

## CGIAR Program performance management standards

### 06 June 2018, Science leader's meeting results

(Numbering from the long list in the meeting Background Document is shown in parenthesis in column 2)

The set of standards in the long list is split into the following categories:

- Standards numbered A-E below are **agreed** (these are respectively standards 2, 4, 5, 11, 18 from the long list in the meeting background document).
- Standards numbered 9 and 10 in the long list are **rejected** by CRP directors and DDG-Rs.
- On Standards numbered 1, 3, 8, DDGR-s have **different views** than CRP directors (as of today)
- Three of standards (15,16,17) in the long list still **need to be reviewed** by the DDG-Rs. For these, the CRP directors propose a consideration for the second business cycle 2022-2024 only.
- Finally, the remaining long listed standards could be better addressed by a **different CGIAR oversight** processes than performance-based measurement and/or need further conceptualization.

	Topics	Measures / monitoring	Comments (DDG-R & CRP/PF Leaders -in italics)
<b>The following standards are AGREED between the DDG-Rs and CRP leaders groups, for implementation in the first business cycle 2019-2021</b>			
A	All key program <u>and project</u> documents accessible to be viewed electronically by appropriate external bodies. (11) <i>Key documents are available to be viewed by CGIAR advisory bodies and SMO.</i>	<i>What documents? POWB, AR, ISC and MC minutes, Go&amp;Mgmt Handbook, ... on website</i> <i>On a needs basis: per project information, at individual, per CoA, per FP level: Give access to MARLO/MEL/GB online reporting tool</i> <i>Standard: 100% available</i>	Possible, but specification of what is the meaning of “key”. This needs to be available or already existing documents that donors allow to share. In the case of projects, only those linked to the CRP. Program documents are responsibility of CRP management, project documents are responsibility of the centers. Definition of what “accessible” means. Not for external bodies only internal to the program/CGIAR.
B	Program theory of change regularly reviewed and updated and logical decisions are taken about (re)prioritization of W1/2 funding, including activities to expand or <u>cut back</u> . (4)	<i>= CRP-MC minutes, tracking of decisions</i>	Possible. This is CRP management responsibility. This should be reflected in the minutes of the management committee in terms of the review and changes. <i>Low cost, implement now. See minutes, tracking of decisions</i>

	<i>(no reformulation by CRP Leaders)</i>		
C	Credible management process for selection and integration, of new projects by program (2)  <i>CRP/Platform has a credible management process for selection, prioritization and inclusion of new projects (see definition provided by SMO)</i>	<i>= Documented process &amp; minutes (e.g. applying process)</i>	The design and prioritization is a center responsibility. The programs management can decide whether to integrate the project.  <i>CRP-MC's do review bilateral project portfolio, start at FP level (WLE, WHEAT, MAIZE) = documented in CRP-MC minutes. De facto standard. Make sure process well documented.</i>  <i>Low cost, implement</i>
D	Gender equality is appropriately mainstreamed into the program (5) <i>Gender is appropriately mainstreamed into the program</i>	<i>All projects or outputs within the CRP have been tagged using the agreed OECD gender scoring system (1,2,3) &amp; for all tagged 1 or 2 there is a summary statement of gender finding(s) - with ex post verification of a random sample to check that the scores are appropriately assigned, on annual basis = 'appropriately'</i>	Possible. Need to define what "gender equality" means and how to measure or track it. This will be at project level, so responsibility of the centers.
E	Program registers and regularly monitors risks (18)		Possible. The centers are monitoring risks, which is overseen by the centers' boards. Program management could do risk analysis at higher level related specifically to the CRP.
<b>The following are REJECTED by the DDG-Rs and CRP leaders groups for implementation in the first business cycle 2019-2021</b>			
	Capacity development is appropriately designed and delivered in support of the Program Theory of Change. (10)		Impossible. This is important but needs to be evaluated not for performance management. This is usually done at the project level.
	Program selects appropriate external partnerships, linked to the impact pathway (9)		Impossible. This would have implications for detailed evaluation, compare partners, due diligence, explain why

