

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

**Description of the Performance Indicators
for CGIAR Centers
(2005 data)**



**Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat
January 2006**

Description of the Performance Indicators for CGIAR Centers (2005 data)

Introduction

Last year the new CGIAR Performance Measurement (PM) System was first piloted. Overall, the exercise has been a positive experience for all involved - on the one hand it helped Centers to better understand their own performance and on the other members expressed satisfaction with increased accountability and welcomed new information on performance also helping in their fund allocation decisions.

Subsequently lessons from this exercise have been drawn, and based on this initial experience the system has been refined. Some indicators have been dropped (i.e. two of the quality of staff indicators) and a few have been added for piloting in 2006 (marked with an asterisk). Other indicators will be developed and tested this year, based on the data already submitted by the Centers (in particular citation indices).

It is expected that the system will continue to be improved over time as we learn about strength and weaknesses of certain indicators.

Timeline for 2006 PM exercise

Timeline for 2006 PM exercise	
January 23	Launch of the 2005 PM process, including instructions and definitions of indicators
February 17	Launch of on-line data collection system
March 17	Deadline for Center reporting on PM indicators - except Finance (April 25)
March 17	Assessment and data verification starts
April 8-12	SC meeting – discussion of PM findings
April 25	Deadline for reporting of finance indicators
May, 17/18	Discussion of initial results by ExCo
June/July	Data verification completed; online report made available to Members and Centers

I. Indicators of Results

Element 1: Outputs

Indicator 1: % MTP output targets achieved in 2005

Definition: Output and Output Target

- **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.

Centers are requested to report on achievement of the annual output targets set in MTP 2005-2007 for 2005. In the MTP 2005-2007 Centers were not asked to define output targets but they listed milestones/verifiable indicators/measurable indicators for monitoring progress in research. Output targets are not the same. They indicate achievement of research results which are deliverable to intended users. Therefore, to report output targets for 2005 Centers should describe in the PM report deliverable achievements that represent as far as possible research achievements planned for 2005. All MTP projects¹ and outputs listed in MTP 2005-2007 should be reported on.

For each of the MTP projects outlined in your Center's MTP 2005-2007 please list the outputs and output targets specific to these outputs and indicate whether the target was achieved, or not. You can provide text explaining targets that were not achieved.² If the outputs and output targets have significantly changed from those planned, provide an explanation for the new outputs and output targets reported.

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

Centers need to have evidence of achievement available (but not submitted) for verification purposes. Published papers, other documents, records, web site references, and researchers' reports are suitable forms of evidence. Other forms of evidence may be acceptable depending on the specific target.

Annex 2 shows the template for data entry

¹ Occasionally called themes or programs, but here referred to as MTP Projects

² This year, since the output targets are defined retrospectively after planning, reporting on exceeding targets does not apply.

Element 2: Outcomes

Definition: Outcome

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

Please report on the **5 most significant outcomes in 2005** resulting from outputs that the Center produced in 2002-2004. The outcomes can be specific to a particular annual output achievement (in the current MTP termed output target), or to an overall output from a Project as specified in the MTP. Each outcome report must be supported by evidence of credible documentation from either the Center or others.

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

- An outcome statement
- What output(s) resulted in the outcome? In which MTP was the output first identified?
- Who used/adopted or was influenced by the output? Identify the kind 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 study was conducted? Who conducted it?

Please provide a reference or source (if not in a formal document) where the evidence can be reviewed.

The SC will score the reports based on the following criteria piloted this year:

- Criterion 1: Of the five cases, how many are truly outcomes? Each case is scored 1 if it is an outcome and 0 if not. Total possible score for this item = 5.
- Criterion 2: Of the cases that scored “1” in the first item, 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. Total possible score for this item = 5.
- Criterion 3: Of the cases that scored “1” in the 2nd item, is there a verifiable source for the outcomes described? Total possible score for this item = 5.

The quality score would be derived by summing the scores for each of the criteria. So, with three criteria, the highest possible score would be 15 and the lowest possible would be 0.

