

Update on the CGIAR Performance Measurement System: Results from the workshop held on July 17/18 in Washington DC

Prepared by the CGIAR Secretariat and the SC/SC Secretariat

Background

At its meeting in May 2008, ExCo, who has oversight responsibility for the CGIAR PM System, made the following decisions:

- *ExCo endorsed the CGIAR Secretariat suggestion to organize a workshop and invite representatives from the SC, CGIAR Membership, Alliance, and M&E experts.*
- *ExCo recognized that there is still a call for output indicators. The workshop should explore ways to improve the PM System, including identifying those indicators that are most useful to the CGIAR System and can act as an early warning system.*
- *A flow chart should be developed to help clarify the link among outputs, outcomes and impact.*
- *The CGIAR Change Management Process has also identified information that needs to be collected and this could be built into the PM System.*

As a follow-up a workshop was jointly organized by the CGIAR Secretariat and the SC inviting representatives from the Alliance (i.e. ADE), CGIAR Membership and M&E experts. The workshop was held on July 17/18, 2008 in Washington DC.

Objectives of the workshop

The main objectives of the workshop were to review the overall design and indicators of the current PM system, and identify possibilities for simplification while maintaining relevance, accuracy and continuity.

Special focus has been on improving the validity and reliability of

- the output element
- the institutional health element

Results

A major enhancement of the PM system has been proposed, simplifying the system and reducing the number of indicators (please see annex for details on the proposed changes).

The full results from the workshop can be accessed at

http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/PM%20workshop%20summary%20of%20proceedings_Final%20_Aug7,%202008_.pdf

Next steps

- ADE will develop a new draft output indicator on (i) capacity building (ii) data management by Nov. 15, 2008 for consultation with the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat. If no viable indicator is developed by mid November the PM System will continue using the publication indicator as the new key output indicator along with information on the achievement of outputs targets planned in the MTPs.
- CGMap will be further developed to also capture information on achievement of output targets available to all interested stakeholders (linked to the PM online system)

- The SC organizes a meeting of Centers impact focal points in November 2008 which will include a consultation on potential indicators of actual impact for inclusion in the PM System
- CGIAR Secretariat and the SC Secretariat in consultation with the Alliance will develop guidelines for use of PM information by end of 2008, in time for the next PM cycle
- The CGIAR Secretariat and the SC Secretariat will prepare a presentation that can be used as a briefing module during Center Board Orientation meetings.
- PM indicators for CPs are being prepared by the SC and CGIAR Secretariat in consultation with the CP coordinators.

Participants

Representatives from the SC, CGIAR Membership, Alliance, CGIAR Secretariat and M&E experts.

Annex: Summary of planned changes for strengthening the CGIAR Performance Measurement System

a) Output targets

1. Achievement of output targets will be monitored by Centers and will be made publicly available through linking CGMap with the PM System. Centers will report achievement (full or partial), deferral of target to a further date or cancellation of output target, and give reasons for other than expected achievement.
2. The PM System will not have an overall measure of percentage of output targets achieved, but through linking the PM System with the newly established CGMap it will continue to allow interested CGIAR Members and Partners to track the results (i.e. outputs) for individual projects.
3. Information on previous year's output target achievement will be reported as part of the MTP submission process (in June of each year)

Output indicators

1. A composite publications indicator (4a,b,d) with distinct weights will be established.
2. Changes to the denominator for the publication indicator will be further examined (budget vs. full-time equivalent).
3. The sub-indicator 4a will include registered cultivars.
4. A new composite indicator for capacity strengthening will be developed; this indicator will include 4c.
5. A new indicator for data management as IPG will be developed.

Indicators for capacity strengthening and data management will be first piloted with a subset of Centers before they are included in the PM system.

b) Outcome indicator

1. The number of required outcome cases will be relative to center budget based on the previous year's CGIAR Financial Report; 4 budget brackets will be established annually.
2. Centers are strongly encouraged to submit outcome cases across the entire project portfolio every 3 years.
3. The annual score will be based on a three year moving average of the assessment.

c) Impact Indicator:

1. Rename indicator to "Impact culture".
2. Establish a composite score on Impact culture (3a and 3b to be merged; 3b score remains for 3 years).
3. 3a to be simplified and the weighting of components should be revisited
4. The annual score will be based on a three year moving average of the assessment.
5. Give centers the possibility to improve their Indicator 3b score by allowing submission of one new study within the 3- year time frame to replace a lower score study.
6. SPIA's meeting with center focal points on impacts will aim at designing an indicator of actual impact by AGM 08.
7. Benchmark of one ex-post impact assessment per \$5 million center budget needs to be revisited by SC
8. Impact culture indicator should move to the culture of learning and change component once an indicator of actual impact is introduced to the PM system

d) Governance sub-element

1. Develop a single summary score for the governance checklist
2. Streamline checklist into two tiers, reduce sub-indicators to those meaningful to annual reporting, tie to benchmarks/best practices where possible; introduce weights to the checklist
3. Clarify assessment criteria for Board statements
4. Seek Alliance Board feedback on revisions to checklist and assessment of Board statements
5. Recommend that annual submissions of Board statements be reviewed by board chairs before submission; continue to give greater focus on governance in EPMRs

e) Culture of learning and change sub-element

1. Develop a single summary score for the culture of learning and change checklist
2. Streamline/revise checklist and introduce weights, if possible
3. Eliminate: questions related to data management (covered by output indicator), Partnerships (information to be evident in stakeholder survey, publications, capacity indicator, outcomes, EPMR)
4. Indicators of impact culture should move to this component once a way to measure actual impact is found.

f) Diversity sub-element

1. Drop the indicator “Diversity in recency of PhDs”
2. Consult with G&D program on indicator 5A (explore retrieving data from survey)

Some sub-indicators reflect system-wide goals that are values-based (diversity, investment in staff development) for which there is no established benchmark or that will vary depending on the size and mission of the Center. Measuring performance in these areas remains important. In these cases, the center's scores will be compared to the system-wide average to enable Centers to set internal goals and to place their performance in context.

g) Financial health indicators

1. Retain two indicators: (i) reserves and (ii) cash management; the remaining three indicators are to be removed from the PM system
2. Increase the benchmark for reserves to 90 days (with a transition period of 3 years) – this is subject to ExCo approval
3. Propose to ExCo to eliminate maximum number of days of reserves;
4. Establish benchmark for cash management on restricted operations at less than 1.0
5. Alliance and CGIAR Sec should develop a common and broader set of “dashboard” financial indicators for monitoring financial health outside the PM at Center level (governance checklist may help to verify whether a common system is used by Centers)

h) Stakeholders Perceptions No changes were discussed.

