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This Scorecard reports on Financial Performance, Deliverables/Outputs and the Satisfaction Survey for all the CGIAR’s system entities.
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Expenditure by ISPC has remained stable.

IEA had significant increased expenditure in 2014 due to the launch of CRP evaluations.

CO expenditure change between 2013 and 2014 was driven by administrative charges paid to Bioversity International and costs of moving into a new building.

FO’s expenditure increase from 2013 to 2014 is artificial. The decrease/low expenditure in 2013 was due to the postponement of RM activities and MTR to 2014 in light of the GRRC recommendations.
IEA: IEA was established in late 2012, and the increase in budget reflects start-up and increase in activities and deliverables.

FO: Expenditure on Meetings and Workshops in 2014 were for MTR and Resource Mobilization.
Chart 4: Fund Office Highlights and Expenditure by Year ($’000)

- Organized FC7&8, a Funders Forum, supported FC committee and created FCIP;
- Worked with other system entities to develop a common template for scorecards;
- Facilitated the handling of IITA failed investment case and suspension of funding;
- Developed and managed a crisis communication plan (IITA);
- Prepared and issued its quarterly newsletters, the CGIAR Fund Update;
- Provided funding balances and analysis information;
- Prepared briefings on CGIAR research and results;
- Provided CSP analysis.

- Organized FC9&10 and supported FC committee meetings;
- Set up a Resource Mobilization Group;
- Coordinated decision-making on the PwC 2nd Phase Report;
- Reached the level of $1 billion in total annual investment in CGIAR and led press work to publicize this milestone;
- Launched new monthly bulletin, CGIAR Roundup;
- Provided funding balances and analysis information;
- Prepared briefings on CGIAR research and results;
- Provided CSP analysis.

- Organized FC11&12 and 2014 Funders Forum;
- Supported MTR;
- Coordinated the 15 CRP extensions;
- Supported committee work for FCIP, FCGC, EIAC, PRT and FCRG;
- Aligned evolution of SRF and RM;
- Handled recruitment of two ISPC members and new chair;
- Collaborated on communications at development dialogue;
- Led Fund website migration;
- Prepared briefings on CGIAR research and results;
- Provided funding balances and analysis information;
- Provided CSP analysis.
The expenditure outside of CGIAR funding in 2012 ($518,722) and in 2013 ($1,738,000) is counted in the figures.

**Chart 5: Consortium Office Highlights and Expenditure by Year ($‘000)**

- 2012: 5,658
  - Completed the CRP portfolio
  - Launched SRF Action Plan performance and IDO processes
  - Launched second round of Communities of Practice
  - 11 CRPs launched

- 2013: 6,631
  - Conducted SRF Action Plan IDO processes
  - Consultations on the Guidance for the CRP 2nd Call
  - Completed 1st round of CRP POWBs
  - Shared services reactivated
  - Accompanied PwC 2nd phase governance review

- 2014: 7,578
  - Developed and reviewed CRP Extension Proposals for 2015-16
  - Handled and resolved tensions with Centers
  - Completed CO “building and development” phase (building opening, ratification by French parliament, going-live of OCS)
  - New SRF prepared with 1st round consultations
  - Successfully organized 1st CGIAR Development Dialogues in New York
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditure ($'000)</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2012 | 2,795               | - Published ISPC white paper on SRF and prioritization  
- Completed CRP proposal review process (8 commentaries).  
- Completed a cross CRP-study incl. theories of change, impact pathway analysis and seed systems  
- Completed stripe report of NRM research in the CGIAR  
- 4 Impact briefs published and the SIAC program formulated |
| 2013 | 3,693               | - Provided ISPC white paper on outcome mapping (IDO concept) with discussions in several CGIAR fora  
- Provided review and inputs into CGIAR policy and strategy documents (open access, gender mainstreaming)  
- Completed and published strategic studies (i) farm size and urbanization; (ii) conservation agriculture  
- Held Science Forum 13 in Bonn with BMZ on Nutrition and health outcomes: targets for agricultural research  
- Initiated the Strengthening Impact Assessment in the CGIAR (SIAC) program |
| 2014 | 3,261               | - Published reports of strategic studies on (i) Metrics, (ii) Biotechnology  
- Conducted review of 15 CRP extension proposals providing commentary on each and a review of the portfolio to FC and Consortium  
- New ISPC Chair appointed, ISPC Chair helped convene SRF development events amongst funders and CGIAR groups  
- Held follow up workshop and special issue developed of scientific papers on nutrition and agricultural research  
- SIAC program continued and enhanced by W1 funding arrangements from mid-2014  
- DIIVA (dissemination of improved varieties) synthesis report and 4 Impact Briefs published |
• Established IEA unit operations and recruit core team (1 admin + 1 consultant)
• Developed rolling evaluation work plan, and launch website
• Initiated 1 CRP evaluation (FTA) and 2 reviews (CRP Governance and Management; Generation Challenge Program)
• Finalized 2 reviews with FC endorsement, and 1 CRP evaluation
• Initiated and conducted 9 CRP evaluations
• Developed framework and provided support to 5 CRP commissioned evaluations
• Held annual CGIAR evaluation community meeting and training
• Finalized evaluation standards and evaluation guidance notes

