



Report on an Audit of the Management and Governance of the ICT-KM Program

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Transmittal Memorandum	
Introduction and Overall Conclusion	1 – 6
Detailed Findings and Recommendations.....	7 – 43
Annexes	
I. Risk analysis	
II. Action Plan for recommendations	
111. Terms of Reference	

April 11, 2006

The CIO, ICT - KM Program

Att: Enrica Porcari

Report on a Management Review of the ICT-KM Program

Attached is a report on an internal audit of the management of the ICT-KM program. The audit was conducted in accordance with the Institute of Internal Auditors' *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*.

The objective of the audit was to review the adequacy of the internal control systems operating in the Program to ensure the achievement of its business objectives in the following categories:

- Effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation activities;
- Reliability of the financial reports submitted to donors;
- Compliance with applicable donor requirements;
- Compliance with applicable program policies.

Our review of the Programs Management and Governance processes indicated that the Program faces certain risks that could hamper its effectiveness if not addressed. We have identified the risks in the existing governance and management process and have made recommendations in this report to address them. We have also carried out a risk analysis for the Program (annex 1).

We conclude that the Project's management and governance processes have been able to ensure the Program progresses towards its desired objectives, however at great cost to the current staff involved and it is unlikely the progress can be sustained to ensure the Program achieves all the desired outcomes it hopes to achieve.

We wish to express our sincere appreciation to ICT-KM PROGRAM staff, consultants and collaborators who provided their support and assistance during the audit.

Sincerely,



John Mwangi
Associate Director, CGIAR Internal Audit Unit

Distribution:

E.Porcari, ICT-KM, CIO
F. Reifschneider, Director CGIAR
CGIAR IAU staff

J. Fitzsimon, Director, CGIAR IAU
E. Frison, Director General IPGRI

CGIAR SYSTEMS OFFICE
REPORT ON AN AUDIT OF THE ICT-KM PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

1. During 2006, the ICT-KM CIO requested the CGIAR Internal Auditing Unit to carry out a Management and Governance Review of the ICT-KM Program as part of a broader review that included a Financial Management Review and a Program Review. The review was conducted by John Mwangi, Associate Director, CGIAR IAU, and was conducted during March 2006.

2. The ICT-KM PROGRAM was launched in 2002 with the appointment of the CIO and seeks to demonstrate and stimulate new ways of generating, storing, sharing and using information in CGIAR organizations. It is one of several initiatives intended to help the CGIAR evolve into “one system”: an internationally distributed, efficiently integrated, knowledge sharing system that operates effectively.

3. The ICT-KM Program works through a combination of CIO office efforts and activities, and a portfolio of projects. The office, which comprises a CIO, a Program Manager, a Program Associate and part-time consultants, works with a relatively small annual budget. The Program Manager role has only been filled for part of the life of the Program – the job was filled in the office in Penang in February 2005, but the individual left the Program in February 2006. His role was to support the implementation of the projects and this role has been taken over by a dedicated consultant.

4. To help make the CGIAR “one system” concept a reality, the Program harnesses information technologies and knowledge management practices, and introduces modifications and new approaches aimed at changing long-established organizational practices and related behaviors. In some cases, the Program works to design, implement and report on changes within specific organizational units, individually and within clusters. In other initiatives, it tries to influence changes in practices or relationships across the CGIAR System as a whole.

5. If it is to make significant progress towards this vision, the Program has identified five key outcomes that include:

- Management framework - A management framework must be established to assist the CGIAR in this ICT-KM-focused, capacity-development and change process;
- Connectivity Infrastructure - All CGIAR staff, regardless of their location, should be able to communicate easily and cost effectively and have access to the tools necessary to accomplish their objectives;
- Content Management - All data and information produced or managed by the CGIAR should be safeguarded and made openly accessible into the future;
- Work Culture - The prevailing work culture should be one of collaboration and sharing, both within the CGIAR and with partners; and

- Economies of Scale - Operations within the CGIAR relevant to the Program should be made as cost efficient as possible through collaborative actions.

