there a formal process in place for evaluating Board members before re-appointment?

YES  NO

5A-11) How often did the full Board and the Executive Committee meet in 2006 (including virtual meetings)?

\_\_\_\_\_ (No. of meetings of full board)

\_\_\_\_\_ (No. of meeting of Executive Committee)

5A-12) Has the Center completed a Board commissioned CCER on Center governance and management during 2004-2006?

YES  NO

5A-13) Does the Board have a clear strategy for communicating with stakeholders (including CGIAR Members, other Centers, Partners)?

YES  NO

### **Determining the Center's mission and strategy**

5A-14) In 2006, has the entire Board been engaged in reviewing, approving and guiding major institute-wide plans (i.e., MTP)?

YES - Fully  YES - Partially  NO

### **Program Oversight**

5A-15) In 2006, did the Board discuss and act on any significant deviations from previously announced targets and strategic goals for 2005 as defined in the MTP?

YES - Fully  YES - Partially  NO

---

<sup>7</sup> A "comprehensive" orientation program is considered to run at least ONE full day and includes orientation to the Center (in the areas of program, finance, HR, corporate services) and its role within the system.

5A-16) Does the Board have an approved schedule for CCERs on program matters?

- YES  NO

5A-17) In 2006, did the Board monitor actions taken in response to CCERs and EPMRs?

- Yes - Fully  Yes - Partially  No

### **Financial Oversight**

5A-18) Is there, in Board-approved documents, a clear policy on the delegations of authority from the Board to the Director General which indicates those financial transactions for which the approval of the Board is necessary, and those for which decision is delegated to the Director General?

- YES  NO

5A-19) Is there a Board approved investment policy in place?

- YES  NO

5A-20) Has the Board rotated external auditors in line with the CGIAR policy?

- YES  NO

5A-21) Does the full Board receive information on key financial indicators on a quarterly or more frequent basis?

- YES  NO

5A-22) In 2006, did the Board discuss and act on any significant deviations (more than 10 percent) from the budget planned for 2005?

- YES  NO  No deviations

### **Setting and reinforcing ethical standards, values and policies**

5A-23) Is it Board practice to have each Board member declare potential conflicts of interest ahead of each meeting?

- YES  NO

5A-24) Has the Board discussed/ reviewed the Center's human resource policies during 2005-2006?

- YES  NO

5A-25) In 2006, has the Board received and reviewed Center staffing numbers and trends (including consultants and gender and diversity information)?

- YES                       NO

5A-26) Has the Board reviewed the adequacy of the Center's risk management and internal control mechanisms as an explicit Board meeting agenda item during 2005-2006?

- YES                       NO

5A-27) Is there a board approved grievance policy?

- YES                       NO

5A-28) Is there a board approved "whistle blowing" policy?

- YES                       NO

### **Ensuring strong and continuous leadership of Centers**

5A-29) Do Board members other than the Board Chair participate in the annual performance appraisal of the DG, including decisions on compensation?

- YES - Fully               YES - Partially               NO

5A-30) Is there a current succession plan for senior management?

- YES                       NO

### **Disclosure, Transparency and Accountability**

5A-31) Is the following Center information publicly available (e.g. on the Center website)?

- the Centers's current Medium-Term-Plan

- YES                       NO

- Financial performance of the Center (i.e. as disclosed in the Center Annual Report)

- YES                       NO

- Staff compensation structure (i.e. salary scales for different grades of staff)

- YES                       NO

- the latest Center External Programme and Management Review (including Center response)

- YES                       NO

- Minutes of the Center Board Meetings (concerning non-confidential agenda items)

- YES                       NO

5A-32) Does the Center have a formal code of conduct / ethical principles (including conflict of interest rules) for staff, managers and board members?

- YES, fully enforced  
 YES, partially enforced  
 YES, but not enforced  
 NO

5A-33) Are your procurement policies and their implementation fully consistent with the CGIAR Guidelines on Procurement of Goods, Works and Services (FG 6)?

- YES, fully enforced  
 YES, partially enforced  
 YES, but not enforced  
 NO



b. What percentage of the overall 2006 budget was spent on staff training (e.g. computer, language, project management, leadership training etc.)?

- 0- 0.5%     0.51-1.0%     1.1%-2.0%     2.1%-3%     more than 3%

c. Considering staff training only (question 5C-4b), what is the total number of training days in 2006 for all IRS staff, divided by the total number of IRS staff?

- less than 1     1-2.5     2.6-4.5     4.6-6.5     6.6-8     more than 8

d. Considering staff training only, what is the total number of training days in 2006 for all NRS staff, divided by the total number of NRS staff?

- less than 1     1-2.5     2.6-4.5     4.6-6.5     6.6-8     more than 8

**5C-5) On average, how many days did an IRS staff spend in 2006 on program planning and review?**

- 0-2.0     2.1-3.0     3.1-4.0     4.1-5.0     More than 5

**5C-6) Completed CCERs in 2004-2006**

a. How many Board commissioned CCERs on program-related matters were completed in 2004-06?

- 0     1     2     3     4 or more

b. What is the percentage of your program budget (average for 2004-2006) that has been covered by CCERs completed in 2004-06?

- 0%-30%     31% - 50%     51-70%     71%-90%     over 90%

**5C-7) Partnerships**

a. How many SWPs/CPs was the Center actively engaged in as a partner during 2006?

- less than 3     3-6     7-10     more than 11

b. How many **new and substantive** partnerships did the Center establish with external partners (e.g. National Agricultural Research Institutes, Civil Society Organizations) in 2006?

\_\_\_\_\_ No. of **NEW** partnerships

Please list names of up to 3 new partner organizations.

**5C-8) Do you systematically preserve research project data (primary and secondary data sets), including documentation on the data and project?**

- YES, we have a comprehensive (meta) database for primary and secondary research data that is fully available for internal use<sup>8</sup>
- YES, we have some, but not all, of the research project data preserved and these are internally available
- NO, we do not have at all a (meta) database preserving research data systematically

---

<sup>8</sup> Including the infrastructure to electronically store, catalog, retrieve and back-up research data for institutionalized access and disaster recovery.