

Lessons Learnt From the Pilot Year 2004 Implementation of the CGIAR Performance Measurement System¹

Executive Summary

The new CGIAR Performance Measurement (PM) System was piloted in 2005 with data from 2004. Overall, the exercise has been a positive experience for all involved - on one side it helped Centers to better understand their own performance, and on the other side members expressed satisfaction with increased accountability and welcomed new information on performance which also helped in their funding allocation decisions.

The CGIAR Secretariat and the Science Council's joint assessment of the pilot experience indicate that the exercise has been useful for Members and Centers, but that several refinements are necessary. An improved PM System is expected to be in place for 2005. Suggestions for refining the performance elements and specific indicators include the following:

1. Eight Performance Elements

RESULTS DIMENSION

- **Outputs** – The output indicator “ % of output targets achieved” is appropriate, but the SC will need to work with Centers to guide the planning of output targets so they are measurable and clear, and significant enough to result in a difference towards achieving CGIAR goals;
- **Outcome** – During the initial years of the PM System implementation, Centers should be provided guidance on reporting their 5 documented outcomes that fully meet the definition of outcome (adoption, use or influence of Center outputs). The SC will then assess and rate 5 documented outcome cases. The SC rating will constitute the performance measure;
- **Impact** – Both impact indicators should be maintained with minor modifications: For the first indicator Centers should specify and document the ex-post impact assessment (epIA) activities, outputs and outcomes over the past year, particularly related to: (a) epIA studies; (b) innovation and advancement of epIA; (c) communication/dissemination and capacity enhancement; and (d) impact culture. For the second indicator Centers should be requested to submit every three years their two best completed impact studies that document the change towards achieving CGIAR goals. The PM indicator will be a SC/SPIA rating of the studies for rigor.
- **Stakeholder Perception** - The SC agrees that measuring stakeholder perceptions is important, but does not consider the tested indicator as a suitable results indicator and therefore suggests dropping it until a suitable one is identified and tested. On the other hand, shareholder and client views are considered a critical and important component of performance in most institutional performance measurement systems (or balanced score card systems)—because customer/stakeholder satisfaction is one

¹ Based on findings from the CGIAR Secretariat, the SC, the CGIAR Internal Audit Unit and considers feedback from Centers.

of the main targets for-profit and non-profit organizations aim at. This year's pilot covered only the CGIAR Member perceptions, and could be improved based on the experience with the pilot. In addition, the survey or surveys could be structured so as to capture more differentiated perceptions of a wider range of stakeholders.

POTENTIAL TO PERFORM DIMENSION

- **Quality of Research Staff:** The definition of the publication indicator should be further clarified by developing criteria for inclusion of publications in the count. Also the inclusion of the “impact factor” of journals should be considered in the final calculation of the indicator; the “no. of awards” indicator showed validity weaknesses in reflecting quality of staff. The SC recommends dropping this indicator. Alternatively, the definition of the indicator could be either designed to be further restrictive by developing criteria for the inclusion of awards in the count, or a substitute indicator yielding more valid and reliable data should be developed; the indicator “% of Center’s top choice candidates for research and managerial positions who accept the offer” should be either dropped (as suggested by the SC) or replaced by another indicator that better captures a Center’s performance or ability to attract high quality candidates. This element could be merged with Element 6 under the heading of “Quality and Relevance of Current Research”.
- **Quality and Relevance of Programs:** The publication indicator is considered suitable, but it should be explored whether it would be more appropriate to measure the publications with developing country partner authors per scientist as a percentage of total papers rather than the actual number. In addition, two other indicators could be tested next year: (i) EPMP rating of quality of research programs, and (ii) Citation indices.
- **Institutional Health**
 - **Governance:** Results from the pilot indicate that the checklist has been helpful in understanding Board performance in terms of only some aspects of organization and management of Board business and Board engagement with Centers strategic business. Therefore, complementing this checklist with other measures would strengthen this sub-element of institutional health. Options could be (i) requesting annual Board statements confirming/not confirming their fulfillment of certain Board oversight responsibilities, and (ii) conducting a Board member survey.
 - **Culture of Learning and Change:** The questionnaire should be expanded to also capture additional dimensions of learning and change, including knowledge sharing and innovation.
 - **Diversity:** The diversity indicators should be maintained and definitions clarified. Two additional indicators could be considered as complementing one of the pilot indicators (% of management positions occupied by women): (i) % of female scientists, and (ii) % of female postdocs.
- **Financial Health:** Although both indicators seem to be well established in the CGIAR, their adequacy for reflecting the financial health of the Centers should be examined, including their recommended range. Also the inclusion of additional

financial indicators should be explored, with inputs from the CGIAR finance community.

2. Performance Data Collection

- Instructions for collecting the data and definitions of indicators should be made clearer in the 2006 exercise;
- PM web site should be enhanced by including a FAQ section.

3. Verification of reported data

- Centers should be requested to submit most of the supporting documentation during the data collection phase, and should be guided as much as possible in providing the needed information to allow for more consistent back up information.
- Guidance for organizing an “*audit trail*” should be given, so that data verification can be completed more timely and efficiently.