6. The Management Framework established for the Program is relevant to all of the desired outcomes and is, therefore, essential for the operation of the Program. Since the appointment of the CIO in 2002, the following elements of the Management Framework have been put in place:

- CIO hired (manages Program);
- ICT-KM Sub-Committee of the CDC established (governs Program);
- Advisory Group (AG) established with representatives from a variety of Communities of Practice and functional groups (advises Program);
- ICT-KM Program Three-Year Strategic Plan developed and approved by the CDC;
- 2004 Investment Plan developed and approved by the CDC;
- Fourteen projects developed, funded, resources administered and implementation started;
- Integrated M&E plan at Program and project levels developed and implemented;
- Communications plan implemented (website, 12 monthly e-newsletters, quarterly e-newsletter on website, AGM materials, conference presentations, publications);
- Broad consultation process implemented for informing future activities;
- Program human resources expanded.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

7. Our review of the Programs Management and Governance processes indicated that the Program faces certain risks that could hamper its effectiveness if not addressed. We have identified the risks in the existing governance and Management process and made recommendations to address them.

8. We conclude that the Project's management and governance processes have been able to ensure the Program progresses towards its desired objectives, however at great cost to the current staff involved and it is unlikely the progress can be sustained to ensure the Program achieves all the desired outcomes it hopes to achieve. We have made some recommendations for the future and these include:

- Review the CIO's tasks with a view to ensuring they are realistic and consider the need for additional staff;
- In-depth review of the effectiveness of the AG with a view to reconstituting the group;
- Propose revision of current governance arrangements;
- Program to fund dedicated time for Project leaders to secure dedicated time on projects;
- Enhance project management on large risky projects through use of project steering committees;
- Program to review and refine draft risk analysis and implement the mitigation measures identified.

9. An earlier version of this report was circulated for comment to the CIO. Recommendations made and target dates for their implementation are listed in Annex I - Action Plan.

10. We wish to express our sincere appreciation to the staff, consultants and collaborators in the ICT-KM program who provided support and assistance to the review process.

DETAILED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Clarity of the Programs objectives;

11. The vision of the ICT-KM Program is outlined in the 2004 Investment Plan which states:

*“The **VISION** of this strategy is one of a CGIAR without boundaries, an internationally distributed, unified and open knowledge “organization”. CGIAR staff, regardless of their location, will collaborate in science, using high capacity computing and communication. The global public goods the CGIAR manages will be safeguarded, developed and made accessible for use by all stakeholders.”*

12. The program goals outlined in the Investment Plan indicate that the program aims to assist the CGIAR to:

- Transform the way it works, incorporating new ICT and KM practices to preserve, produce, and improve access to the agricultural global public goods needed by the poor in developing countries
- Be a leading knowledge broker, bringing together all actors in an open, inclusive community for global public goods research for development.

13. In our view, the projects objectives and outputs are clearly defined in the Business Plan. It also seems that they are well understood by the ICT-KM staff and consultants.

Appropriateness of the organizational structure and governance structure of the ICT-KM Program

14. The ICT-KM Program was established as a result of a reform process within the CGIAR aimed at making the system function much more as a unified system than it had been doing in the past. In 2001 the position of CIO was created and the incumbent was responsible for providing vision, strategic planning and coordination of Information Technology (IT), Information Management (IM) and knowledge Management (KM) within the CGIAR system. Specific emphasis was made on the CIO’s role to identify, champion and coordinate areas of collaboration between CGIAR Centre’s and information domains for greater system wide value.

15. In order to ensure support for the CIO in order to achieve the goal, purpose and

outputs of the Program, a Management and Governance structure was defined in the ICT-KM Strategic Plan and subsequently implemented. The Plan indicated that the ICT-KM Program is managed by the CIO, with the active involvement of an Advisory Group (AG) composed of representative communities of practice in the CG system.

16. The CIO's role was defined in the Plan which stated "The CIO is responsible for providing vision, strategic planning, and coordination of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), Information Management (IM) and Knowledge Management (KM) within the CGIAR system". The plan also indicated that the CIO "will identify, champion and coordinate areas of collaboration between and among CGIAR Centre's and information domains for greater system wide value". The CIO is also expected to work at two levels providing both system wide strategic leadership and Centre specific advice and support. The Plan provided for the CIO to report jointly to the Chair of the CGIAR ICT-KM subcommittee of the Centre Directors Committee (CDC) and to the Director of the CGIAR.