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

Please specify and document (up to 1000 words) the ex-post impact assessment activities, outputs and outcomes during 2005, particularly related to: (a) *ex post* impact assessment studies; (b) innovation in and advancement of *ex post* impact assessment; (c) communication/ dissemination and capacity enhancement; and (d) impact culture. For your report please also consider the more specific criteria and guidelines in Annex 3 that will be used to assess Centers.

Historical narrative (one-time submission, for year 2006 only) - please submit a historical narrative (less than 500 words) that describes previous impact assessment activities at the Center prior to the year 2005. The narrative should explain how impact assessment has been institutionalized in the Center, as well as major ex post impact assessment products produced prior to the period for the current PM exercise. This description will not be rated, but it will help place 2005 activities in perspective.

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

Please submit the two best impact studies completed in the period 2003-05 that document the difference that the Center has made in achieving CGIAR goals. Note that entries submitted for last year's PM exercise are acceptable if they were published in the period 2003-05 (inclusive). Please find in Annex 4 the checklist that SC/SPIA will use for rating each center's *ex-post* impact assessment studies for rigor.

II. Indicators of Potential to Perform

Element 4: Quality and Relevance of Current Research

Indicator 4A: Number of peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2005

Please report the number of all peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2005. Please also submit the list of publications.

Guidelines for measuring the number of peer-reviewed publications

- This should include publications strictly published in 2005. Do not include anything in press or anything published in 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 working papers, internal series 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 agricultural or otherwise appropriate in nature. Likewise for staff leaving an institute all appropriate 2005 publications may be counted.

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.

For calculating the number of scientists, please use the definition in Annex 1

Indicator 4B: Number of peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2005 that are published in journals listed in Thomson Scientific/ISI

Please report the number of peer-reviewed publications per scientist in 2005 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>

The above guidelines apply, if pertinent (e.g. ONE entry of each paper per Center, staff joining and leaving the Center)

Please also submit the list of publications.

Indicator 4 C: Percentage of scientific papers per scientist that are published with developing country partners in refereed journals, conference and workshop proceedings in 2005

For calculating Indicator 4C use those publications listed in Indicator 4A 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.

Please also submit the list of publications.

Indicator 4 D*: Science Council endorsed EP MR rating of Center research quality

This indicator will be piloted in 2006 and you don't need to provide information for it.

Element 5: Institutional Health

GOVERNANCE

Indicator 5A: Score on governance checklist

Please complete the checklist in Annex 5 for your Center.

Indicator 5B*: Assessment of Board statements

Please submit a short statement describing the three most important actions taken by the Board in 2005 for improving the performance of the Board and the difference these actions have made in the performance of the Board [max. 500 words].

A peer-review panel composed of three experienced Center Board members³ will assess the submissions in terms of relevance/merit and the anticipated impact of the actions taken.

CULTURE OF LEARNING AND CHANGE

Indicator 5C: Score on Culture of learning and change check list

Please complete the checklist in Annex 6 for your Center.

DIVERSITY

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

Indicator 5E: Percentage of women in management: Calculation of the percent of management positions, either research or non-research, occupied by women as of 31. December 2005.

Definition: “Management position” includes Director General, Deputy Directors General, Directors of major programs/divisions and senior heads of administration.

³ The panel would be composed of two former Board members and one governance specialist (a former EPMR panel member).

Indicator 5F: **IRS Nationality concentration: % of internationally-recruited staff that come from the top two nationalities represented on the IRS staff of the Center.**

Please also indicate the Nationality.

Indicator 5G: **Diversity in recency of PhDs: % scientists receiving the Ph.D. in the last five years (2001-2005).**

Element 6: Financial Health⁴

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.

⁴ The deadline for submission of the finance indicators is April 25, 2006 to ensure that the audited financial statements and the results from the peer-review exercise are available.

III. STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS

In 2006 a more comprehensive Stakeholder Perceptions Survey will be piloted covering CGIAR Members as well as other partners and stakeholders.

Centers will be requested to provide contact information of their partners. The survey will be conducted by an independent survey research organization. The CGIAR Secretariat has approached a number of survey research organizations (including GlobeScan and Market & Opinion Research International) for developing proposals to conduct perception surveys.

