

## **List of Annexes**

*Annex 1: Summary of Definitions*

*Annex 2: SC Scoring of Outcomes*

*Annex 3: Checklist on Impact Culture*

*Annex 4: Checklist on Governance*

*Annex 5: Checklist on Culture of Learning and Change*

## ***Annex 1 Summary of Definitions***

**Outputs** are the products of research with a defined time line, contributing to reaching the Center goals by offering solutions to problems identified during the planning process.

**Output Targets** are the annual deliverables, defined by quantity and type, expected in a specific year and contributing to achieving the MTP Project Outputs. Output targets are deliverables in the following categories: materials, policy strategies, practices, capacity, and other kinds of knowledge.

**Outcome** is the external use, adoption, or influence of a Center output(s) (e.g. by partners, stakeholders, clients).

**Impacts** are the longer range social, environmental and economic benefits that are consistent with CGIAR goals and the center's mission and objectives

### **Scientist**

Number of scientists should be counted in terms of **Full Time Equivalents** (based on the staff list as of December, 31 2009) and should include the time of

- All internationally recruited staff contributing to Center and CP research in 2009, including also
  - Post-doc fellows and research fellow/associates (including externally funded positions),
  - visiting or honorary scientist,
  - Part-time staff or joint positions (counted as 50%),
- Regionally recruited staff with PhDs who are appointed as scientists, e.g. network coordinators, country representatives, senior breeders, etc.
- Nationally or other regionally recruited staff, if the staff member is the first author or the only Center author of a peer-reviewed publication included in the publication count.

Excluded is managerial/administrative staff (DG, DDG, Director Finance, Director HR, Head of Training, Head of information technology and other wholly administrative regional representatives). EXCEPTION: if a managerial/administrative staff member published in 2009 and his/her publication is included in the calculation of indicator 1a/b or 2, then the staff member must be included in the scientist count as well.

### **Full Time Equivalent (FTE)**

Is the percentage of time a staff scientist works represented as a decimal. A full-time person is 1.00, a half-time person is .50 and a quarter-time person is .25. Please note that the basis for calculating the FTE of scientists should be the date in their employment contract. Scientists that joined or left the Center in 2008 should be pro-rated according to the month they joined or left the Center, e.g. if they worked 7 months in 2009 then the FTE would be 7/12 or 0.58. Any discounting related to the scientist work program (e.g. time allocation to research, project management) is not allowed.

In the exceptional cases where a scientist has left the center in a year prior to 2009 and his/her publication was published in 2009, the publication can be included and the FTE will again be the number of months that the scientist worked during the year they left divided by 12, e.g.; the scientist left in 2009 and worked 5 months during that year, then the FTE would be  $5/12 = 0.42$

**Externally peer reviewed publication**

Publications that have been reviewed by experts that are not Centers' staff or work as consultants with the Centers.

**Internationally Recruited Staff (IRS)**

In the calculation of the number of International Recruited Staff, please include internationally recruited scientist and managerial/administrative staff **plus** Secondments, Postdocs that are funded externally who have been working at your Center for more than 6 month in 2008.

**Senior Management Team**

The Senior Management team includes the DG, DDG, Directors of major programs/divisions, and senior heads of administration if they report directly to the DG.

## ***Annex 2: SC Scoring of Outcomes***

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Basis of scoring</b>	<b>Score</b>
Monitoring an outcome from Center research and capacity strengthening activities.	Is the outcome described an actual outcome?	yes/no	mandatory condition
	Is there a reasonable (plausible) indication that the outcome is derived from a realized Center output or output target?	yes/no	mandatory condition
	Basic score if mandatory conditions are met		1
Linking outcome to planning	1. Is the realized output/output target from which the outcome is derived clearly identified in an MTP?	It must be possible to find the output/output target/milestone from an old MTP which should be indicated in the outcome description	0-1
Documenting outcomes	2. Is the realized output/output target clearly described and verified?	yes/no	0-1
	3. Is the outcome description specific on how the output was used to derive the outcome?	yes/no	0-1
	4. Is there clear evidence of the outcome?	yes/no	0-1
	5. Is the linkage from the Center output/output target explicitly documented in the outcome evidence?	yes/no	0-1
Significance and magnitude of outcome	6. Does the outcome show significant, documented and verifiable adoption/use/influence in the main recommendation domain?	Peer assessment is done on basis of following factors: extent of use/adoption by intended users; geographic coverage or reach of intended user groups; likely impact on CGIAR goals; outcome resulted from new knowledge or creative use of knowledge; outcome derived from more innovative research or capacity strengthening; outcome in more intractable targets; extent to which outcome is similar as reported before for same output.	0-3
	7. Is the outcome derived from a research or capacity strengthening output that can be extrapolated widely (i.e. as a result of IPG research?)	Peer assessment	0-1
Overall assessment of outcome and outcome monitoring.		Total score for case (provided mandatory conditions are met)	1-10