17. The CIO Office consists of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) previously based at the Worldfish HQ in Penang Malaysia and now based in Rome since September 2005 and a Program Associate based in Penang. The Program had the services of a fulltime Program Manager from February 2005 to February 2006. The Program draws on consultants for strategic purposes, M&E support and communications writing. One of these consultants covers some of the aforementioned Program Manager's role.

18. The ICT-KM Strategic Plan provided for a Program Advisory Group (AG) whose role was to assist the CIO identify priorities within the CG system regarding ICT and Knowledge Management, to support the preparation of action plans and to champion their implementation. The Plan also defined criteria for the selection of the members of the AG. Together with the CIO, the AG was required to:

- Spearhead the development and implementation of an evolving system wide strategy that harnesses the new potentials of information and communications technologies;
- Coordinate and encourage linkages and learning at system wide level between and among the CGIAR's ICT and KM communities to enable and enhance new ICT and KM possibilities across the system; and
- Coordinate fundraising and allocation of resources to support the implementation of activities identified in the system.

19. In terms of composition, the Strategic Plan indicates that the AG is composed of representatives from several communities of practice (CoP) and management groups within the CG including IT, IM, Marketing, Training Capacity and Strengthening, Scientists, Publishing, DDG's, DG's and the CGIAR system office. The plan provides Terms of Reference (ToR) for the members which require the AG members to:

- Actively participate in activities of the AG (before, during and after sessions);
- Conduct adequate preparatory work, including polling of their constituency, before attending AG sessions;
- Attend AG sessions.
- Champion implementation of identified and agreed upon ICT-KM AG action plans;
- Act as liaison to their Community and not just their Centre;
- Support the CIO in identifying ICT-KM issues of broad concern to the CG system.

CIO tasks too broad to be effectively carried out by one person.

20. The tasks required to be carried out by the CIO as outlined both on a system wide level and at the Centre level are far too broad to expect one person to effectively carry them out. Some of the tasks have been allocated specifically to the CIO while some have been allocated to the CIO and the AG. In the absence of a mechanism to ensure the AG fulfills its role, it is possible that the burden of the joint tasks will be left with the CIO.

Recommendation 1:

We recommend that the tasks are reviewed with a view to providing appropriate assistance to the CIO through a fulltime staff appointment.

Effectiveness of the AG is questionable given its composition and modus operandi

21. The effectiveness of the AG is questionable as an effective support to the Program because, firstly, the Group is made of a diverse range of actors within the various parts of the CGIAR representing management groups and Communities of Practice (COP). Given that the program is supposed to “Assist the CGIAR to transform the way it works”, the current composition of the AG may not be effective given that in reality, the work of the CGIAR is carried out through the 15 autonomous Centres and not through COP’s. The current arrangement may not effectively facilitate the adoption of the changed practices that the program envisages on the ground i.e. in the Centers’.

22. Our review further indicated that the CIO has no mechanism in place to ensure that the group effectively fulfills their responsibilities as outlined in their TOR in order to effectively advance the vision of the Program. Based on our discussions with some of the members of the AG, it appears that the Group does not seem to have a common understanding of what is expected of them. Some members assume that they have a monitoring role over the program and others feel that they serve as a sounding board when required for ideas generated by the CIO.

23. We also noted that the AG does not have provision for regular face to face meetings and they rely on email and telephones for their communications needs. The program does not provide for the funding of dedicated AG meetings and they meet when they piggy back on other scheduled events where most of them will attend. Input from the group is thus often dependent on the motivation of individual AG members and stimuli from the CIO. It is also clear that the Group’s current consultation process has no clear mechanism to ensure that the inputs provided by the group are representative of the views of the AG members CoP. The role of the AG is further complicated by the fact that some members of the group are also Project leaders. This arrangement opens up the possibility of perceived or actual conflict of interest when an implementation role of Project Leader is combined with an Advisory role of AG.