Chart 7: IEA Highlights and Expenditure by Year ($’000)

- 2012: $165
- 2013: $1,295
- 2014: $2,621
**FO:** Underspend in 2012 and 2013 was primarily driven by (1) staff attrition and delay in on-boarding of staff, (2) postponement of events and review of the CGIAR reform in light of the GRRC recommendation.

**CO:** Variance in 2014 comprises mainly of administrative charges paid to Bioversity International. There had been an expectation that the Consortium would be recognized as an international organization, by the French Government, before the end of 2013. As a result, no overhead for Bioversity International administration charges was included in the initial 2014 budget.

**IEA:** Budget reflects 3 months of operation in 2012.

**ISPC:** Underspend in 2012 was due to receipt of CGIAR funds mid-year. Underspend in 2014 was due to the late appointment of the new Chair and two Council members and one senior professional staff. Council focused on CRP review activities and delayed some other studies.
**Chart 9: Expenditure Variances by General Categories & Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Category</th>
<th>Under Spent %</th>
<th>Over Spent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>-58% -48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Charges</td>
<td>-19% -25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>-40% -42%</td>
<td>-10% -11% -9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting and Workshops</td>
<td>-100% -100%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/Council Meetings</td>
<td>-27% -29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Office**
- Operating Expenses in 2014 comprise of non-recurrent expenses pertaining to moving to the new building and OSU implementation.
- Overhead charges represent administrative charges paid to Bioversity International.
- Crucial meetings that had not been projected took place for SRF-related activities in the last quarter of the 2014.

**Consortium Office**
- Overspend in 2014 on meetings and workshops was due to the FC request to develop a full RM strategy which required additional time and funding.
- Underspend on Operating Expenses in 2014 was due to funds reallocation to the FC initiatives such as Dalberg Global Development Advisors Consultancy Report.
- Overspend on Board/Council Meeting in 2014 was due to consultancy costs for FC IP committee which were not anticipated and not budgeted.
- Travel expense in 2014 was deliberately reduced to reallocate portion of budget to FC initiatives.
Note:
IEA:
• Over-expenditure on travel budget line item reflects reallocation of funds for personnel travel to evaluation meetings and missions, which was originally budgeted for in the Operating Expenses, and explains the under-expenditure in 2014.

ISPC:
• Underspend in 2014 was due to the late appointment of the new Chair and two members and one senior professional staff. Council focused on CRP review activities and delayed some other studies.
Chart 10: Staff vs. Consultants Expenditure Ratio by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>ISPC</th>
<th>IEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>57.9: 1</td>
<td>4.2: 1</td>
<td>20.3: 1</td>
<td>2.2: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>16.4: 1</td>
<td>2.6: 1</td>
<td>17.8: 1</td>
<td>1: 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.2: 1</td>
<td>3.2: 1</td>
<td>11.6: 1</td>
<td>1: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio Definition: Expenditure of Staff Salary/Expenditure of Consultants Fee.

**FO:** Low ratio in 2014 was due to Resource Mobilization and MTR project in which senior consultants were hired.

**CO:** Ratio was stabilized in 2014 together with staff recruitments.

**IEA:** In 2014, approximately 45 consultants were recruited as evaluation team members for specified number of days. This ratio varies across years depending on number of evaluations and size of evaluation team. In addition, as IEA staff has been limited (3 staff members), with a large number of deliverables, long-term consultants were also recruited to assist with core activities.
Section 2: Deliverables/Outputs Report

- **System output level:** Based on the system-wide Gantt chart, the system outputs table shows the progress of the key deliverables for CGIAR as a whole (such as SRF, CRP 2nd call and CRP extensions).

