

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

**Guidelines for the Reporting of Performance Indicators
for CGIAR Centers
(2007 data)**



**Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat
January 18, 2008**

Guidelines for the Reporting of Performance Indicators for CGIAR Centers (2007 data)

Introduction

The CGIAR Performance Measurement System is a regular feature in the CGIAR Monitoring & Evaluation structure.

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 2008 PM exercise.

Timeline for 2008 PM exercise	
January 18	Launch of the 2007 PM process, including instructions and definitions of indicators.
February 12	Launch of on-line data collection system.
March 14	Deadline for Center reporting on PM indicators.
March 17	Data assessment and verification begins
March 31- April 2	SC meeting – discussion of PM findings.
April 30	Data verification completed.
May 15	Discussion of results by ExCo.
June	Online report made available to Members and Centers.

2. The CGIAR Performance Measurement System – Use and benchmarks

The performance measurement system is a diagnostic tool to understand the current performance status of each CGIAR Center against a set of indicators.

The PM system is used as

- a learning tool for a Center’s own performance management and benchmarking with its sister Centers where possible and appropriate,
- a tool for demonstrating accountability and transparency to CGIAR stakeholders,
- an M&E instrument complementing EPMRs and Center-Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs),
- a tool to enable a better understanding of CGIAR System performance.
- an early warning system to alert the CGIAR to any problems and weaknesses annually and thereby allow the rapid implementation of counter measures.

A frequently asked question is about the recommended target that Centers should strive for each indicator. The PM System has so far used benchmarking in two ways. i) Benchmarking performance of a center against itself over time, ii) benchmarking internally among Centers. In some cases, such as nationality concentration among scientists or gender diversity, there is no right answer. However, it should be noted that the literature provides ample evidence that staff diversity promotes innovation, change, and provides an enabling environment for staff, and therefore it is deemed useful to monitor this indicator on what is perhaps a broad target by measuring whether any Centers are too high or too low relative to other Centers. It is expected once strong trend data for each individual Center is available that Centers could be “benchmarked” against their past performance through self-assessment on some indicators, where possible.

3. Submission of evidence material supporting the performance measures

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

Centers are requested to submit certain evidence supporting the reported data at the time of submission of the indicators. This requirement is indicated with the phrase “Requested evidence material”. However, during the verification phase conducted by an External Verifier, the Centers will be requested to submit more detailed evidence material for those indicators selected on a sample basis. (e.g., governance checklist, culture of learning and change checklist etc.). While this material can be uploaded to the PM database already earlier (if desired by the Center), we suggest to wait until the indicators to be verified are selected so the burden will be less on Centers.

Part 2: Description of Indicators

I. Indicators of Results

Element 1: Outputs

Indicator 1: % MTP output targets achieved in 2007

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.

Rationale: This indicator measures directly the achievement of the actual product that the Centers have planned to develop for the targeted users.

Centers are requested to report on achievement in 2007 of the annual output targets set in MTP 2007-2009. The PM report is to cover all MTP projects and outputs listed in MTP 2007-2009. 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 3rd 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 2007, Centers should include only output targets from MTP 2007-2009 planned for 2007 that describe deliverable research and capacity building achievements. The SC has recommended that the monitoring of output target achievement be transferred to the MTP process. The output target achievement will be reported and monitored in the CGMap, which is a System level database. The SC recommendation will be further considered and discussed at ExCo meeting in May 2008.

- 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).

Rationale: This indicator measures the relevance of the research by the Center and its ability to monitor and document outcomes from the diffusion of research outputs as the first step toward demonstrating impact.

Centers are requested to report on the **five (5) most significant outcomes documented in 2007** resulting from outputs that the Center produced. The outcomes need to be linked to an identifiable achieved output target (also called research milestone in MTPs prior to MTP 2006-2008) or to an overall achieved output specified in any MTP.

Please provide a description (in 500 words maximum) for each of the five outcomes, including the following:

- An outcome statement
- What output/output target resulted in the outcome?
- In which MTP was the output/output target identified as planned before its achievement?
- Where was the achievement of the output/output target documented?
- 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 magnitude (in terms of, for example, geographic coverage or reach of intended user groups) of the outcome relative to the intended recommendation domain?
- What is the evidence for the outcome? Specifically, what kind of data were collected or study was conducted? Who collected the data and/or conducted the study? If not included in the outcome evidence, what is the evidence that shows that the outcome is derived from the output/output target?

Requested Evidence Material

Please make all evidence documents available in the PM database as attachments (files or zipped files). Keep the documentation to the minimum and include only direct evidence explicitly documenting the outcome and showing the link from the output to the outcome, not anecdotal evidence.