24. The Program is aware of the deficiencies in relation to the AG and has been considering options for changes in relation to the current structure of the AG to ensure successful achievement of the Program objectives. Alongside these considerations, there has

been a parallel initiative within the CGIAR system where the System Office and the Alliance Executive is considering the mandating of specific AG models for each of its constituent Programs. In light of the awareness in the deficiencies in the current model of the AG and the ongoing initiatives, it may still be worthwhile for the Program to initiate an in-depth evaluation of the current model and how best it can be re-engineered to serve the needs of the Program more effectively. This evaluation would take into consideration issues such as appropriate composition, interaction and role in the Program structure.

Recommendation 2:

We recommend that the AG's effectiveness is addressed through an in depth evaluation of its desired role, past practice compared to this role and desired modus operandi in light of the results of the in-depth evaluation.

25. The Program Governance is executed through the CIO reporting to the DG of the host institution and also to the Director of the CGIAR. Previously the Governance role was entrusted to an ICT-KM sub committee of the Centre Directors Committee (CDC) as documented in the original business plan, before this arrangement was discontinued for the present governance arrangement. The present governance arrangement may be convenient but not necessarily more effective than the original arrangement envisaged in the strategic plan. It is our view that the involvement of a Sub-committee of the CDC provides greater participation of the CGIAR leadership in what is undoubtedly a very important Program. The greater visible involvement of the Centre leadership is advantageous to a change program of this nature as the Directors serve as visible change champions for all other individuals in the CGIAR resulting in greater uptake of the changes envisaged by the Program. We were advised that there is currently a Proposal within the Alliance Executive which is reviewing the Governance arrangements for the various system offices and even though this may have specific recommendations for the Program, we would recommend that the Program also carries out its own evaluation of the current arrangement and make proactive recommendations regarding a more suitable arrangement.

Recommendation 3:

We recommend that the Program develop its own recommendations for a Governance structure that will better contribute to its Program objectives in order to influence any ongoing initiatives.

Clarity of staff roles and responsibilities

26. The present staff of the Program includes the CIO based in Rome and the Program Associate based in Penang. The CIO's role is defined in the ICT-KM Strategic Plan and the Program Associate is an employee of Worldfish Centre and thus has a job description provided by her employing Centre.

27. We noted that the CIO's role as outlined in the Strategic Plan indicates that the CIO

works at two levels namely at the system wide strategic leadership level and at the Center level providing specific advice and support. Some of the CIO's responsibilities are also documented as joint responsibilities under the role and responsibilities of the AG. The section on joint responsibilities states that "Together the CIO and the AG provide a strategic, open and transparent mechanism for promoting the implementation of ICT and KM approaches that support the CGIAR as an integrated system. They provide a single, well publicized entry point for submission of ideas. Through the Strategy formulation and implementation process they provide a space for consultation, dialogue and learning. The CIO and the AG are jointly responsible for assisting in the process of raising funds for ICT-KM initiatives. They are also responsible from a corporate perspective for overseeing the implementation of the activities and learning from them".

28. The joint roles and responsibilities noted in the Strategic Plan may not be practically executed as outlined and we noted that these need to be reviewed for practical application given the availability of members of the AG. It is our view that the clarity of roles would be greatly enhanced if they were defined separately for the CIO and for the AG.

Recommendation 4:

We recommend that the initially envisaged individual and joint roles and responsibilities be reviewed in the proposed in-depth evaluation with a view to rationalizing them for greater practical application within the desired objectives of the Program.

Policies and procedures governing the management of operational, financial, and administrative activities of the secretariat

29. During the review we noted that the Program had documented some of the Key policies and procedures which it needs to ensure clarity in the various crucial aspects of its implementation. The documented procedures include "Guidelines for Project Documentation" and "Criteria and ToR for Project selection".

30. The Guidelines for Project Documentation provide a template with guidelines for preparing documentation for projects for consideration of funding by the CDC. The guidelines cover all aspects of the project document including: the background and justification, the identification of objectives, elaboration of the methodology, outcomes, institutional arrangements, and the budget. They are used by the Centre staff who want to submit project proposals. The guidelines ensure uniform proposals are developed and submitted for evaluation in order to facilitate the evaluation process and subsequent award for funding. Our review indicated that the guidelines were clearly articulated and were useful in ensuring detailed proposal were submitted for consideration.

