

Answers to questions received during the Tech reporting info sessions on Reporting on Outputs and Reporting on Outcomes

Timeline for reporting:

Q: Does the results submission deadline end in January or in February 2026?

A: The deadline depends on the type of results being reported:

- Pooled results (reported by P/A under W1/W2 funding): must be submitted by end of January 2026. These results undergo a quality assurance (QA) process in February 2026.
- W3/bilateral results: since these do not go through QA, they can be reported in PRMS until late February 2026.

PRMS Governance:

Q: Who is responsible for approving changes to reporting categories and for balancing the benefits of collecting detailed information against the reporting burden on P/A?

A: Ahead of each reporting cycle, CGIAR organizes focus group discussions, workshops, and individual meetings with donors and stakeholders (e.g., Initiative/Program leads/co-leads, MELIA experts, SO MEL, IPSR team, and Center representatives). Through these exchanges, feedback is collected on which reporting fields are valuable to keep, remove, or add, ensuring both alignment with CGIAR's strategy and responsiveness to donor requirements.

This input is then prioritized based on feasibility and strategic relevance, with decisions documented in the annual Learning & Optimization (L&O) report. In practice, adjustments to reporting categories are made through this iterative process of consultation, review, and refinement.

For innovations specifically, the responsibility for defining reporting requirements lies with the IPSR team and the Scaling for Impact (S4I) program. In addition to providing the information needed for CGIAR's core technical reporting products (e.g., P/A Annual Technical Report, Results Dashboard, Portfolio Narrative), PRMS also functions as a system-wide platform for capturing innovation-related metadata that responds to broader institutional needs. This data supports resource mobilization for innovation-focused work, informs S4I activities, and contributes to other cross-cutting initiatives.

During 2025, several dedicated engagements on innovation reporting were convened, including two IPSR feedback sessions on PRMSv2 (April 14 &15) with scaling facilitators and a session with S4I leaders (April 23) culminating in a PPU-led PRMS design workshop in Rome in 28-30 April 2025. Following that workshop, the IPSR/S4I team submitted revised proposals to PPU, which then finalized the current reporting arrangements through the established consultation and review process (Learning & Optimization process).

Q: What role will Science Programs and Accelerators have in the decision making process?

A: A Performance & Results Management (P&RM) Steering Group is currently under development to provide strategic oversight of key, interrelated performance and results management topics. The group will oversee the implementation and optimization of the Performance and Results Management Framework, the Technical Reporting Arrangement, the PRMS system, and the Gates Foundation MELIAF Grant.

It will be chaired by the Chief Scientist and is expected to include representatives (TBC) from Programs/Accelerators, PPU, PCU, Center MELIA focal points, Communications & Advocacy, Business Development, IAES, and the Gates Foundation (for MELIAF-specific topics). The group will meet twice a year, with the first meeting planned for Q4/2025.

Reporting on w3/bilat projects:

Q: Can we report on results from bilateral projects that are not mapped to a P/A?

A: In 2025, reporting of W3/bilateral results should focus on projects mapped to and agreed by the Science Program/Accelerator. Please refer to this [dashboard](#) for the complete list of w3/bilateral projects mapped to and agreed by Programs and Accelerators in 2025.

Q: If a bilateral project is mapped to and was agreed by more than one P/A, how should results be reported to avoid duplication?

A: Results should be reported under the P/A with which the project aligns most closely - that is, where it contributes to the objectives, impact pathway, or thematic scope of the P/A's TOC and research agenda. For any additional P/As to which the W3/bilateral project is mapped, these can be recorded in PRMS as internal collaborators on the result.

Reporting on KP

Q: Can PowerPoint presentations (PPTs) be reported as Knowledge Products (KPs)?

A: PPT presentations can be reported as KPs if they qualify as intellectual assets generated through research and development activities, and if they contribute to behavioral change among specific actors. It is important that these presentations are an integral part of the Science Program/Accelerator Theory of Change (ToC). The quality of such presentations must be reviewed by the Center curators, following the QA processes established by each Center. Additionally, presentations can serve as evidence for other results.

Reporting on CapDev

Q: For PhD reporting can we report on the PhD completion from an Initiative if that Initiative was mapped to the P/A?

A: Yes, PhD training and completion can be reported, provided the PhD is reaching its closure year.

Q: In CapDev, gender is disaggregated as *Female/Male*, while in other results levels it is shown as *Women/Men*. Is this distinction intentional?

A: No, the distinction was not intentional - it was an oversight. We will adjust and ensure consistency by using “men/women.”

Reporting on innovations

Q: Will there be guidance on innovation bundles: how they are created, managed and displayed in the dashboard ?

A: Yes, an innovation-focused session will be held in late October to provide further guidance on reporting innovations across all levels. The session will explain how innovation bundles will work in practice, including the evidence required, how to establish linkages, and how this will be reflected in the Results Dashboard.

The session will also showcase cross-CGIAR projects that already use PRMS innovation data, demonstrating how reporting supports not only technical outputs but also resource mobilization, portfolio analysis, and strategic donor engagement. In addition, the IPSR team is assessing the feasibility of an analysis of innovations submitted by mapped Initiatives to Programs, which could serve as a baseline for each Program and strengthen continuity between Initiative-level and Program-level reporting.

Q: Doesn't reporting only the highest score remove the value of tracking innovation maturity at a localized level, since lower scores would be hidden?

A: The key point to note is that at the innovation development (output) level, the readiness score reflects the highest maturity reached anywhere the innovation is being developed. For example, if an innovation is at level 4 in Zambia, level 5 in Colombia, and level 8 in Kenya, the innovation development record will retain the score of 8, because it has already been proven to reach that level of maturity in at least one location.

This does mean that country-specific variation is not visible at the development stage. However, that detail is not the purpose of innovation development reporting. Localized readiness and use are tracked at the **innovation use (outcome) level**, which is always context-specific and records the readiness and uptake of the innovation under enabling conditions in a given geography.

In practice, this approach simplifies reporting at the development stage—saving time and effort—while still ensuring that the relevant, context-specific information is captured where it matters most: at the innovation use and outcome level.

Q: Will we be asked to update all previously reported innovations? How will this work - will those innovations be mapped to the new Programs/Accelerators?

A: All innovations reported in 2024 will need to be updated. Updates will follow the mapping of Initiatives to Programs/Accelerators (P/As). For example, if Initiative X submitted an innovation in 2024 and that Initiative has since been mapped to Program Y, then Program Y will be responsible for updating that innovation.

If an Initiative has been mapped to multiple Programs, all mapped Programs will have visibility, but the designated lead Program will be responsible for ensuring the update. Notifications will be sent through PRMS to the Leads, Co-Leads, and Coordinators of each relevant Program.

Any innovations not updated by the deadline (to be communicated during the reporting cycle) will be **marked as inactive** after the reporting period.

Q: Do we have templates (editable) for the innovation profile briefs?

A: The update of templates for innovation development results is ongoing, and the revised versions will be available on the CGIAR P&R hub ahead of the October innovation-focused session.

Q: How to calculate/estimate and project innovation use numbers for 2030?

A: This [guidance note](#) outlines a practical process for estimating or projecting innovation use figures by 2030. It helps teams develop evidence-based, realistic, and traceable projections for both individual and organizational users.

PRMS access

Q: When will our role in PRMS change? When I log in, it shows my role in the Initiative?

A: You will be able to see your new role assigned to the specific Program/Accelerator once the 2025 reporting phase opens in PRMS.