

PMS 2008 (2007 data)
SC Scoring of Outcomes

Purpose	Criterion	Basis of scoring	Score
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
	2. Has an outcome from the same output/output target been reported in an earlier year?	Centers are discouraged to report adoption/use of a research and capacity strengthening results in a piecemeal fashion (as occurring in a few countries or among a few different farmer groups at a time). Additional outcome study from a major output from which outcome has already earlier been reported is accepted particularly when the recommendation domain is very large or when the adoption and use occurs sequentially among different kinds of user groups.	0/0.5
Documenting outcomes	3. Is the realized output/output target clearly described and verified?	yes/no	0/0.5
	4. Is the outcome description specific on how the output was used to derive the outcome?	yes/no	0/1
	5. Is there clear evidence of the outcome?	yes/no	0/1
	6. Is the linkage from the Center output/output target explicitly documented in the outcome evidence?	yes/no	0/1
Significance of outcome	7. Does the outcome show significant, documented and verifiable adoption/use/influence in the main recommendation domain?	Peer assessment taking into consideration factors such as: reach of intended users; 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.	0-2
	8. 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)	1-9

The Center can gain max. 9 points from its 5 outcome cases as an average of individual case scores. In addition, the SC will credit max. 1 point for a set of cases that represent reasonable coverage of the Centers research and capacity building activities using in its judgment considerations such as: # of MTP Projects and coverage of research budget of the Projects where outcomes have been documented, coverage of research themes relevant for the Center, comparison with previous outcome submissions. The intention of the additional premium point is to encourage Centers to document over time outcomes across their research agenda.