

Issued: 22 September 2017

## CGIAR System-Level Results Reporting: Progress and plans

### Purpose

This document presents a draft paper on CGIAR System-Level Results Reporting to be shared with the System Council as part of its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (in Part II of this document), as well as additional information on the proposed common reporting indicators for the System Management Board to review in its consideration of the material to be presented to the System Council in Part I.

The contents of the paper are organized as follows:

Part I- **additional information for SMB** on common Indicators for System-Level reporting-  
Part II- **draft System Council Paper** on Plans for CGIAR System-Level Results Reporting

### Action Requested

The Board is asked to:

1. Consider the content of the draft paper to be finalized for the System Council's 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, particularly focusing on and endorsing the proposed list of common progress reporting indicators
2. Take note of the plans for system-level reporting on progress made in 2017.

**Distribution notice:**

This document may be distributed without restriction.

Prepared by: CGIAR System Management Office

[Part I](#) – Common indicators for progress reporting – additional information for the System Management Board

1. The proposed common reporting indicators alongside their proposed data sources and reporting responsibilities for CRPs and project managers are listed in Table 1 below.
2. The indicators proposed are intended mainly for high-level quantitative reporting of progress, as required by a number of funders. Considerable discussion has taken place with key donors on the perils of using these indicators mechanistically for comparing research programs or making funding decisions, as this has had poor outcomes in the past both in the CGIAR and elsewhere (gaming and perverse incentives). This message needs to be consistently communicated to funders.
3. This is a shorter list of indicators (9) than were required in Phase 1 (34). Additional efficiency savings should be possible through the use of Management Information Systems to report and collate the data, as mentioned in the attached paper to the SC. New reporting indicators will be introduced gradually.

4. Proposed next steps on the common reporting indicators include:

<b>Next step</b>	<b>Proposed deadline</b>
<b>Detailing indicator definitions, disaggregates and methodologies, in wide consultation</b>	Oct 17
<b>Detailing the SDG/international data sets to be used for high level SLO tracking</b>	Oct 17
<b>Approval of templates for CRP and System-wide reporting</b>	Nov 17
<b>Agreement on responsibility for quality checks</b>	Dec 17
<b>Guidance manual for those responsible for reporting, collating and checking data</b>	Dec 17
<b>Endorsement of proposed reporting formats, including the CRP Portfolio Report</b>	Dec 17

5. Table 1 below provides details of the proposed reporting behind each indicator, for which a mock-up of what could be presented in the Portfolio Report in future is presented in Annex 1 of the paper for SC5:

Sphere	Indicators	Proposed disaggregates to be available in MIS system	Proposed data source	Reporting responsibilities
Interest/ influence (dev outcomes/ impacts)	<b>Global progress towards SLO targets</b> together with narrative and numbers on <b>evidenced, at-scale uptake/use/benefits</b> from CGIAR investments	n/a	SDG and other international sets, plus... narrative with evidenced impact numbers from relevant studies.	Collation of SDG/other target data CRPs and SPIA report annually on appropriately-evidenced <u>at-scale</u> outcome case studies & impact studies with numbers. Including extrapolations, with evidence.
	<b>Projected uptake:</b> ex-ante assessment of <b>people</b> to benefit from current investments: “Recommendation domain”	subIDO, geographic, innovation type (variety/policy etc), field, gender	Ex-ante assessments/ estimates, self-reported: only for <i>pilot/scaling stage/policy</i> projects/activities. <b>New indicator, introduced gradually.</b>	Project managers of pilot/scaling/policy projects in agreement with Flagship leaders. Reported only at beginning of project, can be updated if new data available Via MARLO/MIS (in future).
	<b>Projected uptake:</b> ex-ante assessment of <b>hectares</b> to benefit from current investments: “Recommendation domain”	subIDO, geographic, innovation type (variety/policy etc), field, gender	Ex-ante assessments/ estimates, self-reported: only for <i>pilot/scaling stage/policy</i> projects/activities. <b>New indicator, introduced gradually.</b>	Project managers of pilot/scaling/policy projects in agreement with Flagship leaders. Reported only at beginning of project, can be updated if new data available. Via MARLO/MIS (in future).
Influence (research outcomes)	<b>Participants in CGIAR activities “Direct reach”</b>	subIDO, geographic innovation type, field, geographic, gender End-user/next-user, new/ongoing	Self-reported numbers	Annually reported by project and activity managers in agreement with Flagship leaders Via MARLO/MIS (in future).
	<b>Hectares directly reached by CGIAR activities</b>	subIDO, geographic innovation type, field, geographic, gender New/ongoing	Self-reported numbers	Annually reported by project and activity managers in agreement with Flagship leaders Via MARLO/MIS (in future).
	<b>No. of policies/ laws/regulations/ budgets/ investments modified in design or implementation, informed by CGIAR research</b>	subIDO, scale (international, national/local etc), field	Self reported with name of policy/investment/etc, evidence	Reported annually by projects in agreement with Flagship leaders. Via MARLO/MIS (in future).
	<b>Altmetrics (or Plum X, etc):</b> Demonstrates policy citations, media and social media use	as above	International data sources (automatically picks up any document with a doi or in CGspace or other approved repository)	Can be collected annually directly by SMO. Scientists, comms people or librarians would be responsible for allocating doi or putting in an approved repository to ensure publications are picked up
Control (outputs)	<b>Number of innovations by phase</b> (research, field testing if relevant, available for uptake, demonstrated uptake)	As above, for innovations in available for uptake and demonstrated uptake phases	Self –reported with name of innovation or significant finding and evidence.	Reported annually by projects in agreement with Flagship leaders.
	<b>Number of ISI publications</b>	subIDO, scale (international, national/local etc), field	International data sources	Can be collected directly by SMO.
	<b>People trained</b>	Gender, long/short training, current/new	Self-reported	Reported annually by projects in agreement with Flagship leaders.



