Session 9: Recommended pre-read

Examples of Progress to date on:

1. Framework
2. Templates (POWBs 2017)
3. Indicators
4. ICT support tool
Foundation for RBM

Sphere of Control
- Foresight & Initial stakeholder engagement
- Research, innovations & services
- Changes in capacity & aspirations

Sphere of Influence
- Changes in practices
- Direct/indirect benefits
- Improved well-being & ecosystem health

Sphere of Interest

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

SDGs

MEL for Research Relevance & Quality

MEL for Research Use & Effectiveness

MEL for Development Effectiveness

Rapid assessment and learning loops
Sphere of Control

Monitoring of:
- Quality of Research
- Output Delivery
- Immediate research outcomes

Sphere of Influence

- Monitoring stakeholder behavior (project/research initiative)
- Outcome stories (research teams)
- Outcome assessments (evaluations – impact studies)

Sphere of Interest (SRF/SDGs)

- Monitor sub-set of SDGs and SRF indicators
- Pursue impact studies, embedding this as part of the research process, where appropriate

Foundation for RBM
Harmonizing Performance Components

- Theories of Change and Impact Pathways (2016 Proposals)
- For CRPs
- For Flagships
- Platforms

Periodic Reflection, Review and Revision

- Updating the annual plan
- Annual Reports

Performance Assessment
- Portfolio
- CRPs
- Platforms
- Flagships
- Modules
CRP Annual Plan of Work and Budget (POWB) for 2017
- INTERIM TEMPLATE –

See for instructions and guidance at the end of the template

COVER PAGE
Name of the CRP
List of participating Centers and other key partners (including logos)

A. CRP LEVEL [3 pages maximum]

A1. Delivery [1 page maximum excluding Table 1]

A1.1 Adjustments/changes to your Theories of Change
Describe any planned adjustments/changes to your Theory of Change (ToC) (if any), e.g. if a CRP has changed as a consequence of either some flagships not being funded in 2017 (or beyond) or because operational realities have changed in other ways that this presumably effects the overall approach of the CRP to the delivery of the results. [Link to your CRP ToC changed or as in proposal]

A1.2 Highlight expected Outcomes and Outputs
Describe some key outcomes that your CRP expects to contribute in 2017 and some key outputs that your CRP expects to deliver in 2017. Distinguish where possible between those that are building on past work (and therefore, for example, expect to expand or scale) and those that are new areas of investment (as per annex 2). Point to any key outcomes and outputs relevant to gender, youth and CapDay.

A1.3 Use of different Funding Sources
Indicate how W1-2 funding will be used vis-a-vis W3-bilateral. Also provide a summary financial table (see table 1)

Table 1: CRP planned budget by flagship for 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagship Name</th>
<th>Planned Budget 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1/W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(one row per FP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2, etc...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP Management &amp; Support Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2. Collaboration and Integration [1 page maximum]

A2.1 Contribution to and from Platforms
Describe expected services, collaborative research or studies, materials that would be required from each of the CGIAR Platforms (Big Data, Excellence in Breeding, Genebanks, and Gender) to support the implementation of the CRP’s POWB for 2017, and an indication of the source of the budget where possible (e.g. CRP, Platform, Joint, other)

A2.2 Cross-CRP interactions
Describe what is being done in collaboration with other CRPs any relevant outputs, outcomes and progress towards impact. Focusing on results that could not have been produced without such alliances and insisting on the give and take value for your CRP.

A2.3 Expected Efforts on Country Coordination
Describe expected efforts related to the CGIAR country coordination initiative in 2017. How will the CRP engage with CGIAR’s country coordination and in which countries? What are the priority themes for coordination and how will this work be funded?

A3. Management, Governance and Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning [0.5 page maximum]

A3.1 Relevant Changes in Management and Governance
Describe any relevant changes to the CRP compared to the proposal, such as in the governance structure, Program Management Unit, or in the administration of the MEL process.

