



Fund

Fund Council

8th Meeting (FC8)—Punta del Este, Uruguay

October 31 - November 1, 2012

**Feedback on the CRP Portfolio and Individual
CRP Annual Progress Reports -
Canada (CIDA) & US (USAID)**

(Working Document - For Discussion Only)

*Document presented for Agenda Item 3:
CRP Portfolio Annual Progress Report, CRP Annual Reports,
CRP Financial Reports, and FC Members' Feedback*

Submitted by:
Fund Office

Feedback from FC Members on the CRP Portfolio and Individual CRP Annual Progress Reports

Canada:

- Overall, this report provides useful updates on progress, especially in the management of different areas as the CGIAR transitions to a new model of operations. The highlights sections provide brief snapshots of the status of various CRPs in these areas.
- Moving forward, it will be very useful to include more content of the progress of results of CGIAR research. We look forward to the intermediate development outcomes and performance management system that is referred to on p. 12 and to the recommendations made by the science leaders' assessment, mentioned below.
- While not required in the interim template, upon reading the report, it noticeably does not provide any mention of donors to the CGIAR system. In the next round of reports, providing mention of Fund Donors can help improve multilateral donor visibility, recognition of contributions, and help incentive window 1 and 2 contributions, as well as showing transparently where funds were invested.
- We appreciate the updates and status reports on alignment and integration of bilateral projects with CRPs and the indication that over the upcoming years, bilaterally-funded activities will need to improve alignment with CRPs. It will be useful to be understand how the prioritisation process regarding further alignment with CRP strategies will link with the establishment of the proposed intermediate development outcomes. Additionally, as a donor, it is not always easy to interpret which bilateral initiatives 'fit' within the new strategies and models. Ensuring that CRP leadership is actively engaged on this front, including clearly defining priorities, can help donors better identify investments that align with the new CRPs.
- We appreciate all the momentum and work being undertaken on gender within the CRPs . It would be useful to indicate in the gender section how and when the draft Gender Strategies will be finalised and shared. We support the development of system-level gender outcomes mentioned in the report, and as they are developed, are interested in how they will be reported (e.g. will it be within this report?).
- Regarding the Financial Table, it would be useful to include a section highlighting areas of financial risk and/or any special provisions/discrepancies highlighted in audited financial statements. Also, given the 'separation' of windows 1 and 2, it would be useful to reflect that in the financial statements (i.e. include separate lines for window 1 and window 2 funding).

- As the work on review of financial guidelines and reserve policies moves forward with regards to the IITA situation, due consideration should be made to ensuring relevant and consistent financial information is reported at the Consortium and CRP level.

Regarding the individual CRP Progress Reports:

- There seems to be significant variation among CRP reporting in terms of level of detail and approach. It would be useful if these are more streamlined and consistent.

- Providing a simple table of milestones and achievements is useful to report back on expected outputs and targets and quickly communicates the key information. Given that donors (and others) will be using these reports to annually report to the public and our governments on progress and results, ensuring they capture the key achievements is important to communicating the CGIAR story. For example, detailed references to individual publications could be attached as an annex, and the reporting on each output could be kept to a qualitative or quantitative statement that is more easily interpreted. (e.g. Maize Report)

United States:

We appreciate the ongoing discussion on harmonized reporting and the progress made so far. As has been fully recognized in these discussions, our ability to describe the achievements of the Consortium's research-for-development activities within our internal reporting systems and to win continued support for this work, depends on meeting statutorily mandated reporting requirements. We look forward to supporting the Consortium in the further development of reporting templates and data standards to minimize the reporting burden across both Consortium members and donors.

We would like to express our appreciation for the Annual Reports for 2011 provided to the Fund Council, noting that several CRPs were functioning for only part of the reporting year. We recognize that the interim templates are intended to be used on a trial basis to gain experience with harmonized reporting, and we provide the following feedback to support the Consortium objectives for the monitoring system, including the satisfaction of Fund donor minimum reporting requirements. As was discussed at the March Fund Council meeting, there is a need for more detail and supporting documentation as we proceed in the stepwise, empirical approach to designing the harmonized reporting system.