List of Annexes

Annex 1 Summary of Definitions

Annex 2. Output Template

Annex 3. Detailed Guidelines and Assessment Indicators for Indicator 3A

Annex 4 Checklist for SPIA Rating of a Center's Ex-post Impact Assessment Study Rigor

Annex 5: Checklist on Governance

Annex 6: 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** and should include the time of

- all internationally recruited staff contributing to Center and CP research in 2005, 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 Secondments and also Postdocs that are funded externally who have been working at your Center for more than 6 month in 2005.

Senior Management Team

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

Annex 2. Output Template

Project	Output	Output target 2005	Category of Output target	Achieved?

Categories of output targets to be used are materials, policy strategies, practices, capacity, and other kinds of knowledge.

Annex 3. Detailed Guidelines and Assessment Indicators for Indicator 3A

Criteria/Questions	Indicators of performance	Expectation	Assessment Weight
<p>epIA studies: Please provide a complete list of ex-post impact studies of technologies/outputs developed at least in part by the Center, which have been produced over the past year (indicate these in scientific citation format and italicize authors who are Center staff). Please provide a two to three sentence description of each, which specifies the research assessed, the geographic or thematic/programmatic coverage of the study, the impact indicators analyzed, and the approximate cost of the study.</p>	resources invested in epIA studies (e.g. # number of studies, expenditure)	<p>The Center should make meaningful attempts to assess major impacts that can be reliably attributed to its work. This implies that those Centers with a portfolio that includes more readily assessable categories of research (i.e. more crop genetic improvement) should be expected to have a greater number of large-scale quantitative studies. Centers with more difficult to assess portfolios will be expected to produce evidence that their research has been influential in fostering desirable shifts in policy or resource management practices, and should eventually have at least a limited set of quantitative examples of attributable impact.</p>	40%
	epIA coverage of research areas with few prior studies (e.g. policy and NRM research)		
	studies with wide geographic scope		
	peer-reviewed publications		
	studies that trace research outputs to CGIAR goals		
<p>Innovation and advancement of epIA methods and processes: Please list all IA methods papers or computer models produced over the past year by your Center. In addition, please describe specific examples of how the studies listed above have applied innovative methods to overcome attribution problems, and explain any methodological workshops convened. .</p>	innovative methods applied in epIA studies	<p>Centers should be advancing the relevance, robustness, and comprehensiveness of ex-post impact assessment coverage across their research portfolios. Methods will need to be continually improved for this to be possible.</p>	20%
	methodological papers produced		
	impact assessment models developed		
	methods workshops convened		
<p>Communication/dissemination and capacity enhancement: Please specify how the findings of epIAs have been disseminated. In particular, please list the numbers of external workshops held, as well as the numbers of different media (such as briefs, newspaper articles, etc.) produced to communicate impact findings. Capacity strengthening activities and materials for partner IA specialists should be detailed, as well. Please also describe whether your Center has its own website for impact assessment (in addition to participating in the Systemwide website).</p>	publication of epIA briefs	<p>Ex-post impact assessment results should be communicated widely to intended audiences through appropriate media, including a portfolio of conferences, journal articles (for legitimacy), grey literature, briefs, a website, and potentially popular media. It is also valuable if methods and techniques are communicated to partners, such as NARS through capacity enhancement activities and materials.</p>	20%
	dissemination of epIA findings in popular media		
	conferences/workshops for external audiences		
	impact assessment website and numbers of hits /downloads		
	seminars, workshops or training materials for NARS in the area of impact assessment		
<p>Impact culture (internal feedback and learning for user relevance): a) Please provide a list of internal workshops convened by the Center’s impact assessment unit/specialists within the past year to help orient and improve the relevance 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 (two sentences to describe data collection and analysis for each, and major findings); 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 underpin the Center’s priority-setting procedures, or have been used to validate earlier ex-ante work.</p>	internal workshops conducted by impact assessors to orient and plan research	<p>An important element of a Center’s impact culture is that adequate efforts are made to ensure that research outputs are relevant to the conditions and preferences of intended adopters and hence will generate outcomes and ultimate impact. Impact assessors should conduct workshops that help to plan and improve the relevance of future research, while systematic evaluations of the appropriateness of outputs to client needs should be undertaken regularly. Internal feedback loops from evaluation to the refinement of <i>ex ante</i> impact assessments and research outputs comprise a critical means for fostering relevance.</p>	20%
	clear examples of systematic empirical evaluation of relevance of research outputs		
	clear examples of use of specific ex-post impact assessment results in ex-ante analysis		

