

**CRP Management Team**  
**2nd meeting - 23/04/2012**

Present:

Cary Fowler

Paula Bramel

Jane Toll

Anne Clyne

Charlotte Lusty

Andie Dimitriadou

Stefania Grando (CGIAR Consortium Office) – by telephone

**Agenda:**

1. Issues arising from feedback from Centers on March Minutes
2. Review input from Centers into PMI
3. Review templates for financial and budgeting requirements
4. Finalize deadline dates and process for approval of workplans, reports, agreements, and other activities for the year
5. Process for allocation of funding to capital and non-recurring activities

**Discussion points**

- No news from the Fund Office about the contract yet.
- Implications of the fact that Centers do not consider us a CRP. The only way to get the old proposal through was to name it a CRP. It is a research support CRP. Funders consider it a special type of CRP and therefore we should be able to have our own reporting templates. Gordon will have more clear answers on reporting tomorrow after talking to the Fund Office.
- Report templates: Advantage in possibly using the same template format, otherwise it becomes complicated to integrate the various reports. If there are parts of the templates that do not fit us, there can be flexibility. Some donors wish reporting to include outcome and impact. Current interim templates for reporting on 2012 will be reviewed and approved at the end of the year. The aim is to have the same templates for technical reporting for all Centers in terms of categories. Instead of outputs we call them performance targets, they will look like the performance indicators we used before. Everything will be publicly available on the website. We feel we could fit in the CRP reporting, maybe with a separate column for bilateral funding. If our technical reporting is slightly different it should not be a problem. We should aim to fit with the financial reporting. Tomorrow we will get a reply from the Fund Office on how much flexibility we can have.

**Feedback from Centers on Minutes and PMI**

Responses were received from CIAT, CIMMYT, ICARDA, ILRI, IRRI and Bioversity. Issues raised included accountability for outcomes and use of the information. Regarding outcome, it is already included in the performance indicator tables. We are not looking at details about the efficiency of use – that would be too complicated. We should think about it as an ongoing scoring process rather than an output that finishes at some point. More meaningful indicators for outcome should be investigated later. We need to be transparent and explain to Centers why we need the information and what we do with it. We need to make clear that the system is not perfect but it is dynamic and it will keep developing. Centers said that some issues were covered in GPG2 but we need to explain that we need updated information; it is necessary to show them the connection with the present.

Only minor changes to the questions by Centers. An interesting question is what is meant by 'target'. There is concern about the Centers' accountability for targets. Centers should be accountable for meeting the yearly targets, while the 5-year ones should be more of an aspirational nature. Centers find it difficult to think about targets since their work changes continuously and this has to be taken into consideration. We need to be clearer about what we mean by 'target'.

Suggestion that the Consortium should report to the Treaty Governing Body is considered as reasonable.

During the annual meeting, it should be made clear to the Centers that any issues should be dealt with by the Consortium, not by the Trust. However, it needs to be clear that the Consortium has only limited staff and no policy person.

Some Centers suggest having a stakeholder committee. The MT's view is that any issues should be discussed at the annual meeting and therefore there is no need for a stakeholder committee. A system to link at least the crop CRPs could be considered in the future. Discussion about the role of GENESYS in the system. It will need to fit in but since it is evolving we cannot yet be sure in what ways.

High-level indicators: need separate management and endowment indicators.

Capital funds: view of the Consortium is that they can be carried forward to the next year as long as they remain in the same CRP.

Action: Make minor changes and clarifications in the PMI and send back to Centers.

### **Financial templates**

Issue with depreciation vs. capital. There is no place in the budget for capital – should we consider it the same as depreciation? Gordon will advise accordingly.

Bilateral funding: is a separate column necessary?

Financial reports are due every six months. The first 6-month report will be mostly an interim report, while the second will be the final report on which we will ask questions and review.

Gordon to advise regarding disbursement: since amounts are relatively small, it would make sense to disburse funds every six months instead of every three? This depends on the CRP contracts, Gordon will advise.

### **Deadlines**

Procedure for finalizing contracts: once the Consortium receives the contract from the Fund Office, it will take 4-5 weeks for the final contract to be signed between the Consortium and the lead Center of the CRP. Then the first payment is requested to the Fund Office and the lead Center starts contracts with the other CRP Centers.

The deadline of July 31<sup>st</sup> for submission of the complete baseline and 5-year plans should be moved to June 30<sup>th</sup>.

The April 30<sup>th</sup> deadline for 2011 financial reports should be moved to March 15<sup>th</sup>.

### **Funding for capital and non-recurring activities**

It is agreed that small amounts can be allocated for non-recurring activities as appropriate. For the rest, proposals will be solicited. The Consortium's view is that non-recurring funds can be allocated as long as there is a clear commitment and a clearly defined time span.

The issue of capital funds requires further investigation. It is necessary to distinguish between infrastructure and equipment. Depreciation policies vary from Center to Center and are mostly grey areas. We need to recognize that we cannot start depreciating from zero things that have been depreciated already. Gordon is expected to advise accordingly.

Comments on funding of non-recurring activities:

#### *Collecting and acquisition*

A brainstorming session with Luigi is considered necessary.

#### *Optimizing collections*

Need to identify critical and realistic backlogs. This is not a call for proposals. Need to consider these issues during the annual meeting and proceed accordingly.

#### *Global outreach*

To be considered during the annual meeting and proceed accordingly.

*Genesys*

The Management Team will deal with Genesys and discuss about it during its May meeting. It needs to go forward once the review is done and before the annual meeting.

**Next meeting**

The next meeting of the Management Team will be held on Tuesday 22 May at 10.00.