Quantitative results and targets

- The milestones framework currently in place describes results as fully, partly, or not achieved/redirected. A more quantitative approach would be to set specific targets in advance, ideally for the life of the CRP planning horizon, and then report actual results against those targets. The milestones serve as intermediate markers of the targeted outputs and outcomes, but should be set and measured each year.
- A short explanation could be given when results exceed or fail to achieve those targets each year, and future targets could be adjusted according to program learning and adaptation. This would allow a quantitative analysis of achievements, and donors could make qualitative assessments of progress according to their own definitions.
- For example, on the CRP 3.3 Milestone Report in product line 6.4.3 the milestone is to train at least 60 extension agents. This is marked as a “1”, fully successful. The comments however state that only 50 extension agents were trained (a 17% difference). Ignoring the fact that this does not seem to be fully successful, it would be easier to read this information if it was in the format of the target being “60” and the actual being “50”. A short explanation could then be provided on why it was under the target. If the target is a multi-year target, it could be broken down into targets for each future year and actual numbers attained reported at the end of each year. At this time, targets for future years to could be revised based on experience.

Data attributes

We suggest that the Consortium conduct an analysis of established minimum donor requirements in the below categories, as well as those suggested by other donors and each CRP. If each CRP can provide adequate specificity in reporting the attributes of the data, donors and other interested parties will be able to independently analyze and re-tabulate the data according to their requirements. Establishing a reliable set of terminology (with clear definitions) across all CRPs would assist donors in mapping their requirements to the CRP data in subsequent years. In support of the objective to meet minimum donor requirements, we have attached an example of the template we use to collect data, including data attributes for disaggregation, for CRPs 3.1 and 3.4. The small losses in flexibility for each CRP might be easily outweighed by the advantages in clarity, comparability, and ease of analysis of more standardized reporting.

- Current descriptions of activities use a lot of program-specific terminology. While this is helpful to those intimately involved in the activities, it would assist non-specialists to understand the accomplishments if more general categories were assigned to each data point (e.g., breeding, training). There should be different levels of monitoring the activities. Much of what has been reported is very task specific and does not get at if broader objectives are being met.

- For most donors, gender integration is an important part of program evaluation. Wherever possible, data should be broken down by sex, particularly for capacity building, training, and other activities that target individuals, households, or groups. Household type is also important, specifying presence of male adults, female adults, and/or children.
- Similarly, individuals and groups targeted should be characterized by type, for example producer, farmer, farmer association, private sector, government, or non-governmental organization. Practices should be described by type and sector. Market activities should specify the commodity of focus. Investment in partnerships should specify the type of entity in the partnership.
- Activities may take place over multiple years, and progress through time for a given activity should be evident in the data. To understand achievements over time, all activities should be described as new or continuing. Data on policies being analyzed or promoted should include the stage of consideration for each (e.g., analysis, drafting, presentation, passed, implantation). Research on technologies or practices should include the phase of development for each (e.g., under research, under field testing, available for transfer).

Accessibility

- We strongly endorse the plan of the Consortium to make the data available online, ideally in an exportable format so that donors and others could download and analyze the data according to their specific requirements.
- Please consider reporting all quantitative data in numerals, in a separate column from any units or other labels. Another separate column should then report the units, with further details in a separate column.

We also endorse the principle of establishing a common template across the Consortium, including the common definition of terms and data attributes, to streamline data presentation by CRPs and analysis by donors. After seeing just three CRP reports, the level of variance in content, format, and specificity is huge. The template as it stands now is too flexible if it allows for this type of variation. If donors are to be able to quickly read a performance report and grasp both how it is meeting its objectives and comparing it to the performance of other CRPs, there has to be greater consistency in style and content.