**Annex 3. Measures of Impact Culture**

**Criterion 1. EpIA studies/Advancement of epIA methods (45%)**

1. A. Please provide the full citation of all *ex post* IA studies published in 2008 that attempt to assess major impacts attributed to your Center’s work and provide summary information describing the scale of adoption (# farmers, # of hectares) and the main impacts or effects resulting from the adoption in economic or social or environmental terms. [20 points maximum if submitting one or more *ex post* IA study per every \$20 million of Center budget]

Study #	Full citation	Clearly state the research related output being assessed and the role of the center in realizing that output. Indicate the geographic scale/size of the assessment, the time period covered, and the method used. Present main result/indicators of impact reported by the study, i.e., estimates of adoption or uptake, estimates of income and other effects (on poverty, environment) both positive and negative – max of 100 words for each study
1		
2		
3		
4		

1.B. For each *ex-post* IA study listed in 1.A above, please provide the relevant information under each component by checking the appropriate item<sup>1</sup> [20 points maximum for *ex post* IA studies’ quality score of 100]

	Component Weight (out of 100%)	Indicator weights
I.B. EpIA studies		
1. Publication venue (select one only)	10	

<sup>1</sup> Self evaluation (by the Center), subject to random auditing processes.

Refereed journal		10
Book chapter		5
Conference paper (includes proceedings)		4
In-house publication (reviewed externally)		3
In-house publication (not reviewed externally)		1
2. (Co-) authorship (additive up to max 5)	5	
With other CG Center scientists		1.67
With NARS scientists		1.67
With ARI scientists		1.67
Center only scientists		0.83
3. EpIA coverage (primary type of research assessed) (select one only)	10	
Commodity improvement		5
NRM related		7
Policy related		10
Biodiversity related		10
Training/capacity building related		10
Other challenging area (specify )		10
4. Distance down the impact pathway covered by the study (points based on the highest-point indicator marked)	25	
Uptake/adoption (only for policy-related research)		10
Uptake/adoption plus direct impacts at the adopter-level (Stage 1): improved yield/quality, higher incomes, lower risk, improved health, etc.		10
Uptake/adoption plus intermediate impacts that go beyond the direct impacts at the adopter-level (conserve resources, increased market access/efficiency, developed human capacity, increased productivity)		15
Uptake/adoption plus ultimate societal impacts on poverty, food security, environment (Stage II)		25
5. Geographical breadth or scale of documented uptake/adoption on which the impacts assessed by the study are based (points based on the highest-point indicator marked)	25	
Single location (region) within a single country		10
Multi-locations (regions) within a single country		15
Multiple locations (regions) within several countries (~ 2-5)		20
Global coverage across the center's mandated political region (e.g., the whole region of West Africa, Latin America, Asia , Sub-Saharan Africa, All developing countries, etc.)		25
6. Advances in new methods/models & use of novel indicators	25	

(additive, up to a max. of 25 pts)

Addresses non-economic impact indicators		12.5
Addresses differential effects (different target groups)		12.5
Addresses negative effects		20
Addresses multiplier effects (other sectors)		5
Employs novel methods (combines quantitative & qualitative, etc.)		12.5
Other methodological advances (specify : _____ )		12.5
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	

1.C. Please provide an estimate of the number of full time equivalent staff<sup>2</sup> devoted to epIA work in your Center in 2008 [5% for IA investment relative to Center budget]:

\_\_\_\_\_.

<sup>2</sup> Please refer to the FTE and Scientist definition included on the Annex 1: Summary of definitions. Please indicate FTE for both internationally and nationally recruited scientist and consultants, but not for RAs. It applies only to those conducting IAs, not communicators and trainers.