The study documenting the outcome must have been completed in 2007 but the output/output target from where the outcome derived can be from any time period. Relevant sections from large reports can be extracted into a single document. In such case full references need to be given. If the evidence for the achievement of the output is not in the outcome study, it needs to be included separately. The most appropriate evidence documents are studies that have been specifically conducted to monitor outcomes and therefore clearly establish the link from Center output to the outcome. Testimony from a stakeholder is not sufficient evidence.

Direct evidence means that a study has been conducted or set of observations are collected showing explicitly that the outcome has occurred or the outcome is explicitly reported in document other than an outcome assessment, for example in a newspaper article. Anecdotal evidence refers to material, including for example books, photographs, newspaper articles and bills that have limited relevance to the outcome reported or make an unsubstantiated reference to the outcome.

The value of the overall evidence depends on the strength of the evidence about the outcome having occurred and attribution of the outcome to a specific Center output/output target.

Assessment

Each of the 5 outcomes will be assessed by the SC with a maximum total score of 10. The criteria to assess each of the outcomes are:

1. Is the outcome described an actual outcome?
2. Is there a reasonable (plausible) indication that the outcome is derived from a realized Center output or output target?
3. Is the realized output/output target from which the outcome is derived clearly identified in an MTP?
4. Has an outcome from the same output/output target been reported in an earlier year?
5. Is the realized output/output target clearly described and verified?
6. Is the outcome description specific on how the output was used to derive the outcome?
7. Is there clear evidence of the outcome?
8. Is the linkage from the Center output/output target explicitly documented in the outcome evidence?
9. Does the outcome show significant, documented and verifiable adoption/use/influence in the main recommendation domain?
10. Is the outcome derived from a research output that can be extrapolated widely (i.e. as a result of IPG research?)

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.

Rationale: This indicator measures the Center's efforts to document impact from their past research to fulfill their accountability imperative towards CGIAR stakeholders. It also measures Centers efforts to institutionalize impact culture among their own researchers and partners.

Indicator 3A: SC/SPIA rating of Commitment to documenting impacts and building impact assessment culture

Centers are requested to report information on the commitment to documenting impacts and building impact assessment culture 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 as a measure of the relevance and quality of current research. The first two indicators (4A and B) both measure the number of externally peer-reviewed publications but distinguish two groups of publications - externally peer-reviewed articles published in journals listed in the Thomson Scientific/ISI (4B) and other externally peer-reviewed publications (e.g. books and other externally peer-reviewed articles; 4A).¹ Jointly these two indicators represent the Center's entire externally peer reviewed publication record. The 4A indicator aims to assess the "reach" of Center publications to a targeted audience while indicator 4B puts more emphasis on quality and international recognition. This year you are asked to provide the information for 4A and 4B slightly more disaggregated.

In order to strengthen the quality attribute of the publications indicators, an additional indicator (4D) will be tested in 2008 based on a sub-group of 4B publications.

Indicator 4A: Number of externally peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2007 (excluding articles published in journals listed in (i) the Thomson Scientific/ ISI).

Rationale: This indicator reflects the scientific productivity of the Center for targeted stakeholder audiences (not including major international journals)

Please report the externally peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2007. Please report separately– if pertinent:

- number of externally peer-reviewed publications per scientist in externally published journals and books.
- number of externally peer-reviewed publications per scientist in Center-produced book/research report series or journals.

Externally peer reviewed means that the publications have been reviewed by experts that are not Centers' staff or work as consultants with the Centers.

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, (iv) volume number, (v) name of journal, (vi) book or other, (vii) page numbers (range), (viii) indication of whether it is a Center owned series/journal or an externally published journal or book, (ix) indication of which author is a developing country partner if applicable, and (x) editors.

¹ The Thomson list includes several open access journals and articles and those are to be included in 4B. Other open access journal articles are to be included in 4A.

- List of scientists included in the denominator FTE. This list must include: (i) Name and position or title, (ii) date of hire and departure, and (iii) status (e.g. IRS, RRS NRS). Please also include a description of your indicator computation and the FTE for each scientist in the list.

Guidelines for measuring the number of peer-reviewed publications

- This should include publications strictly published in 2007. 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 staff¹; 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 abstracts, working papers, internal series, newsletters, 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 in 2007 all appropriate 2007 publications may be counted. If the scientist has left in years prior to 2007 and the publication is published in 2007, then both the publication and scientist must be counted only if the publication was prepared during the scientist's tenure at the center. Please refer to "Annex 1. Summary of definitions" for the calculation of FTE in these cases.
- 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.

¹ 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 2007 that are published in journals listed in (i) Thomson Scientific/ISI.

Rationale: This indicator reflects the productivity and publishing quality of the Center as a provider of research that meets international peer standards as established by an internationally recognized journal database.