A3.2 Monitoring, Evaluation, Impact Assessment and Learning Plans
Describe key monitoring initiatives, evaluations, impact assessments planned for the year, within the framework of the program’s theory of change.
B. FLAGSHIP LEVEL

Flagship [1, 2, ..., n]. (1.5 page maximum per flagship, excluding tables)

B.1 Delivery

B.1.1 Expected Annual Milestones towards Outcomes 2022
Describe for each flagship what is planned during 2017 to contribute towards the FP 2022 outcomes, with whom you are working (key partners) to achieve this, and how this will deliver on the corresponding SRF sub-IDO and target. Summarize plans to achieve and document annual milestones (table 2).

B.1.2 Outputs towards Outcomes 2022
Key research outputs and their contribution to the outcomes 2022, including Gender and other cross-cutting issues such as Youth or Capacity Development (see table 3).

B.1.3 Contribution of W1-2 Funds
Indicate how W1-2 funds will be used, for what purpose, and the relationship with W3-Bilateral funds. See table 3 for a breakdown and allocation by actual outputs.

Flagship level tables consolidated

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FP No.</th>
<th>Mapped and contributing to Sub-IDO</th>
<th>Relevant CRP sub-IDO indicators*</th>
<th>2017 Target**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-IDO 1.1.3</td>
<td>CRP sub-IDO Indicator 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRP sub-Indicator 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-IDO 1.3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-IDO 1.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclaimer:

2.1) Keep in mind that the indicators for sub-IDOs are still in progress.
2.2) *Relevant CRP Sub-IDO indicators as provided to SMO in Nov. 2016 for SC3-05 Item
2.3) **Whenever available please provide targets.

Table 3: Expected Annual Milestones (progress markers) towards Outcomes 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FP No.</th>
<th>FP Outcome 2022</th>
<th>Milestone 2017 Max. of 3 milestones per FP outcome 2022</th>
<th>Mapped budget request for 2017 W1/ W2 USD</th>
<th>W3/ bilateral USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.1</td>
<td>Milestone 1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milestone 1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.2</td>
<td>Milestone 1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milestone 1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.3</td>
<td>Milestone 1.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 2.1</td>
<td>Milestone n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclaimer:

5.1) Milestones could be outputs or outcomes as appropriate to the scale and maturity of the work. In this table 3 please focus as much as possible on milestones towards outcomes to avoid overlaps and duplication with table 4.
3.2) Budget amounts are mapped to outcomes from costing outputs and activities that are required to enable changes that we expect to happen.

3.3) It is important to acknowledge that the budget amounts are likely not directly correlated to the work proposed for this year, but build on investment and outputs from the past.

Table 4: Expected Key Output 2017 towards Outcomes 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FP No.</th>
<th>FP Outcome 2022</th>
<th>CoA Output</th>
<th>Tagging of expected outputs 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>Outcome 1.1</td>
<td>CoA output 1</td>
<td>G, Y, CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.2</td>
<td>CoA output 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.2</td>
<td>CoA output 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.2</td>
<td>CoA output N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclaimer:
4.1) Please see explanations in the instructions and guidance below to complete the tagging columns for the cross-cutting topics.
4.2) G = Gender, Y = Youth, CD = Capacity Development;
4.3) Markers: 0 = not targeted, 1 = significant, 2 = principal
4.4) CoA (Cluster of Activity) Outputs or Key Outputs reported in the POWB are expected to be key products, new knowledge and services produced through a variable number of deliverables reported at the project level (and not necessarily at the program level); for output’s definition, see glossary.

- END of INTERIM TEMPLATE –

Annex 1: Glossary

- **Impacts**: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects resulting from a chain of events to which research has contributed, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. These effects can be economic, socio-cultural, institutional, environmental, technological or of other types, sphere of interest; see annex 3, and phase of scaling in annex 4.

- **Impact assessment**: In CGIAR, this term is generally used for an ex-post study which uses specialized methods to estimate the changes in selected development parameters and the extent to which these are attributable to defined research activities or programs of the CGIAR1. However, in phase II and under the new strategy and results framework 2017-2030, the CGIAR Research Programs are taking on a wider definition of the term, recognizing that there are different forms of impact assessment built into the programs of work, e.g. Theories of Change as one ex-ante impact assessment.

- **Indicator**: A quantitative or qualitative variable that represents an approximation of the characteristic, phenomenon or change of interest (for instance, efficiency, quality or outcome). Indicators can be used to monitor research or to help assess for instance organizational or research performance2.