## **Criterion 2: Building an IA culture at the Center and enhancing the capacity of IA (including communication/dissemination) (20%)**

- A. IA conferences and workshops: List those held for both external and internal audiences, e.g., showing results of impact studies of a particular research theme; assessing the expected impacts of planned and ongoing research of the Center. Describe theme and number of participants for each. [5%]
- B. Utilization of epIA results: Describe using specific examples how empirical epIA findings have been applied as a basis for ex-ante impact projections that contribute to the Center's priority-setting procedures, or have been used to validate earlier ex-ante work. (< than 100 words) [5%]
- C. Baseline surveys/studies: Provide specific examples of establishment (or updating) of baseline studies conducted in the reporting year to provide counterfactuals for future epIA (< than 100 words) [2.5%]
- D. EpIA briefs, popular media: List epIA briefs produced and other forms of communication of epIA study results. [2.5 %]
- E. Training materials: List IA related training materials developed [2.5%]
- F. MS or PhD theses completed: List MSc and PhD dissertations completed (published) during 2008. [2.5%]

**Criterion 3. One epIA published study that effectively demonstrates the impact of the Center on the poor or food insecure people and to the environment, rated for quality and rigor (35%)**

**Checklist for SPIA's Rating of a Center's Ex-post Impact Assessment Study Rigor<sup>3</sup>**

1) Clear presentation of assessed research (A Necessary Condition)

The study, either internally or with supplemental information, must adequately describe how the Center's activities have contributed to specific improvements in the relevant technologies / policy recommendations and what the costs were for the Center, and its partners-- if applicable.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2) Reasonable and transparent assumptions (5%)

Are the major assumptions regarding the assessment methodology (in all components of the analysis) reasonable and/or adequately justified (transparent)?

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3) Reliable and representative data (7%)

a) Are the sources or methods of derivation of data on adoption, productivity gains/unit cost reductions and other benefits clear? (2.5%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>3</sup> Based on an anonymous external peer reviewer's assessment.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

b) Do adoption, productivity gains/unit cost reductions and other benefit data appear to be based on scientifically sound survey and other instruments? (4.5%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

4) Realistic counterfactual (4%)

a) Is the counterfactual scenario clear? (2%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

b) Does the counterfactual appear to represent a plausible scenario (including other potential sources of technical and policy change) in the absence of the assessed research outputs? (2%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

5) Sound attribution of benefits to research (7%)

a) Is the method of attribution of benefits to the research output clearly described? (2%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

b) Is the method of attribution of benefits to the research output appropriate (i.e. are potential mitigating factors sufficiently addressed)? (3%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c) Has there been a suitable amount of sensitivity analysis to assess the robustness of the conclusions? (2%)

- Exceptional (4)
- Good (3)
- Satisfactory (2)
- Not satisfactory (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. Distance down the impact pathway covered by the study (4%)

- Only uptake/adoption (0)
- Uptake/adoption plus direct impacts at the adopter-level (e.g., improved yield/quality, higher incomes, lower risk, improved health, etc.) (2)
- Uptake/adoption plus intermediate impacts that go beyond the direct impacts at the adopter-level (e.g., conserve resources, increased market access/efficiency, developed human capacity, increased productivity) (3)
- Uptake/adoption plus ultimate societal impacts on poverty, food security, environment (4)

Is this study focused on impact assessment of policy research?

- Yes (2)
- No (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Geographical breadth or scale of documented uptake/adoption on which the impacts assessed by this study are based (4%)

- Single location (region) within a single country (0)
- Multi-locations (regions) within a single country (2)
- Multiple locations (regions) within several countries (~ 2-5) (3)
- Global coverage across the center's mandated political region (4)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8) External input (4%)

Who has authored and reviewed the study?

- Author(s) include external experts; the study was subject to external peer review (4)
- Author(s) only include Center staff; the study was subject to external peer review (3)
- Author(s) include external experts; the study was not subject to external peer review (2)
- Author(s) only include Center staff; the study was not subject to external peer review (0)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

## Annex 4: Governance Checklist

### Principles of Corporate Governance

*CGIAR Guidelines on Center Governance, 2007*

- Focus on purpose and outcomes
- Ensure accountability
- Understand stakeholder perspectives
- Ensure transparency and timely disclosure
- Commit to effective governance

Part 1: Governance Checklist	Score	Notes
<b>Focus on Purpose and Outcomes</b> <b>Ensure Accountability</b>		
1. Has the full board been engaged in developing or updating the Center's strategic plan in the past two years?  Yes – Fully    Yes – Partially    No	1/.5/0	A two-year time frame is given to reflect the length of time planning takes, the 5+ year period covered by most plans, and the good practice of periodically updating the plan.
2. In 2009, did the board assess the Center's performance based on the targets and strategic goals approved in the Medium Term Plan and/or the strategic plan, and act on <b>significant deviations</b> <sup>4</sup> from projected results?  Assessed results: Yes    No  Acted on significant deviations: Yes – Fully Yes – Partially No No deviations	Assessed=.5/0  Acted=1/.5/0  No deviation=1	The question acknowledges the importance of a board's monitoring function and its responsibility to use information about results in an active way to anticipate potential problems and improve performance.
3. Does the board have an approved schedule for CCERs on program matters?	1/0	This question may become dormant for a period of time if

<sup>4</sup> **Deviation:** achievement of any target/output was less than 100 % or was deferred or cancelled.  
**Significant Deviation:** If more than 30% of the targets/outputs deviated from the plan.