Please report the number of peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2007 that are published in journals listed in the Thomson Scientific/ISI Master Journal List (database of over 14580 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 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, (iv) volume number, (v) journal name, (vi) page numbers, (vii) ISSN, and (viii) indication of which author is a developing country partner if applicable.
- List of scientists included in the denominator FTE. This list must include: (i) Name and position or title, (ii) date of hire and departure, and (iii) status (e.g. IRS, RRS NRS). Please also include a description of your indicator computation and the FTE for each scientist in the list.

Follow the guidelines for measuring the number of externally peer-reviewed publications given above when applicable. For calculating the number of scientists and its FTE 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 2007.

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 has NARS based co-authors within the total list.

Requested Evidence Material:

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

Indicator 4 D: Relative rating of Center's 10 best publications included in indicator 4B regarding journal impact factor.

Rationale: This indicator reflects the quality and originality of the Center's research shown by ability to reach top quality journals with a proportion of all publications.

This indicator is piloted in 2008 on a sample of articles submitted for 4B. Centers do not have to provide additional information. **The results of this piloting will be shared with Centers but will not affect the result of this year's exercise.**

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 2007 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. (e.g. Board minutes or papers presented to/adopted by the Board).

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 2007).

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 comes from the top two countries represented in the IRS staff nationality list for the Center (as of December 31, 2007). 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 (2003-2007).

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 as described in FG3. 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 2007) and should include the time of

- All internationally recruited staff contributing to Center and CP research in 2007, 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 is 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 2007 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.

Full Time Equivalent (FTE)

Is the percentage of time a staff scientist works represented as a decimal. A full-time person is 1.00, a half-time person is .50 and a quarter-time person is .25. Please note that the basis for calculating the FTE of scientists should be the date in their employment contract. Scientists that joined or left the Center in 2007 should be pro-rated according to the month they joined or left the Center, e.g. if they worked 7 months in 2007 then the FTE would be 7/12 or 0.58. Any discounting related to the scientist work program (e.g. time allocation to research, project management) is not allowed.

In the exceptional cases where a scientist has left the center in a year prior to 2007 and his/her publication was published in 2007, the publication can be included and the FTE will again be the number of months that the scientist worked during the year they left divided by 12, e.g.; the scientist left in 2006 and worked 5 months during that year, then the FTE would be $5/12 = 0.42$

Externally peer reviewed publication

Publications that have been reviewed by experts that are not Centers' staff or work as consultants with the Centers.

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 2007.

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 – 2008 PM Exercise

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

A. Please provide the full citation of all epIA studies² published in 2007 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		
.		
.		

²An 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	
1. Publication venue (check one)							
Refereed journal							
Book chapter							
Conference paper (includes proceedings)							
In-house publication (reviewed externally)							
In-house publication (not reviewed externally)							
2. (Co-) authorship (check one or more)							
with other CG Center scientists							
with NARS scientists							
with ARI scientists							
Center only scientists							
3. EpIA coverage (check at least one)							
commodity improvement							
NRM related							
policy related							
biodiversity related							
training/capacity building related							
other							
specify:							
4. Distance down the impact pathway covered by the study (check one or more)							

Components	Study # (corresponding to the list in I.A)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
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)							
5. Geographical breadth of impacts assessed by the study (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)							
6. Advances in new methods/models for epIA embodied in the study (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 number of full time equivalent staff³ devoted to epIA work in your Center in 2007:

³ Please refer to the FTE and Scientist definition included on the Annex 1: Summary of definitions. Please note that particularly these criteria applies to internationally and nationally recruited scientist and consultants, but no RAs. It also 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) (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 2007 (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):
- 3. Any other method of dissemination of *epIA* findings used in 2007:

B. Please specify your Center’s efforts in building capacity in IA in 2007 (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 2007 (e.g., NARS scientists):
(Please attach list events)
2. Number of IA related training materials developed:
(Please list)
3. Number of IA visiting specialists from a NARS hosted:
4. Any other IA related capacity building efforts in 2007 (max of 100 words):

IV. Please list/describe any other impact-related activity or outcome of 2007 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 2007⁴

Composition and Structure (as of December 31, 2007)

5A-1) What is the percentage of Board leadership (Chair, Vice Chair and Standing Committee Chairs) with developing country origin?⁵

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

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

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

5A-3) What percentage 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?⁶

- 0 1 2 3 or more

5A-5) How many Board members have professional expertise in corporate, non-profit or public governance?⁷

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

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

- YES NO

⁴ Some indicators for this year are been kept dormant because either they have been fully achieved by the Centers or showed no variation during the last years. These indicators can be reactivated in the next years. Those indicators will be marked with an asterisk.