31. The "Criteria and ToR for Project selection" provides the key principles which guide the ICT-KM Program and hence the type of projects it would like to fund. The criteria include: integration, innovation, linkages, learning, appropriateness, sustainability, scalability, technical, accountability, alignment with ICT-KM strategy, expected impact on

the CGIAR system, strategic nature of the project, balance across Centers, fundability and do-ability. The guidelines also outline the expectations the Program requires from the Lead Administrative Centers.

32. The documented procedures reviewed related mainly to the Program's goal of ensuring transparency and quality control in project selection and the subsequent execution of the projects in the Centers. It is our view that this has been effectively carried out in the Program to minimize the risk of Centers feeling there has been bias in awarding of projects and to ensure appropriate projects have been selected in keeping with the Program's vision. The guidelines are also appropriate for informing Centers hosting projects of their roles and responsibilities in project implementation.

Hosting arrangements of the ICT-KM Program with Worldfish

33. Our review noted that there are no specific hosting arrangements defined for the ICT-KM Program by Worldfish. At the time of the review, we noted that the Program does not also have a hosting agreement with IPGRI. However we noted that the ICT-KM Program core budget of approximately US\$ 300,000 has been managed by the Worldfish Finance function. Since January 2006 it has been managed by IPGRI.

34. At the time of the review, IPGRI has not yet signed a formal hosting agreement with the Program and we would recommend that one is drafted and signed to clarify the services to be offered to the Program and accompanying costs to be charged to the Program to minimize the risk of future misunderstanding.

Recommendation 5:

We recommend that the Program sign an official hosting agreement with IPGRI

Program management (including management of 14 ongoing projects)

35. Since March 2004, the Program has initiated 14 projects based in the different Centers. The Program also has 2 projects led by the CIO making a total of 16 projects. In order to manage the projects effectively, the CIO has instituted a project tracking system. The Program had also recruited a fulltime Project Manager who was responsible for tracking and supporting the Project leaders. The incumbent is no longer with the Program and the tracking is being carried out by a Consultant and the Program Associate, with the CIO also having an oversight role.

36. In order to keep track of the projects, the CIO's office maintains Project tracking documentation on excel spreadsheet which is updated on a monthly basis for each Project. The information is gathered through monthly telephone conversations with the Project Leaders. The documentation captures the progress status of each of the projects and identifies any problems that have arisen or may arise and in some cases leading to extensions of the projects.

37. Despite the project tracking system being in place, we noted that the Project implementation may be affected by the fact that the Project leaders are not working full time on the Projects but also have their full time jobs to take care of. This may have hampered the effective implementation of some of the projects. One of the ways to address this in future activities is to ensure that adequate resources are budgeted in projects to finance the time of the Project leaders in their Centres so that they can dedicate sufficient time to the projects. We also propose that for the larger, more risky projects, a dedicated Project Steering Committee is established to mitigate the risk of project failure on large projects.

Recommendation 6:

Recognizing that Project Leaders have their normal duties in their Centres, we recommend that the projects the Program funds budget adequate resources to pay for sufficient dedicated time from the Project leaders.

Recommendation 7:

We recommend that for the larger risky projects, the Program appoints Project Steering Committees to mitigate the risks of project delays and or failure.

Management of donor agreement requirements – Financial and technical monitoring

38. The Project agreements are signed by the hosting Centre DG and the agreement is managed at the hosting Centre. All donor reports are however channeled through the CIO's office which provides the channel for monitoring the progress of the Projects. We did not identify a major risk with the current arrangements

Management of Internal and External Communications

39. Given the global nature of the Program, communication is largely carried out electronically. The Program has deployed several tools for communication, including the Website, the Monthly newsletter, email, telephone, presentations by the CIO and Project Leaders and occasional face to face meetings.

40. The primary stakeholders (close to the Program itself) who need to be communicated to include: the Project Leaders, the AG members, the host institution Director, the CGIAR Director. On a secondary (programmatic) level, the Program needs to communicate with Center staff, DGs, external partners and communities of practice across the CGIAR. Some of the communication with communities of practice is left to the AG members who are representatives of various communities of practice. It is not clear how well the AG members actually communicate with their communities of practice and we noted that there was no clear mechanism to ensure that there was sufficient communication with them.