Yes                      No		responses to it indicate that all Centers have adopted this practice.
4. In 2009, did the board monitor actions taken in response to CCERs and EPMRs?  Yes – both Yes – only EPMRs Yes – only CCERs No – both	Y/B=1 Y/EP=.5 Y/C=1 No=0	While not all Centers have EPMRs that are current, all Centers should be involved in a current schedule of CCERs. To respond “Yes/only EPMR” implies a gap in planning and reviewing programs through CCERs.
5. How often does the full board receive information on key financial indicators?  At least quarterly              Annually	At least quarterly =1 Annually=0	The full board needs to review financial indicators on a regular basis.
6. In 2009, did the board act on any significant deviations (10% +/-) from the approved budget?  Yes                      No                      No deviations	1/0  No deviation=1	
7. Did the full board participate in the annual performance appraisal of the DG, including decisions on compensation?  Yes                      No	1/0	
8. Does the board review annual trends in Center staffing, including gender, diversity, and turnover?  Yes                      No	1/0	The staff is a significant organizational asset and the ability to hire and retain qualified staff, as well as to assure that the Center is an equitable, satisfying workplace, should be viewed by the board as a critical aspect of its legal and ethical duties.
9. Is there a board-approved policy on delegation of authority, particularly with respect to financial transactions, that	1/0	This question is an indicator of the board’s ability to balance board

<p>makes clear the decision-making responsibilities reserved to board?</p> <p>Yes            No</p>		<p>and management roles while reinforcing the board's responsibility to remain independent of management.</p>
<p>10. Has the board reviewed the adequacy of the Center's risk management and internal control mechanisms as an explicit agenda item in the past two years?</p> <p>Yes            No</p>	1/0	<p>This question will be dormant in 2008 because all Centers have indicated adoption of the practice. The question will remain on the checklist as an ongoing reminder to boards to maintain this practice.</p>
<p><b>Understand Stakeholder Perspectives</b></p>		
<p>11. As part of planning, program evaluation or ongoing board development, did the board take the opportunity to engage directly with partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries?</p> <p>Yes            No</p>	1/0	
<p>12. Is the role of board members in serving as ambassadors and advocates for the Center included in the terms of reference describing board member responsibilities?</p> <p>Yes            No</p>	1/0	
<p>13. Does the board have a formal mechanism for regular, independent interaction with staff (e.g. through meetings with staff councils or other representative staff groups)?</p> <p>Yes Please describe</p> <p>No</p>	1/0	<p>This question reinforces a standard articulated in the CGIAR Guidelines on Center Governance. It also reinforces the need for a board to remain independent, open to communication and feedback from multiple sources, not captive only to the perspective of the DG.</p>

<p><b>Ensure transparency and timely disclosure</b></p>		
<p>14. Is the following information publicly available on the Center’s website?</p> <p>___ Annual report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ___ including financial statements</li> <li>• ___ including performance indicators</li> </ul> <p>___ Medium term plan</p> <p>___ Latest EPMR (including Center’s response)</p> <p>___ Staff compensation structure (salary scales)</p> <p>___ Schedule of full board meetings</p> <p>___ Schedule of executive committee meetings</p> <p>___ Archive of board meeting agendas and summaries including non confidential decisions (recommended 2 year minimum)</p> <p>___ Contact information that allows for independent communication with the chair of the board</p> <p>The following items are dormant in 2009. No response required.</p> <p>___ Mission, vision and strategic goals</p>	<p>Each positive response is worth .25</p> <p>Total point value=2.50</p>	<p>Recommendations in the stripe review of Center governance and the guidelines for Center governance emphasize the need for organizational transparency and transparency in governance. In addition to adopting practices that make governance transparent, the board should also assure that the Center is transparent to its stakeholders, including staff.</p> <p>All Centers reported full compliance with the two items listed as dormant.</p>

