



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 - World Bank**

(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 (Cont'd)

World Bank

- The content and structure of the portfolio progress report is very much welcomed, including the use of text boxes for providing more detailed and tangible evidence. We also very much welcome and appreciate the critical and constructive reflections in the sections on "Research progress", "Transition to a CRP portfolio" and the final section on future portfolio analysis, which helps to provide a more realistic picture on how integrated the portfolio is or isn't, and what is needed to conduct a more meaningful analysis in future. We encourage the Consortium to continue along these lines.
- The World Bank acknowledges that this is an interim period and that there shall be a continuous improvement process in results reporting, especially in the light of the planned Performance Management System (PMS) and the formulation of IDOs. Our understanding is therefore that in the mid-term the SRF with its new PMS and the CRP portfolio and individual reporting need to be fully aligned. We would be happy to provide feedback on a draft set of IDOs and their mapping across the portfolio these are being reflected in a refined reporting format. Eventually we would like to see meaningful outcome measures for the overall portfolio and are happy to know that their development is a top priority for FY 13.
- We also share the view that the individual progress reports are of varied quality and further work on specifying the format is needed; we welcome the approach taken by CCAFS in their report, where they not only honor the agreed format, but are also providing a good example of the use of a "traffic light system" for highlighting progress against set targets in a systematic way; maize CRP provides a systematic report on progress against strategic initiatives and milestones planned for 2011. GRiSP has provided a set of detailed reports on its progress, and a glossy annual report showcasing its research highlights. Both of these report types provide rich information and the glossy report also serves as a tool for advocacy. However, for the purpose of FC reviewing progress, populated template of an annual progress report would have conveyed the information in a more consistent and concise format.
- Gender reporting is quite variable across the CRPs, which is understandable given the fact that the process for developing the gender strategies for each CRP has only recently started. We look forward to a more comprehensive treatise in the next reporting cycle.
- We noted that in the next portfolio progress report an analysis of management structures shall be included. In this context, we would like to encourage the Consortium to also include organizational effectiveness measures (beyond finance) in their progress report as a standard feature.

We also share the Consortiums view that partnerships are not only a critical element for success of individual CRPs, but also for the portfolio as a whole (page 12, first paragraph). In this context we encourage the Consortium to explore whether and how targeted strategic partnerships for the Consortium as a whole can increase the research efficiency/ effectiveness of individual CRPs. This may involve first taking stock of the type and of quality of the partnerships and the continuous monitoring of partner feedback and perceptions for the system as a whole.