- **Inputs**: the financial, human, and material resources used in research.

- **Output**: the products, new knowledge and services which result from research, capacity building and other activities related to research for development3, sphere of control, see annex 3. Outputs are resulting of discovery and proof of concept phases; see annex 4.

- **Outcome**: the intended or unintended short-term and medium-term effects resulting from an intervention’s outputs4, change in knowledge, attitudes and skills, manifest as change in discourse, institutions, policy and practice that result in part of in while from the CRP’s research and associated activities, sphere of control and influence, see annex 3. Research outcomes are resulting of pilot phase and development outcomes since scaling up phase; see annex 4.

- **Milestone**: is a progress marker towards our Flagship 2022 outcomes and into which they are divided for monitoring intermediate performance along a timeline. Milestones are measurable and observable. Annual milestones are defined to reflect some reasonable achievement for the specified time period (challenging but achievable). Milestones could be outputs or outcomes as appropriate to the scale and maturity.

- **Performance management**: the continuous process of setting goals, measuring progress, giving feedback, coaching for improved performance, and rewarding achievement.

- **Target**: an amount of change that is to be achieved over a specific time frame in an indicator.

- **Theory of Change (ToC)**: includes the impact pathways and the assumptions along the way. Presents a hypothetical identification of the ways by which change is expected to occur from output to outcome and impact along an impact pathway. The ToC questions the assumptions about causality underlying the relationships between outputs, outcomes and impact. In ToC the assumptions present the mechanisms of change.

---

1 From “CGIAR standards for independent external evaluation”, IEA, Doc 2015
2 L.G. Mora, J. mee and R.C. Felt, Road to Results, World Bank, 2009
## Consolidated report on POWBs 2017

### Cross cutting sub-IDO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-IDo</th>
<th># of CRPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1 Reduced net greenhouse emission for agriculture, forests and other forms of land use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2 Increased above and below ground biomass for carbon sequestration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.3 Improved forecasting of impacts of climate change and targeted technology development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.4 Enhanced capacity to deal with climate extremes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.5 Enabled environment for climate resilience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender &amp; Youth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.1 Gender-equitable control of productive assets and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.2 Technologies that reduce women’s labor and energy expenditure developed and disseminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.3 Improved capacity of women and young people to participate in decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies &amp; Institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.1 Increased capacity of beneficiaries to adopt research outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.2 Increased capacity of research institutions, as evidenced by rate of investment in agricultural research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.3 Conductive agricultural policy environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.4 Conductive environment for managing shocks and vulnerability, as evidenced in rapid response mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.1 Enhanced institutional capacity of partner research organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.2 Enhanced individual capacity in partner research organizations through training and exchanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.3 Increased capacity for innovation in partner research organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.4 Increased capacity for innovation in partner development organizations and in poor and vulnerable communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** Data derived from Table 2 of the POWBs for 2017 - includes cases where CRPs declare indicators and targets for 2017 contributing to meeting specific sub-IDOs. The absence of outputs against individual sub-IDOs does not mean they are being addressed, simply that that outputs and outcomes relevant to that sub-IDO are likely to be derived later in the 5-year program cycle.
What CGIAR is planning to deliver in 2017 *

+ 6,500,000 farmers growing bio-fortified varieties

+ 200 new varieties
=> maize, rice, wheat, roots, tubers & bananas

Increased genetic gain
+ 1.0-1.5% maize, rice, wheat
+ 5% fish

+ 5,000,000 farmers adopting new varieties with less use of inputs or increased genetic gain

+ 6,500,000 farmers growing bio-fortified varieties

+ 32,000,000 households consuming bio-fortified varieties

+ 1,300,000 households with increased access to capital

+ 1,000,000 households Potentially affected by policy changes

GHG emissions at least 5% GHG emissions reduction or reach at least 10,000 farmers

+ 7,000,000 households covered by social protective programs

+ 600,000 hectares of land restored or prevented from deforestation

* Based on 11 CRPs Plan Of Work & Budget for 2017
Task Force on Indicators

Commissioned in April 2016

=> Operationalizing the SRF with a set of high-level Indicators and a new Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework

Philippe Ellul (System Organization), Michelle Guertin (MAIZE/WHEAT/CIMMYT), Tonya Schuetz (consultant), Shaylyn Gaffney (MAIZE/WHEAT/CIMMYT), David Rider-Smith (WLE/IWMI), Hope Webber (RICE/IRRI), Claudio Proietti (RTB/CIP), Nancy Johnson (A4NH/IFPRI), Karl Hughes (GLDC, FTA/ICRAF)

Tom Randolph (Livestock & Fish), Graham Thiele (CIP/RTB), Bas Bouman (IRRI/RICE)

Ahmed Kablan (USAID), Leslie Perlman (USAID), Michel Bernhardt (GIZ), Corinne Abbas & Jeroen Rijniers (Dutch Government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Bhramar Dey (BMGF), Andrew Alford (ACIAR)

Sirkka Immonen (IEA), James Stevenson (ISPC/SPIA),
## Ten aspirational targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target ID, descriptions and intermediary 2022 values</th>
<th>2030 values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 100 million more farm households have adopted improved varieties, breeds or trees, and / or improved management practices</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 30 million people, of which 50% are women, assisted to exit poverty</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve the rate of yield increase for major food staples from current &lt;1% to 1.2-1.5% per year</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 30 million more people, of which 50% are women, meeting minimum dietary energy requirements</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 150 million more people, of which 50% are women, without deficiencies in one or more of the following essential micronutrients: iron, zinc, iodine, vitamin A, folate and vitamin B12</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 10% reduction in women of reproductive age who are consuming less than the adequate number of food groups</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 5% increase in water and nutrient (inorganic, biological) use efficiency in agro-ecosystems, including through recycling and reuse</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reduce agriculturally-related greenhouse gas emissions by 0.2 Gt CO2-e yr-1 (5%) compared with business-as-usual scenario in 2022</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 55 million hectares (ha) degraded land area restored</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 2.5 million ha of forest saved from deforestation</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRP Sub-IDO level Indicators

CCAFS (Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security)

**CCAFS FP1: Priorities and Policies for CSA in 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description for 2017*</th>
<th>Measure of Verifiability</th>
<th>For which year?</th>
<th>Targets for 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance resilience of smallholder farmers to climate shocks and other stresses</td>
<td>Number of SHs receiving programmatic, financial, policy-related trainings for adopting CSA-related practices and technologies (that potentially reduce production risks).</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced poverty (SLO1)</td>
<td>Improved access to financial and other services</td>
<td>Number of sub-national public and private initiatives providing access to novel financial services.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CCAFS Table 2: SLOs, IDOs and sub-IDOs with proposed indicators**

(*) CCAFS-FPs and Sub-IDOs listed are extracted from the CCAFS PIM Table C (Full proposal)
(**) The proposed indicators are coming from an interim PowB proposed by CCAFS and based on the RBM section Annex 3.6 of the Full Proposal.
# Table 2 from POWB 2017; CCAFS example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagship No.</th>
<th>Mapped and contributing to Sub-IDO</th>
<th>Relevant CRP sub-IDO indicators*</th>
<th>2017 Target**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>1.1 Optimized consumption of diverse nutrient-rich foods</td>
<td># of organisations and institutions in selected countries/states adapting plans and directing investment to optimise consumption of diverse nutrient-rich foods, with all plans and investments examined for their gender implications</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Improved forecasting of impacts of climate change and targeted technology development</td>
<td># of countries/states where CCAFS priority setting used to target and implement interventions to improve food and nutrition security under a changing climate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Enabled environment for climate resilience</td>
<td>$ USD new investments by state, national, regional and global agencies, informed by CCAFS science and engagement</td>
<td>USD 75 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Gender-equitable control of productive assets and resources</td>
<td># of national/state organisations and institutions adapting their plans and directing investment to increase women’s access to, and control over, productive assets and resources</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Increased capacity for innovation in partner development organizations and in poor and vulnerable communities</td>
<td># of policy decisions taken (in part) based on engagement and information dissemination by CCAFS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>2.1 Reduced smallholders production risk</td>
<td># of farm households receiving incentives (training, financial, programmatic, policy-related) for adopting CSA related practices and technologies that potentially reduce production risks with increased benefits for women</td>
<td>0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Improved access to financial and other services</td>
<td># of sub-national public/private initiatives providing access to novel financial services and supporting innovative CSA business models</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Improved forecasting of impacts of climate change and targeted technology development</td>
<td># of site-specific targeted CSA options (technologies, practices and services) tested and examined for their gender implications</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A common set of harmonized indicators