Annex 4. Checklist for SPIA Rating of a Center's Ex-post Impact Assessment Study Rigor

1) Clear presentation of assessed research (A Necessary Condition)

The study must adequately describe how the Center's activities have contributed to specific improvements in the relevant technologies/policy recommendations and what the costs were for the Center, and its partners-- if applicable.

Comments: _____

2) Reasonable and transparent assumptions (15%)

a) Are the major assumptions regarding the assessment methodology (in all components of the analysis) reasonable and/or adequately justified (transparent)?

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

3) Reliable and representative data (20%)

a) Are the sources or methods of derivation of data on adoption, productivity gains/unit cost reductions and other benefits clear? (5%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

b) Do adoption, productivity gains/unit cost reductions and other benefit data appear to be based on scientifically sound survey and other instruments? (15%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

4) Realistic counterfactual (15%)

a) Is the counterfactual scenario clear? (5%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

b) Does the counterfactual appear to represent a plausible scenario (including other potential sources of technical and policy change) in the absence of the assessed research outputs? (10%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

5) Sound attribution of benefits to research (20%)

a) Is the method of attribution of benefits to the research output clearly described? (5%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

b) Is the method of attribution of benefits to the research output appropriate (i.e. are potential mitigating factors sufficiently addressed)? (10%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

c) Has there been a suitable amount of sensitivity analysis to assess the robustness of the conclusions? (5%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

6) Distance down the impact pathway (15%)

a) Does the analysis make a reasonable effort to trace impact pathways to CGIAR goals (economic, environmental, food security and distributional), given the attribution difficulties of the assessed research output?

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: _____

7) External input (15%)

Who has authored and reviewed the study?

- Author(s) include external experts; the study is subject to external peer review (4)
- Author(s) only include Center staff; the study is subject to external peer review (3)
- Author(s) include external experts; the study is not subject to external peer review (2)
- Author(s) only include Center staff; the study is not subject to external peer review (0)

Comments: _____

Annex 5: Governance checklist for 2005

Organization and Management of Board Business

Composition and Structure

1. What percentage of Board leadership (Chair, Vice Chair and Committee Chairs) comes from developing countries?
 0% 1-20% 21-40% 41-60% over 60%
2. What percentage of Board leadership positions (Chair, Vice Chair and Committee Chairs) are held by women?
 0% 1-20% 21-40% 41-60% over 60%
3. How many Board members have professional expertise in financial management?⁵
 0 1 2 3 or more
4. How many Board members have professional expertise in corporate, non-profit or public governance?⁶
 0 1 2 3 or more

Orientation and Assessment

5. Have all new Board members (starting their terms in 2004 or 2005)
 - attended a CGIAR Board Orientation Program? YES NO
 - attended a comprehensive⁷ center-specific orientation program? YES NO
6. Has the Board conducted a self-assessment in 2005?
 YES NO

⁵ “professional expertise in financial management” means that a Board member should either have (1) a recognized professional qualification in finance (preferably CPA, CA or equivalent), or (2) have undergone a major special training in financial management, or (3) have substantive experience in directly managing significant financial matters in the public or private sector.

⁶ “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.

⁷ 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.

7. Has each Board Committee conducted a self-assessment during 2004-2005?

- YES NO

8. Has the Center completed a Board commissioned CCER on Center governance and Center management during 2003-2005?

- YES NO

Board Engagement with Center's Strategic Business

Involvement in Strategic Planning

9. Is the entire Board engaged with formulating or modifying the Center's strategic plan?

- YES - Fully YES - Partially NO

Involvement in Program Review

10. Does the Board discuss and act on any significant deviations from previously announced targets and strategic goals as defined in the MTP?

