Consortium

**CRP Annual Reports 2014 General Comments**

**Consortium Office**

The overall quality of the Annual Reports (ARs) 2014 has improved when compared with previous years. From a total of 13 ARs 2014 received by the Consortium Office, the quality was judged as Good (4 reports) to Very Good (5 reports) and Excellent (4 reports), and mostly written according to the Guidelines. Nevertheless, different interpretations of the Guidelines led to the following list of suggestions to improve and harmonize the reports for clarity and readability, as well as for monitoring and evaluation. It is likely that not all of the comments will be relevant to a particular CRP, but it is suggested that all CRP Directors go through the list and determine which recommendations apply to their individual AR 2014 and whether such comment(s) should be incorporated in to the revised version of their report.

**General Comments on Structure and Format**

1. Provide the logos or list of CRP, participating Centers and other key partners on the cover page.
2. Please add an acronym list at the beginning of the document, i.e. before the main text of the report.
3. Provide links to the relevant Center Performance Summaries.
4. Please include updated comments on database management and open access conditions, including information on compliance with relevant data protection and ethics guidelines/regulations.

**Section A**

5. There is need to credit contribution of all the partners involved in selected key achievements. This also applies to Section C on progress towards outputs (Section C1), outcomes (Section C2) and impact (Section C3).

**Section B: Impact Pathway and IDOs**

6. Since they are living documents, ToCs should be reviewed annually and understood as dynamic tools in the light of research results, changes in the operational environment, etc.

**Section C: Progress along the Impact Pathway**

7. There is a general need to clarify what research question(s) is being addressed (and the resultant outputs) to achieve an outcome, and what mechanisms or drivers influence its adoption.
8. Please distinguish between the 2014 outputs/outcomes from those attributable to previous years' as accumulative results. The latter, if present, can be reported when showing overall adoption in the scale up process.
9. Identify research questions at different scales (local, national, regional, global) to inform discussion on scaling up/down results: linking local demand with the right scientific questions, getting answers at different scales and validating them against the questions.

**Annex 1**

10. In talking about impact on policies, identify local regulations and policies that are drafted and implemented as a consequence of a CRP's activities (citing the actual policies or drafts, not just number and country, in the third column of Table 1), supported with tangible and verifiable evidence, e.g. the scientific basis/drivers to policy changes.

11. Present a summary on the CRP research staff (numbers, grades and gender) involved. See table template from FTA AR 2014.

| | Female | Male | TOTAL | F/M |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Director/Team Leader | | | | |
| Principal Investigator/Senior Scientist | | | | |
| Scientist | | | | |
| Post-doc / Research fellows | | | | |
| Other scientific and support staff | | | | |
| TOTAL CRP | | | | |

12. It is necessary to provide a link to the complete list of papers published in 2014 that involve the CRP research activities (e.g. CIMMYT and/or IITA scientists working on MAIZE or WHEAT). Funding acknowledgement (W1, W2, W3 and bilateral) is expected in all publications, which would aid in mapping the publications to CRPs' contribution. Also, a classification based on ISI impact index would provide information on science quality and content rather than the provided alphabetical lists.

**Section F: Capacity Building**

13. Include the number of people involved in capacity building or training activities, classifying by CGIAR/non-CGIAR, PhD/MSc/NARS, local/International, continent/country of origin, gender, etc. This also applies to all organized Workshops. And for workshops, please also define the activities' contribution to capacity building in the Capacity Building section.

**Section E: Partnerships Building Achievements**

14. Describe the ongoing collaborations with ALL the other CRPs in terms of goals and expected joint outputs. A clear table indicating the cross-CRPs collaborations with the corresponding "give & take" explanations by FP would greatly enhance the discussion.

**Section G: Risk Management**

15. The risk management section is meant to identify potential risks limiting the CRP capacity to deliver expected outputs and outcomes and to propose the corresponding constructive contingency plans to mitigate such risks, not just for highlighting the likely impact of budget cuts and requesting additional funds as the "obvious", or only, mitigation strategy. Other alternatives like maximizing the use of novel technologies or sharing costs among different CRPs or new partnering should also be considered as described by some forward looking CRPs.

**Annex I: CRP indicators of progress, with glossary and targets**

16. Please double check the consistency between the text in the report and the Table provided in Annex 1, often the numbers don't match. Furthermore, the Glossary has to be tailored for each CRP with the relevant examples for each indicator; it doesn't help the reader to see the left over recommendations from the Guidelines in the CRP Report. Analogously, when showing figures or estimates please append to the report/section/table the methodology used to establish them and the rationale behind their inclusion.