Reporting Organization : USAID

Bureau : Bureau for Food Security

Operating unit : USAID/BFS HQ

Prime Partner : All

Implementing Mechanism : CGIAR-CRP 3.1 Wheat

Data Status : All

Indicator Type : All

Indicator Type : All

[illegible]

[illegible]

Male										
Female										
Association-applied										
Disaggregates Not Available			0							
4.5.2(32): Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance			0	770,000				1,694,000	2,800,000	
Female										
Male										
Disaggregates Not Available			0							
4.5.2(34): Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance			0	770,000				1,694,000	2,800,000	
Type of Risk reducing practice										
Agriculture			0							
Water										
Health										
Disaster Risk Management										
Urban										
Disaggregates Not Available										
Sex										
Male										
Female										
Disaggregates Not Available			0							

4.5.2(39): Number of new technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development: (Phase I/II/III)										
Phase 1 Number of new technologies or management practices under research as a result of USG assistance			0	41,930				46,119		
Phase 2 Number of new technologies or management practices under field testing as a result of USG assistance			0	4,689				5,152		
Phase 3 Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance			0	2,480				2,723		
Disaggregates Not Available										
4.5.2(5): Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance			0	1,411,549				1,552,714	2,310,000	
New/Continuing										
New			0							
Continuing										
Disaggregates Not Available										
Sex										
Male										
Female										
Disaggregates Not Available			0							
4.5.2(6): Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training			0							

Male			0	66				71		
Female			0	66				71		
Disaggregates Not Available										
4.5.2(7): Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training			0							
Type of individual										
Producers										
People in government										
People in private sector firms										
People in civil society										
Disaggregates Not Available			0						0	
Sex										
Male			0	7,334				8,046	0	
Female			0	7,334				8,046	0	
Disaggregates Not Available										

Index	Comments and Deviation Narratives
-------	-----------------------------------

Data Entry Status Report as of 21-Sep-2012 03:50:37 PM, Washington DC Time

Current Selection

Reporting Organization : USAID

Bureau : Bureau for Food Security

Operating unit : USAID/BFS HQ

Prime Partner : All

Implementing Mechanism : CGIAR-CRP 3.4 Roots, Tubers and Bananas for Food

Data Status : All

Indicator Type : All

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Gendered Household Type			0							
Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM)										
Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF)										
Male and Female Adults (M&F)										
Child No Adults (CNA)										
Disaggregates Not Available			0							
4.5.2(2): Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance			0	5,800,000				6,100,000	6,400,000	
Technology type			0							
crop genetics			0							
animal genetics										
pest management										
disease management										
soil-related										
irrigation										
water management										
post-harvest handling and storage										
processing										
climate mitigation or adaptation										
fishing gear/technique										
other										
total w/one or more improved technology										
Disaggregates Not Available										
New/Continuing			0							
New			0							
Continuing										
Disaggregates Not Available			0							
Sex										
Male										
Female										
Association-applied										
Disaggregates Not Available			0							

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Value of trade (in USD)										
Volume of trade (mt)										
Zambia										
Value of trade (in USD)										
Volume of trade (mt)										
Zimbabwe										
Value of trade (in USD)										
Volume of trade (mt)										
Disaggregates Not Available										
Value of trade (in USD)										
Volume of trade (mt)										
4.5.2(39): Number of new technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development: (Phase I/II/III)			0							
Phase 1 Number of new technologies or management practices under research as a result of USG assistance			0	140				140	140	
Phase 2 Number of new technologies or management practices under field testing as a result of USG assistance			0	120				120	130	
Phase 3 Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance			0	90				90	110	
Disaggregates Not Available										
4.5.2(43): Number of firms (excluding farms) or CSOs engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance			0	3,000				3,000	3,000	
Firm										
CSO										
Disaggregates Not Available			0							

[illegible]