⁵ This includes all countries that are in the current DAC list of ODA recipients
www.oecd.org/dataoecd/43/51/35832713.pdf

⁶ “Professional qualification in financial management” means that a Board member should (1) either have a recognized professional qualification in finance (preferably CPA, CA or equivalent) or recognized professional affiliation/membership with a financial professional organization, AND (2) have substantive experience in directly managing significant financial matters in the public or private sector. This means as a Chief Financial Officer or equivalent of the organization, and not in any other capacity where the financial management is not the main function but only an incidental function to the position.

⁷ “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.

Board Practice

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

- attended a CGIAR Board Orientation Program? YES NO

- attended a comprehensive⁸ center-specific orientation program? YES NO

5A-8) Has the Board conducted a self-assessment in 2007?

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) Was a formal evaluation of board members conducted before reappointment?

YES NO NO Renewed board members in 2007

5A-11) How often did the full Board and the Executive Committee meet in 2007 (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 2005-2007?

YES NO

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

YES NO

Determining the Center's mission and strategy

5A-14) In 2007, has the entire Board been engaged in reviewing, approving and guiding the, Medium Term Plans (MTP)?

YES - Fully YES - Partially NO

⁸ 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.

Program Oversight

5A-15) In 2007, did the Board discuss and act on any significant deviations from previously announced targets and strategic goals for 2006 as defined in the MTP?

- YES - Fully YES - Partially NO NO Deviations

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

- YES NO

5A-17) In 2007, did the Board monitor actions taken in response to CCERs and EPMRs?

- Yes - both Yes – only EMPRS Yes only CCERs NO- both

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) How often the full Board receive information on key financial indicators?

- Monthly Quarterly Annually

5A-22) In 2007, did the Board discuss and act on any significant deviations (more than 10 percent) from the budget planned for 2006?

- 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 at the start of each meeting?

- YES NO

5A-24) Has the Board discussed/ reviewed the Center's human resource policies during 2006-2007?

YES NO

5A-25) In 2007, 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 2006-2007?

YES NO

5A-27) Is there a board approved grievance policy?⁹

YES NO

5A-28) Is there a board approved "whistle blowing" policy?¹⁰

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 on the Center external website?

-The Centers' current Medium-Term-Plan

YES NO

⁹ This policy, often part of a Center human resources policy, describes the procedures open to staff to raise concerns about their employment, compensation arrangements or other issues.

¹⁰ This policy describes the open and confidential communication channels open to staff to report concerns about misconduct of a third party (e.g. mismanagements, misuse of authority, etc). It could report about the Centers' non-compliance with its own policies, its contractual obligations with third parties or applicable country laws and regulations. A whistle blowing policy ensures whistleblower is protected against reprisal.

-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)¹¹

- 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, 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

¹¹ The information requested is the compensation structure or criteria used for compensation and the corresponding compensation ranges, not the specific salary amounts of each staff member.

Annex 4: Checklist on culture of learning and change - 2007

5C-1) Staff surveys

a. Has the Center conducted a staff satisfaction and/or attitude survey of ALL staff in 2006 or 2007, where the results were shared with staff?

- YES NO

b. If yes, did the survey result in specific action plans to improve staff satisfaction and /or attitudes?

- YES NO

5C-2) Leadership development program

a. Does the Center have an active leadership development program covering current and prospective staff in managerial positions?

- YES, for current AND prospective staff
 YES, for current staff
 YES, for prospective staff
 NO

5C-3) Individual Learning plans

a. Does the staff appraisal system include the development and follow-up of annual individual learning plans?

- YES NO

b. Does the Center have a mentoring program for young scientists?

- YES NO

5C-4) Staff development activities

a. What percentage of the overall 2007 budget was spent for attendance at international conferences or professional society meetings, or for a short sabbatical at a university, etc?

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

b. What percentage of the overall 2007 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 2007 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 2007 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 2007 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 2005-2007

a. How many Board commissioned CCERs on program-related matters were completed in 2005-07?

- 0 1 2 3 4 or more

b. What is the percentage of your program budget (average for 2005-2007) that has been covered by CCERs completed in 2005-07?

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

5C-7) Partnerships

a. How many SWEPS/CPs was the Center actively engaged in as a partner during 2007?¹²

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

¹² The current seventeen SWEPS are listed and described in the following link:
<http://www.cgiar.org/impact/initiatives.html>

- b. How many **new and substantive** partnerships did the Center establish with external partners (e.g. National Agricultural Research Institutes, Civil Society Organizations) in 2007?.¹³

_____No. of **NEW** partnerships.

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 use¹⁴
- YES, we have some (meta) database, 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

¹³Please consider that for the verification you will be asked to provide: the name of Partner Institute with which Center entered into a New and Substantial Partnership; the date when this partnership was formally forged and the purpose of the partnership. You will also be required to provide a Memorandum of Understanding or any other document to support the establishment of the new partnership in 2007.

¹⁴ Including the infrastructure to electronically store, catalog, retrieve and back-up research data for institutionalized access and disaster recovery.