- **Entity output level:** Details of the entity outputs are provided in the respective entity scorecards for FC13. Reports are available on FC13 website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Status &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Action Plan</td>
<td>Feb, 2015</td>
<td>CO, FO</td>
<td>FO and CO worked on the restated and amended FUA for Gender Action Plan which was approved by FC on Feb 7, 2015 on no-objection basis. Contract was prepared by FO and CO and signed by respective parties early March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Access Proposal</td>
<td>Jan, 2015</td>
<td>CO, ISPC, FO</td>
<td>CO submitted revised proposal in Nov 2014; ISPC reviewed the revised proposal at the end of Nov, 2014; FC approved the revised proposal in March, 2014; contract prepared by FO and CO to be signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCARD 3</td>
<td>Jan, 2015</td>
<td>CO, FO</td>
<td>FO worked with CO on revised proposal which was approved by FC in Jan, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder Forum</td>
<td>tbd, 2015</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>This is biannual event. No Funders Forum is planned for 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Strategy & Governance | |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| CRP Extension | Dec-14 | FO, ISPC, CO | FO and CO has worked on the amended CPAs for CRP extensions which was approved by FC on March 7, 2015 on no objection basis. ISPSC provided reviews of 15 CRP extension proposals by the end of June, 2014 (and five follow-up review) and a commentary on the portfolio in July. Contracts was prepared by FO & CO and signed by respective parties in late March, 2014. |
| CRP Governance | Jan, 2015 | CO, IEA, FO | IEA and CO worked on a new CRP Governance Structure document which was recommended by EIAC and approved by FC in January, 2015. |
| Options Paper | April, 2015 | FO, FCGC | Drafts of Options paper have been provided to FGC and FC members for comments starting from February to April. Final paper was provided on April 8 followed by a conference call hosted by the FC Chair for all FC members. |
| Resource Mobilization | Sep, 2015 | FO | Intersessional programs plan was approved by FC in January, which are being implemented such as innovative financing webinar in April and workshop at FC13, and the revitalization of resource mobilization cop including all the colleagues working on RM from CGIAR. |

| Science | |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| SRF | April, 2015 | CO, ISPC, FO | ISPC Chair has provided inputs and convened meetings in support of the SRF process and finalization. IEA had input into SRF on the learning and accountability section. Consortium Writing Team has prepared a draft version of SRF. CB approved SRF to be submitted at FC13. |
| CRP 2nd Call | Dec, 2016 | CO, FO, ISPC | Criteria guidance document for selecting proposals are under development by respective parties. ISPSC has provided input and advice to the CO on the nature of the second call and the call document. |
| Dryland System | Jan, 2015 | CO, FO | A session has been prepared at FC13 to have a detailed conversation on drylands research at the FC13 meeting, at which FC members would have had an opportunity to consider and opine on how the Fund Council would like the critical issue of drylands to permeate CGIAR’s work. |
| Genebank CRP | March, 2015 | CO, FO | CGIAR Genebanks Options Paper was prepared by FO and CO which was approved by CB late March, 2015. The funding options will be submitted for discussions at FC13. |
| CRP Evaluation | |
| FTA | November, 2014 | IEA, CO | A workshop was organized by IEA during the week of FC12 in Brussels. A management response from CB was provided. the FTA evaluation has recently officially submitted for review by FC members. |
| Maize, AAS, Wheat, PIM | October, 2015 | IEA, CO | IEA has scheduled series of meetings to discuss finalized evaluations and prepared official commentary to FC. CO to coordinate and finalize responses from CB on these four evaluations. |
| L&F | Dec, 2015 | IEA, CO | on plan |
| WLE | Dec, 2015 | IEA, CO | on plan |
| RTB evaluation | Dec, 2015 | IEA, CO | on plan |
| GRISP | Oct, 2015 | IEA, CO | on plan |
| CCAFS evaluation | November, 2015 | IEA, CO | on plan |
| GL, DC, DS, A4NH | April, 2016 | IEA, CO | IEA will provide QA support on these evaluation outputs and validation reports for these evaluations |

| Finance | |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| CGIAR Financial Report | June, 2015 | FO CO | on plan |

| Communications & CGIAR Events | |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Publications (branding guideline, annual report) | July, 2015 | FO, ISPC, CO, IEA | Branding guideline has been produced in 2014. |
| Development Dialogues | 2015 | CO | This will be delayed due to recent funding cut. |
Section 3: Satisfaction Survey Report

IEA conducted the survey in March 2015. The survey went out to 155 respondents including Center Directors, FC members, Funders, CGIAR Scientists, CRP Leaders, CB Members, and ISPC Council Members. There were 55 complete responses (35%).
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The satisfaction rating on overall performance and on communications includes feedback from all the stakeholders who responded to the survey. The scale of the rating is from 1 to 4. 1 represents very dissatisfied, and 4 represents very satisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction on Overall Performance</th>
<th>Satisfaction on Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPC</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEA</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FO**: Ratings on overall performance by stakeholders with whom the Fund Office has frequent and extensive contact such as FC members and Funders (2.7) are higher. Low ratings from indirect stakeholders such as Center Directors and Scientists contribute to the lower rating on FO’s overall performance.