___ List of current board members with biographical information		
<b>Commit to effective governance</b>		
<p>15. Has the board undertaken a thorough assessment of its own performance in the past two years and implemented improvements based on the assessment?</p> <p>Assessed: Yes                      No</p> <p>Implemented improvements: Yes   No</p>	<p>Assessed=.5/0</p> <p>Implemented=1/0</p>	<p>An annual assessment of the board undertaken on the spot at the close of a meeting does not provide an adequate opportunity for either reflection or analysis. A thorough assessment, such as the sample process included in the guidelines on Center governance, requires more time to complete, analyze and review; it is more realistic to undertake this every two years.</p>
<p>16. Does the full board perform an annual evaluation of the board chair?</p> <p>Yes                      No</p>	1/0	
<p>17. Are committee chairs evaluated by the respective committee members annually?</p> <p>Yes                      No</p>	1/0	<p>As committee work becomes more streamlined and the committee structures change, the effective leadership of committees is increasingly important.</p>
<p>18. Was a formal evaluation of board members conducted before reappointment?</p> <p>Yes                      No</p> <p>No board members renewed in 2009</p>	<p>1/0</p> <p>None renewed= 1</p>	<p>This practice is critical to the overall quality of the board. Its inclusion on the checklist measures compliance but also encourages and supports the adoption of a challenging practice.</p>
19. Does the board have at least two	Less than = 0	This question may

members with professional qualifications in financial management <sup>5</sup> ?  Less than 2 2 More than 2	2 = 1 More than 2 = 1	become dormant for a period of time if responses to it indicate that all Centers have adopted this practice.
20. Does the board have at least one member with professional expertise in corporate, nonprofit or public governance? <sup>6</sup>  None 1-2 More than 2	None = 0 1-2 = 1 More 2 = 1	This question may become dormant for a period of time if responses to it indicate that all Centers have adopted this practice.
21. Have all new board members (who started their terms in 2008 or earlier):  - attended a CGIAR board orientation program?  Yes            No  - attended a comprehensive Center-specific orientation program?  Yes            No	CG =1/0  Center=1/0	
22. When did the board commission the last CCER on Center governance?	1/0	The CCER on governance may or may not have

<sup>5</sup> “Professional qualification in financial management” means that a Board member should have one of the following qualifications: (1) a recognized accounting or financial qualification provided by a member of the International Federation of Accountants (in particular a national professional accounting body) such as a CPA, CA or equivalent and/or (2) have substantial experience (at least 10 years) as a Chief Financial Officer or equivalent in a public or private sector organization, or in other senior positions responsible for the analysis of financial statements or financial management of such organizations., or as a faculty member of a higher education institute with responsibilities to teach on such analysis.

Board members who have qualifications or professional/academic experience in public finance or macroeconomics without meeting one of the above requirements will not be considered “professionally qualified in financial management” as the focus of the qualification is on members who have substantial experience at organizational level. Persons with Masters of Business Administration or Public Administration would be accepted provided they meet criteria (2) above.”

<sup>6</sup> “Professional expertise in corporate, non-profit or public governance” means that a Board member should either (1) have a recognized professional qualification in corporate, non-profit/public governance, or (2) have undergone a major special training in corporate/non-profit/public governance, or (3) have substantial experience in directly leading an institution in the public or private sector.

Less than 3 years ago More than 3 years ago		included a review of management.
<b>Policy checklist</b>		
<p>In the last two years, has the board approved or reviewed the following policies:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Investment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Procurement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> HR policy (including grievance procedures)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Whistle blower</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Conflict of interest/code of conduct</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Each positive response is worth .25</p> <p>Each “no response” reduces score for this indicator by .25</p> <p>Total point value=1.25</p>	<p>The checklist includes the basic policies that all Centers should have in place. Policies, such as these, are not adopted or revised annually but, once approved by the board, should be reviewed with regularity.</p> <p>Scoring for this question includes a penalty of .25 if a Center indicates it either lacks a policy on the checklist or that a policy has not been reviewed. Most Centers are compliant with best practices in this area. The stringent scoring of the policy checklist is intended to accelerate the adoption of these policies and practices by all CG Centers.</p>

A composite score on governance will be generated based on (i) the points received for the individual questions and (ii) a weight for the 5 areas listed as key principles of corporate governance.

