Fund

CGIAR

Fund Council

10th Meeting (FC10)—Nairobi, Kenya
November 6-7, 2013

FC Comments on CRP Annual Reports and CGIAR Financial Report

(Working Document - For Discussion Only)

Document presented for Agenda Item 9:
CRP Portfolio Annual Progress Report 2012

Submitted by:
Fund Office

Some comments received from FC members on the CRP annual progress reports (portfolio and individual) and financial report:

Japan

On CRP Portfolio Progress Report

A more detailed description of the two key achievements of each CRP in Annex 2 is suggested; In terms of clarity, for example, the description of the two key achievements of CCAFS, is clearer and easier to understand: a) improving farmer livelihoods through climate-smart coffee and b) commission report released and used by significant development actors.

On Financial Report

Please clarify the discrepancy between figures under Window 3 in Table 2 on p.12 and in Table A2.2 on p.33.

EIARD

On Individual CRP Progress Reports

The text part of the report is interesting and useful. However, the detailed financial templates of some of the CRPs are rather excessive. It is questionable that this level of detail is needed by donors. It prolongs the reviewing time by donors and increases the workload of the centers.

On Financial Report:

EIARD members are generally pleased with the report and it largely meets the members' requirements. Tables A6.1-6.16 were very much appreciated as they provide a quick overview of the funding base of the individual CRPs. We would suggest to lower the level of < 1 m US$ to <0.5 m US$ in order to get more information of the support by the different donors.

Some comments and suggestions for further improvement:

The report is based on the CGIAR Centers' 2012 audited financial statements and not itself audited by an external auditor. A note saying that they meet international standards is not enough for some of our members' requirements. Our members do get the annual financial statements of the centers (though arriving uncoordinated at different times) but they are not audited financial statements themselves. Therefore, we would also like to see the audited financial statements of the CGIAR centers. One way to ensure transparency could be to have links to the actual audited statements in the report.

- Figure 1 is shown twice in the report - p. 4 and p. 8: Is it really only grant income (as the title says) or is it total income?

- There are inconsistencies in figures for Switzerland: Table 3, W3: US$ 1.9 m (GCP & CPWF), however in Table 8 only the US$1.25 m for CPWF was mentioned but not US$0.45 m for GCP. Another inconsistency is in Table A2.2: for W3 only US$0.1 m is mentioned instead of US$1.9 m. Could you please kindly correct this or provide an explanation?

- Table 3 (p.12) and Table A2.2 (p.33) do no match regarding Window 3 funding.*(Note: same as Japan's comments)*

- Table 3 gives a good overview of the CGIAR Fund. However it would be appreciated if another table could be added where bilateral funds are specified and included. That way one could, at a glance, see what the CGIAR Fund share is of the total contributions.

- As done in Figure 10 with liquidity expressed in days, we suggest to also present Fig 9, available reserves expressed in days, for both years 2011 and 2012 in order to see the trajectory.

- Regarding the chapter 'CGIAR financial position' it would be useful in providing interpretation of the data computed. For example, it is not entirely clear why the available reserves expressed in days are going down.