		particular partners were selected. This should be done at the center level with substantial additional effort.
DDG-Rs and CRP leaders groups have <b>differing views</b> (as of today) on the following standards		
Program has an effective scientific challenge and verification approach (3) <i>Program governance structures (Lead Center BoT-, -ISC, -MC) are performing management, advisory and oversight functions as per ToR.</i>	<i>= ToR, minutes, decision tracking documented on annual basis, publically available</i>	<b>DDG-Rs:</b> not possible at the program management level, but it needs to define what “effective scientific challenge and verification” mean, how to measure it. This can happen at several levels, eg. at the center level (boards), it involves a number of indicators. To be effective scientific challenge, this would include external review, which are not affordable, depending on the periodicity. <b>CRP leaders:</b> -ISC = advisory, can challenge -MC = challenge function as well <i>Low cost, implement now, but some extra work on checking on effectiveness</i>
Program works effectively and efficiently with all “Program Participants” (co-managing partners) (8)		<b>DDGRs:</b> Possible at the program management level. <b>CRP Leaders:</b> <i>Not appropriate as a standard, more useful is self-assessment approach and recurring agenda item in CRP-MC and CRP-ISC.</i>
Projects in program have credible documentation of objectives and assumptions, and clear explanation of how they are aligned with program objectives (1)		<b>DDGRs:</b> Possible at the center level. Applicable only to those projects aligned/selected to be part of the CRP. Clarification about what “clear explanation” means and how to verify it. This should not represent substantial additional effort for the centers. <b>Potential for second or later business cycles</b> <b>CRP Leaders:</b> <i>Redundant, subsumed under ITEM C (3<sup>rd</sup> row above), see MARLO/MEL standards of documenting projects, linked to 2022 outcomes, FP/CoAs, sub-IDOs</i>
The following standards are <b>still to be reviewed</b> by the DDG-Rs, and discussed in the two groups		
Program has made adequate progress towards open and FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) data. (15)		<b>Potential for second or later business cycles</b>
Program produces high quality <u>evidence</u> of its claims for outcomes and impacts (16)		<b>Potential for second or later business cycles</b>

	<p>Program progress reporting to CGIAR (annual reports, common reporting indicators) is substantially complete and <u>adequately evidenced</u> (16)</p> <p><i>Program progress reporting to CGIAR (annual reports, common reporting indicators) is substantially complete and adequately evidenced</i></p>	<p>= AR provided, shared on CGIAR website.</p> <p><i>Evidence – check a sample of common reporting indicators and statements in annual reports.</i></p>	<p><b>Potential for second or later business cycles</b></p>
	<p>Program effectively plans and manages budgets (17)</p>		
<p>The following standards from the long list may be better <b>addressed by a different CGIAR oversight process</b> than the performance standards <b>and/or need additional work on conceptualization</b></p>			
	<p>Climate change is appropriately mainstreamed into the program (6)</p>		<p><i>Risk of perverse incentive and confusion. Focus should remain on CCAFS playing role of integrating program.</i></p>
	<p>Projects in programs have appropriate ethical approval, and ethical training of staff and contractors as needed (13)</p>		
	<p>Program has processes in place to ensure that research methods are sound, that perspectives of intended users have been considered and that research findings are robust, logically interpreted and clearly presented. (14)</p>		
	<p>Research and MELIA ('Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Impact Assessment') are strategically used by the program, including for testing assumptions in impact pathways (7)</p> <p>Program manages Intellectual Assets appropriately. (19)</p> <p><i>The CRP/PF uses research and MELIA to inform program development</i></p>	<p>- MELIA multi-year plan approved, budgeted and progress monitored</p> <p>- MELIA (learning, evaluation) tools made available to CRP and partner scientists (via different channels,</p>	<p>CRP-leaders: Ok for first cycle</p>

		<i>including Project Management training)</i> <i>- Some form of tracking of tool use in place</i>	
	Program has adequate measures in place to manage the risk of fraud and scientific fraud (20)		
	Program has systems in place for capturing learning, including managing data effectively and appropriately (21)		
	Efficiency: e.g. program regularly reviews opportunities to make efficiency savings		
	Leadership ...		
	Program responds adequately to other system priorities (e.g. youth)		
	Various aspects of Human Resources, for example staffing in relation to the program of work; retention; clarity on roles and responsibilities; performance systems which reflect program objectives, and gender equality in terms of salary and terms and conditions.		