**CO**: Some ratings fell well short of a more desirable range, but there has been meaningful efforts towards improvement. A key Q4 2014 initiative was to expand the number of Center observers to the CB from 1 to 4 and treat them as if they were full board members. There has been a much more positive and constructive atmosphere in Center-Consorium engagements since then.

**IEA**: Overall satisfaction is high (3.1); with FC and funders indicating 3.39 satisfaction. The other main stakeholder groups include: CRP Directors (overall satisfaction: 3.1), Center DGs (overall satisfaction: 3.0). The highest rated performance area across the survey relates to satisfaction with IEA’s organizational independence, and effectiveness of direct reporting relationship to governing body: (3.43).
Areas of strength included the value stakeholders see in, especially, the legal and communications communities of practices, the CGIAR common annual report; the intellectual assets reporting framework, work on gender, and also how the Consortium represents the system as a whole.
According to CGIAR Governance Framework & Joint Agreement, the Fund Council monitors the performance of the system entities in the below four areas of accountability.

Suggested definitions of these four areas are as follows.

(i) **Strategic impact**: Contribution toward the progress of key deliverables on Gantt chart
(ii) **Quality and relevance of programmatic performance**: Entity level output & deliverables
(iii) **Managerial and governance performance**: Contribution toward CGIAR and CRP governance process
(iv) **Financial performance and resource mobilization**: Budget and expenditure management, efficiency, and help to mobilize resources for funding (for relevant system entities)

Below tables presents the self-assessment ratings from system entities. Notes on these ratings are provided in following slides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>ISPC</th>
<th>IEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Impact</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality and Relevance of Programmatic Performance</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial and Governance Performance</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes on Self Assessment Rating From ISPC

• **Strategic impact:** Contributions to CRP review, assistance to the development of the SRF, Science Forum outcomes on building agricultural programs for nutrition outcomes and studies of cross-cutting themes (biotechnology and metrics) all contribute to the program development and strategic direction of the system.

• **Quality and relevance of Programmatic performance:** The provision of quality advice to the CGIAR has been recognized in the proposed empowerment of the ISPC by the MTR.

• **Managerial and Governance Performance:** Not Applicable: ISPC advice for program management (and indirectly to funders) is contained in CRP commentaries but the ISPC has no direct responsibility in relation to systems management or governance.

• **Financial Performance and Resource Mobilization:** Financial performance rests more with the Secretariat than the advisory function of Council as a whole; The SIAC program is well funded from BMGF and window 1 sources; The ISPC budget is derived from system costs and the FAO and did not seek mobilization of additional resources for its other strategic advisory activities.
• **Strategic impact:** All objectives achieved, esp. CRP extensions, CGIAR Development Dialogues and open consultation on SRF

• **Quality and relevance of programmatic performance:** All outputs delivered on time and at highest quality standards

• **Managerial and governance performance:** Maintained engagement and dialogues with CRPs, incl. on governance improvements based on PwC recommendations; MTR governance recommendation was very disruptive, major efforts to repair relationships with Centers

• **Financial performance and resource mobilization:** unexpected costs due to Bioversity hosting overheads
Notes on Self Assessment Rating From FO

• **Strategic impact:** The FO has facilitated progress on key deliverables of CGIAR such as CRP extensions, organization of Funders Forum, support to MTR

• **Quality and relevance of programmatic performance:** All objectives and functions were achieved and delivered; Details are in FO scorecard

• **Managerial and governance performance:** Successfully facilitated the process of CRP governance structure endorsement by FC, FC committees’ meetings and discussions and MTR assignment

• **Financial performance and resource mobilization:** There was reallocated portions of budgets to fund the FC initiatives; The FO developed a full RM strategy cognizant that it would require additional time and resources, and recognized need to re-address Fund calculation methodology to improve predictability of funding
Notes on Self Assessment Rating From IEA

- **Strategic impact:** 10 full CRP evaluations, and 5 CRP commissioned evaluations with QA validation from IEA will feed into SRF development and 2\textsuperscript{nd} call for CRP proposals

- **Performance:** With only 1.5 years of activity, and 3 staff members, IEA has been able to perform at a high level, with products being used and incorporated into system-level strategy and CRP management

- **Managerial performance:** IEA has contributed to key managerial and governance processes across the system, and assisted in improvement of processes and structures to increase efficiencies including: (1) collaboration with CO, ISPC, and SPIA, (2) collaboration with EIAC/FC, (3) development of evaluation process endorsed by FC, (4) CRP governance and management review endorsed by FC and CB, resulting in changes to CRP governance and reflected in latest CRP guidance, and (5) strategic input into the draft SRF on accountability and learning

- **Financial performance:** IEA has responded to FC request for increase workplan and activities, and has done so without increase in staffing for 2014; Unit costs of evaluations have been reviewed by IEA (and in comparison with international organizations), and reflect efficiency and cost-effectiveness