SDGs

3 SLOs

10 SLO targets – with 10 highest level of indicators

10 IDOs + 4 cross-cutting

Harmonized indicators (3rd TFI meeting & March 2017 POWBs)

=> CRP-specific sub-IDO level indicators by CRPs (POWBs)

30 Sub-IDOs + 16 cross-cutting

Outcomes 2022

=> n project level indicators & Annual milestones

Portfolio

CRP Leaders

Flagship & Project Leaders
**SLO1: Reduced Poverty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Target and Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.1.1 100 million more farm households have adopted improved varieties, breeds or trees, and/or improved management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured by: Number of farm households that have applied one or more CGIAR supported varieties, breeds or trees, and/or improved mgt. practices in current/previous farming season.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research area</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breeding for increased economic potential on the farms</td>
<td>From discovery to adoption of new varieties by farmers, with increased economic potential for the farmers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-IDO</th>
<th>Harmonized Indicators</th>
<th>CRPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3.2</strong> Increased livelihood opportunities</td>
<td><strong>Increased income</strong> through diversified farm activities (diversification of crops, livestock and fish breeds, tree species)</td>
<td>MAIZE, RTB, LIVESTOCK, WHEAT, CCAFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3.4</strong> More efficient use of inputs</td>
<td><strong>Number of farmers</strong> benefitting from direct or indirect actions reducing unnecessary use of input</td>
<td>FTA, MAIZE, RTB, PIM, LIVESTOCK, RICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.1</strong> Reduced pre- and post production losses</td>
<td><strong>Number of farmers</strong> adopting new varieties that reduce pre- and post-harvest losses</td>
<td>MAIZE, RICE, RTB, PIM, WHEAT, RICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.3</strong> Enhanced genetic gain</td>
<td><strong>Number of farmers</strong> adopting new varieties that increase genetic gain</td>
<td>MAIZE, RICE, WHEAT, RTB, FISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.4</strong> Increased conservation and use of genetic resources</td>
<td>Number of germplasm/seed lots, livestock, data sets or related-information distributed and shared to develop or refine genetic use strategies</td>
<td>LIVESTOCK, FISH, RICE, PIM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators for measuring progress

10 SLO-level indicators

# 20 harmonized indicators (sub-IDO level)

+ 300 output-level indicators
Common standards & interoperable facilities for planning, monitoring & reporting

7 Agri-food Systems Programs

Fish
Livestock
Rice
Maize
Wheat
Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA)
Roots, Tubers and Bananas (RTB)

4 Global Integrating Programs

Agriculture for Health and Nutrition (A4NH)
Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS)
Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM)
Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE)

3 Platforms
Genebank
Big Data
EiB

Planning & Reporting online systems in place

MARLO
Managing Agricultural Research for Learning and Outcomes being adopted by 8 CRPs and 1 Platform in 2017

Other systems: RTB, RICE, FISH

Kindly provided by David Abreu (CIAT/CCAFS)
ICT support & operationalization of the CGIAR SRF
- Business Intelligence / Dashboard

Kindly provided by David Abreu (CIAT/CCAFS)
MARLO service delivery & performance management

RBM focusing on iterative processes & built-in:
- Loopled learning
- Monitoring compliance to set standards
- System for adaptive management
- Project evaluation (traffic light)
- CRP mapped into SRF outcome targets
- Modular MEL

System Mgmt

Program Managers

Project Leaders

Business Intelligence: System/donor Reports, POWB, specific/individualized and standard requests

Programmatic Synthesis & Evaluation

Project annual planning and reporting

Program/Project Evaluations

Overall score: 3.1

Kindly provided by David Abreu (CIAT/CCAFS)
Thank you

Philippe Ellul, Tonya Schuetz (SMO)
Michelle Guertin (CIMMYT/MAIZE & WHEAT CRPs)

SC 4 (Amsterdam), 11 May 2017