To be Issued: 20 October 2017

Part II: Draft paper for SC5 on  
CGIAR System-Level Results Reporting: Progress and Plans

Purpose

This document presents to the System Council for its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting an update on CGIAR reporting on progress and outcomes, including a proposal for common CGIAR progress reporting indicators

The paper also presents two annexes:

- **Annex 1:** List of proposed common reporting indicators, with mock-up of table for presentation in an annual report
- **Annex 2:** Example of planned results dashboard

Action Requested

The Council is asked to endorse the proposed list of common reporting indicators and take note of the plans for system-level reporting on progress made in 2017

**Distribution notice: Restricted circulation**

This document is part of an internal deliberative process of the Council and is not for release. The outcomes of the Council's deliberations will be provided in the meeting summary.

Prepared by: System Management Office

## A – Reporting on progress and outcomes

### Common reporting indicator set

1. CGIAR funders – particularly those providing system-level (W1/2) funding – require regular system-level quantitative monitoring of outputs and outcomes based on trustworthy data. Different types of CRPs will report on specific indicators related to their own research, but a way of adding up the results from different types of research in a meaningful fashion for CGIAR as a whole is also required, that reflects the interdependent and coherent nature of its CRP portfolio.
2. Based on consultation with a cross-section of funders, research leaders and CGIAR M&E specialists, a set of common progress indicators has been identified for the purpose of high-level quantitative reporting, as required by many funders.
3. Six principles governed the selection of the common indicator set:
  - I. Aggregable indicators that would be relevant to all parts of the CGIAR system (for example, 'people reached' rather than 'varieties released')
  - II. A representative range of indicators, including spheres of control, influence and interest of CGIAR
  - III. Demand from funders for some specific indicators
  - IV. Parsimony: minimizing the number of indicators required, as reporting has a high cost
  - V. Availability of credible, robust data based on checkable evidence (note: a guidance manual will specify data sources, quality and responsibility for quality checks).
  - VI. That indicators can be reported on through (in future) automated Management Information Systems, not as a separate exercise (as well as reducing the work required, this will also allow dis/aggregation and reporting against areas of interest, such as sub-IDOs, funders, or flagships).
4. An important lesson from the past however (both in the CGIAR1 and elsewhere) is that these indicators should not be used mechanistically to compare research programs or in decision-making on funding. This encourages gaming of indicators (for example, outputs, publications and varieties can multiply when their number is considered as an indicator of success) and perverse incentives to focus on what is easy to measure (e.g. people reached) as opposed to sustained outcomes (adoption and impact).
5. The proposed indicators are listed in the form of a mock-up table in Annex 1. It is planned that a table of this type will form part of an annual CGIAR research report.

---

1 Immonem and Cooksy (2014) Using performance measurement to assess research: Lessons learned from the international agricultural research centers  
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1356389013517444>

### Reporting: formats and timing

6. Each CRP will report annually on progress, and an overall **annual report** will be prepared, which will include the common reporting indicators. This report will also include a table with contextual global-level data on progress at the SLO target level (e.g. global poverty and nutrition trends), together with a narrative and numbers on the CGIAR contribution to each target, taken from appropriately-evidenced, at-scale outcome and impact studies.
7. Proposed timing for reporting on progress made in 2017:
  - CRP annual reports: May 2018
  - An overall CGIAR annual report: Jun 2018
8. Once the IT systems have been appropriately modified, the aim is to also produce a **reporting dashboard** where it will be possible to drill down beyond top-level information and indicators to underlying details, and which can be interrogated at any time of year. This will require some significant IT investment. **See Annex 2 for a mock-up dashboard.**