<b>Principles of corporate governance</b>	<b>Weights</b>
Focus on purpose and outcomes	40 %
Ensure accountability	
Understand stakeholder perspectives	20 % (including policy checklist)
Ensure transparency and timely disclosure	
Commit to effective governance	40%



<b>Continuous learning opportunities for the staff</b>		
<p>a. Does the staff appraisal system include the development and follow-up of annual individual learning plans?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>	1/0	Center should promote and put mechanisms in place for continuous learning of individual staff members in their area of expertise and other fields, e.g. management skills
<p>b. Does the Center have a mentoring program for young scientists?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>	1/0	Sharing of experience, scientific knowledge and networks with junior scientists, and providing the kind of nurturing support will allow young staff members to grow both within their field and within their Center.
<b>Staff development activities</b>		
<p>a. What percentage of the overall 2009 budget was spent for attendance at international conferences or professional society meetings or for a short sabbatical at a university, etc?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0- 0.5% <input type="checkbox"/> 0.51-1.0% <input type="checkbox"/> 1.1%-2.0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.1%-3% <input type="checkbox"/> more than 3%</p>	0/0.25/0.5/0.75/1	As learning organizations will achieve better results it is critical that Centers invest into staff learning and knowledge sharing, both for IRS and NRS.
<p>b. What percentage of the overall 2009 budget was spent on staff training (e.g. computer, language, project management, leadership training etc.)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0- 0.5% <input type="checkbox"/> 0.51-1.0% <input type="checkbox"/> 1.1%-2.0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.1%-3% <input type="checkbox"/> more than 3%</p>	0/0.25/0.5/0.75/1	
<p>c. Considering staff training only (b), what is the total number of training days in 2009 for all IRS staff, divided by the total number of IRS staff?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> less than 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2.5 <input type="checkbox"/> 2.6-4.5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4.6-6.5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6.6-8 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 8</p>	0/0.2/0.4/0.6/0.8/1	
<p>d. Considering staff training only, what is the total number of training days in 2009 for all NRS staff, divided by the total number of NRS staff?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> less than 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2.5 <input type="checkbox"/> 2.6-4.5 <input type="checkbox"/> 4.6-6.5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6.6-8 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 8</p>	0/0.2/0.4/0.6/0.8/1	.

<b>Planning and review of programs</b>		
<p>On average, how many days did an IRS staff spend in 2009 on program planning and review?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0-2.0 <input type="checkbox"/> 2.1-3.0 <input type="checkbox"/> 3.1-4.0 <input type="checkbox"/> 4.1-5.0 <input type="checkbox"/> More than 5</p>	0/0.25/0.50/0.75/1	Continuous adequate internal program planning and review mechanisms as well as external reviews enable a Center to help to monitor program performance, and are the basis for ensuring that learning's are incorporated into program design
<p>b. What is the percentage of your program budget<sup>7</sup> (average for 2007-2009) that has been covered by CCERs completed in 2007-09?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0-30% <input type="checkbox"/> 31 - 50% <input type="checkbox"/> 51-70% <input type="checkbox"/> 71-90% <input type="checkbox"/> 90% +</p>	0/0.25/0.50/0.75/1	CCERs are an internal self-evaluation mechanism critical for future effective program planning, management and results
<b>Data management</b>		
<p><b>Do you systematically preserve research project data (primary and secondary data sets), including documentation on the data and project?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES, we have a comprehensive (meta) database<sup>8</sup> for primary and secondary research data that is fully available for internal use<sup>9</sup></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES, we have some (meta) database, but not all, of the research project data preserved and these are internally available</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NO, we do not have at all a (meta) database preserving research data systematically</p>	1/0.5/0	

<sup>7</sup> Program budget means strictly research budget (i.e. total center budget less budget for corporate services and research support units). The following formula can be used by the centers in computing this indicator: = (Total Budget of Program(s) covered by CCER ÷ Total Program Budget) x 100%

<sup>8</sup> "Comprehensive (meta) database should allow for primary and secondary research data that is fully available for internal use and includes research data generated by the Center or partners undertaking sub-contracted research for research projects managed from headquarters and from Center regional, country and project offices."

<sup>9</sup> Including the infrastructure to electronically store, catalog, retrieve and back-up research data for institutionalized access and disaster recovery.

A composite score on CLC will be generated based on (i) the points received for the individual questions and (ii) a weight for the 6 areas listed as dimensions of a culture of learning and change.

<b>Dimensions of Culture of Learning and Change</b>	<b>Weights</b>
Staff satisfaction.	20%
Leadership Development	10%
Continuous learning opportunities for staff.	50%
Investment into staff development.	
Involvement in planning and review of action plans.	20%
Data Management	