



18 November 2016

ISPC and IEA combined response on paper SC3-03 on performance management

Headline comment: *The respective roles and anticipated efforts of the ISPC, IEA and SMO in the PMS for 2017 are reflected in the proposed workplans and budget of each entity. These, together with the proposal outlined in the paper provide a guarantee of performance management and quality control for the first year of Phase 2, The ISPC and the IEA undertake to continue to work with the SMO to ensure performance management is strengthened during 2017 and that a cost effective system is in place to monitor progress towards delivery of outcomes.*

More detailed comments:

1. In the new CGIAR governance structure, ISPC, IEA and the SMO are expected to play various roles (on behalf of the SC) in monitoring and evaluating performance, leaving the SC to operate at the strategic level. The detailed roles of each entity in monitoring of **performance on an annual basis** and of **progress towards outcomes on a longer-term**, however, were not formally agreed during the transition process.
2. We fully support the effort to develop a more rigorous and coherent performance management system for the CGIAR. Given the extent of change in the FO and CO transition to the SMO, we (the ISPC and IEA) consider that important progress has been made.
3. The conceptual framework for the PMS in paper SC3 – 03 puts accountability in the context of how research programs can be expected to contribute to development outcomes (**spheres of control, influence and interest**). Both ISPC and IEA support this approach and we assume that the future work of the Task Force will take on board the direction outlined in the paper. , however Annex I should be fully aligned with the main text.
4. In the short-term, the **control** sphere of the PMS serves CRP **management decisions** on corrective action at FP level and (independent of CRP) monitoring of performance, to support fund allocation. **Annual** reporting available to donors should serve transparency and accountability purposes. The indicators in Annex 4 for 2017 will monitor implementation of the research in the proposals.
5. In the longer term the **influence and interest** spheres focusing on understanding **adoption, scaling and outcome** patterns are important for program management in terms of adjusting and prioritizing research within a CRP and across the CGIAR research portfolio. The portfolio covers such a wide range of commodities, sectors and geographies, that caution should be exercised in aggregating data on outputs/outcomes.
6. It is difficult and **expensive to try to attribute causality** from the adoption or sub-IDO level to the SLO level. Thus a simple scaling up of adoption information or scaling down of national level statistics to infer CGIAR impacts on SLO should not be used as a performance measure for research. Focusing instead on a **restricted set of analyses for priority activities and locations** and coordinating with SDG indicator development will be important to build credible and robust impact results. Consultation with donors in **prioritizing where** and **what to monitor** is essential.

7. The design of the PMS must take account of the **costs of collecting, analyzing and reporting different kinds of information** and consider how best to obtain “**value for money**” in terms of the information needed by various users relative to the costs of obtaining it.
8. An important means of reducing costs and enhancing efficiency is **building upon, and integrating, information sources that already exist**. In the CGIAR these include: Ex ante appraisal (focus on quality and relevance of proposed program), evaluation (focus on quality, relevance and effectiveness of program in operation) and impact assessment (focus on documented adoption, use and influence of research, outcomes and impact), the latter providing (ex-post) in-depth assessment of Program success in the influence and interest spheres.