- YES - Fully YES - Partially NO

11. Has the Board approved and implemented a schedule for commissioning and following-up?

- Yes - Fully Yes - Partially No

Involvement in Fiscal Oversight

12. Is the management's authority to make financial decisions (e.g., spending, divestment, and budget adjustments) limited to an amount beyond which the approval of the Board is necessary?

- YES NO

13. Is there a Board approved investment policy in place?

- YES NO

14. Does the Board implement clear policies for the appointment, review and rotation of external auditors?

- YES NO

15. Does the full Board receive information on key financial indicators on a quarterly or more frequent basis?

- YES NO

16. Did the 2005 financial outcome deviate significantly (more than 10 percent) from the budget planned for 2005?

- YES NO

17. Has the Board discussed the adequacy of the Center's risk management and internal control mechanisms as an explicit Board meeting agenda item during 2004-2005?

- YES NO

Involvement in Human Resources Policy Development and Oversight

18. Has the Board discussed/ reviewed the Center's human resources policies during 2004-2005?

- YES NO

19. In 2005, has the Board received and acted upon Center staffing numbers and trends (including consultants and gender and diversity information)?

- YES NO

Donor Community, Partnership Facilitation and Fund Raising

20. Is the Board actively involved in establishing public relations and fund raising strategies?

- YES - Fully YES - Partially NO

21. With how many Centers does your Board have an ongoing close association (e.g. common Board members, joint Board meetings, joint ExCom meetings, hosting of a Center Board meeting by another Center)?

_____ (number of Centers)

Adequacy of the annual DG evaluation process

22. Do Board members other than the Board Chair participate in the annual performance appraisal of the DG, including decision-making on compensation?

- YES - Fully YES - Partially NO

Transparency and Accountability

23. Does the policy governing your Center's compensation structure allow for the compensation structure to be publicly accessible (i.e. through the Center website)?

- YES NO

25. Does your 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

26. Are your procurement policies and their implementation fully consistent with the CGIAR Procurement of Good, Works and Services Guidelines (FG 6)?

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

Annex 6: Check list on culture of learning and change - 2005

1. **Has the Center conducted a staff satisfaction or attitude survey of ALL staff in 2004 or 2005, where the results were shared with staff?**
 YES NO

2. **Does the Center have an active leadership development program covering current and prospective staff in managerial positions?**
 YES YES – partially NO

3. **Does the staff appraisal system include the development and follow-up of individual learning plans?**
 YES YES – partially NO

4. **What percentage of the overall budget is spent on staff development activities in 2005?**
 - a. **What percentage of the overall budget was spent for attendance at international conferences and professional society meetings, 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 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%

5. **Considering staff training only (question 4b), what is the total number of training days in 2005 for all IRS staff, divided by the total number of IRS staff**
 less than 1 1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 more than 8

6. **Considering staff training only, what is the total number of training days in 2005 for all NRS staff, divided by the total number of NRS staff**
 less than 1 1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 more than 8

7. On average, how many days did IRS staff spend in 2005 on program planning and review?

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

8. Completed CCERs in 2003-2005

a. How many Board commissioned CCERs on program-related matters were completed in 2003-05?

- 0 1 2 3 4 or more

b. What is the percentage of your program budget (average for 2003-2005) that has been covered by CCERs completed in 2003-05?

- 10%-30% 31% - 50% 51-70% 71%-90% over 90%

c. How many board commissioned CCERs on Center governance, finance or administrative matters were completed in 2003-05?

- 0 1 2 3 4 or more

9. How many SWPs/CPs was the Center actively engaged in as a partner during 2005?

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

10. Do you preserve the Center's "institutional memory" (e.g. databases on partnerships, training, and projects records management programs)?

- YES, we have a comprehensive program
- YES, we have some initiatives, but not a systematic program
- NO, we do not have an active program

11. Do you systematically preserve research project data (primary and secondary data sets), including documentation, and are the data internally available?

- YES, we have a comprehensive (meta) database for primary and secondary research data that is fully available for internal use
- 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