### Next Steps

9. Proposed next steps on CGIAR system-level results reporting include:

Next step	Proposed deadline
<b>Approval of common reporting indicators</b>	This meeting
<b>Guidance manual on indicators, with definitions and data sources</b>	Dec 17
<b>Updating MARLO and other MIS systems for 2017 reporting and new indicators</b>	Apr 18
<b>Reporting on 2017 results (systems in transition)</b>	Jun 18
<b>Results dashboard available on MARLO</b>	Sep 18 tbc

10. Reporting on results is one part of a much wider approach to performance based management in CGIAR. Consideration of gaps in performance-based management is behind many items on this System Council agenda: the proposed Allocation Strategy, the proposed Risk Management Framework, the work underway on the role of ISPC and IEA.
11. Further reflective work on how to continually improve performance-based management is the core business of Centers, CRP management units, and the SMB. A key focus of ongoing work is taking stock of how we can most efficiently collect and present evidence for decision-makers and funders on important aspects of CRP performance management, including research portfolio management, the use of theories of change, partnerships and record-keeping.

## Annex 1: Common indicator reporting set - with mock-up of table for presentation in an annual report for the CGIAR

Sphere	Indicators	Mock-up: example of type of data to be presented in the annual report <i>(Please note that these are imaginary numbers and text for illustrative purposes. Real numbers would be more precise.)</i>
Influence (research outcomes)	<b>Projected uptake:</b> ex-ante assessment of people /hectares to benefit from current investments: “Recommendation domain”	<b>40M people from projects currently in scaling/late pilot phase, of which:</b> 17 M are from varietal releases and scaling 10M from nutrition policy in south Asia 15 M from water management in east Asia....
	<b>Participants in CGIAR activities “Direct reach”</b>	1.5 M new +ongoing, of which: 1,4 M end-users (30% women) in on-farm trials, farmer field days and similar 100k ‘next users’ (25% women) in innovation platforms, policy workshops and similar ...
	<b>Hectares directly reached by CGIAR activities</b>	3M ha new and ongoing, of which: 1.5 M in climate change adaptation 1 M in other forestry 0.5 M in rangelands...
	<b>Number of policies/ laws/ regulations/ budgets/ investments modified in their design or implementation, informed by CGIAR research</b>	2 major international policies, including the XXX policy on animal and human health 20 national policies including 10 on nutrition, 9 on climate change and 1 on food safety 5 major investments, including a large WB water programme... 2000 sub-national policies ...
	<b>Altmetrics (or Plum X, etc)</b> Demonstrates policy citations, media and social media use	200k mentions, including news (5,000), policy documents (1,000) The papers most cited by international policy makers were on XX and YYY... Scores can be explored here: (link).
Control (outputs)	<b>Number of innovations by phase (research, field testing if relevant, available for uptake, demonstrated uptake)</b>	20000 in research phase 1000 in field testing 100 available for uptake: see table XX [list of innovations/findings ready for use] 50 demonstrated uptake, see table YY [list of innovations/findings in use]
	<b>Number of ISI publications</b>	1,500 of which ... xxx
	<b>People trained</b>	Long term: 2,348 (Men: 1,439 and Women: 909) Short term: 431,207 (Men: 239,496 and Women: 191,711)

Annex 2: Example of planned dashboard

## Results Dashboard Mockup - 1



### CGIAR Dashboard

**Link to**

Where and how we work

Click a country to see research and partners

Research progress

Research outputs by phase:  
Research / testing / available / in use

Click on a bar to see details

Publications and influence

Attention score: click for details

**Find outputs, outcomes and impacts by:**

SDGs

IDO/sub-IDO

Area/Country

CRP/Platform

Centers/partners

Our Funder

Clicking bar takes you to database of innovations

**By SDGs**

**By CRP/Platform**

CRP	Platform
CRP 1	CRP 1
CRP 2	CRP 2
CRP 3	CRP 3
CRP 4	CRP 4

**By Area/countries**

**By IDOs/sub-IDOs**

## Results Dashboard Mockup - 2



**SLO1: IDO 1: Enhanced small market...**  
**Sub-IDO: 1.2.2 Reduce market barriers**

**Narrative:**

**System level outcome stories:**  
 (with hyperlink for evidences)

- Livestock Livelihoods & Agri-Food Systems (LS FP5)
- Upgrading rice value chains (Rice FP3)
- **Inclusive and Efficient Value Chains (PIM FP2)**

**Progress of PIM FP2 towards Sub-IDO: 1.2.2**

**Project E: -----**

**Performance**

Data from outcome and impact assessments

Data from project MIS systems