Recommendation 8:

We recommend that a formal communication strategy is developed with clear definition of stakeholders and plans on how best to communicate to them.

Risk Analysis

41. A risk is defined as “something happening that may have an adverse or advantageous (opportunity) impact on the achievement of the objectives of an organization or Program”. The purpose of the risk management process is to systematically identify, analyse and manage high and significant program risks and opportunities relating to the achievement of the Program’s objectives.

42. Within the context of the ICT-KM Program, we carried out a risk analysis process to identify the risks facing the Program and we analyzed these risks in terms of their impact on the Program and the likelihood of the risks occurring.

43. The details of the analysis are provided in the annex. The risk analysis done is a preliminary analysis based on information and insights availed to us during the course of the review. We suggest that it should serve as a basis for Management, staff and consultants of the Program to carry out an in-depth analysis for the future phases of the Program

Recommendation 9:

We recommend that the CIO and Program staff and consultants review the draft risk analysis and use it in the future implementation of the program.

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
---------------	-------	-----------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------	--	---

Risk analysis annex 1

Management and Governance

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
EFFECTIVENESS RISKS							
Delivery of high quality ICT-KM Projects with clear benefits for the CGIAR system, enhances the Programs reputation and assures continued funding.	Failure of the ICT-KM program to deliver high quality project outputs impairs the programs reputation with consequent damage to future donor support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project support by a dedicated program manager or Consultant Ongoing effective advice from the Advisory Group Design new projects based on learning from M&E	CIO		8	5	<u>In place</u> Dedicated Project support from the CIO Office through a consultant and Program Associate <u>Required</u> -Measures to ensure more effective advice from AG -Steering committee appointed for large high risk projects
The learning from the Program are systematically taken on board and shared with all Centers in the CG for their own adoption.	Failure of the Program to disseminate learning in the project implementation impedes the achievement of the Program Objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program monitoring process through outcomes mapping Stakeholder surveys AG members representing communities of practice 	CIO		8	4	<u>In place</u> Learning workshops Meetings <u>Needed</u> More effective dissemination to communities of practice through more

← - - - - **Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
							effective AG and Program Champions at the Centres.

FINANCE

FINANCIAL INTEGRITY AND COMPLIANCE RISKS							
The ICT-KM program is sustained into the future and does not close down due to lack of funding.	The ICT-KM Program runs out of resources before the projects are completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donor relations with CGIAR to ensure sufficient funds Resource mobilization strategy targeting multiple donors 	CIO		8	4	<u>In place</u> Close relationship with CGIAR <u>Needed</u> Resource mobilization strategy
Financial management of the ICT-KM Program expenditures enhances its financial management reputation	Significant financial failures concerning donor funds provided for ICT-KM activities damages the programs reputation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICT-KM financial management system Project funds managed by Centre finance Units and these are subject to external and internal audit 	Program Administrator	Financial Management review in 2006	9	1	<u>In place</u> Centre's manage Project funding

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
---------------	-------	-----------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------	--	---

Risk analysis – ICT-KM Program

STRATEGY AND RESEARCH

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
EFFECTIVENESS RISKS							
ICT-KM Program strategy provides a compelling story (substantively and in presentation) for investors (donors) and CGIAR Centers and inspires their support of the ICT-KM Program goals and objectives	The ICT-KM Program strategy does not comprehensively address the issues identified in the vision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy Setting • Engaging the “right” project leaders. • Engaging the right Advisory group members • Project selection guidelines 	CIO		10	5	<u>In place</u> Project selection guidelines <u>Needed</u> Advisory Group to be reviewed to ensure greater participation (Recommendation 2)
ICT-KM PROGRAM maintains strategic relevance in the face of external developments e.g. the increasing regional collaboration in SSA through development of regional MTP’s	The ICT-KM Program strategy and research portfolio is not responsive to new issues that emerge due to new knowledge and/or changing external environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy Setting and review • Advisory Group interaction • Governance processes 	CIO		8	4	<u>Needed</u> Restructuring of AG Closer relationship with the DG’s (Recommendation 2 and 3)
ICT-KM Program strategy promotes innovative and quality-driven ICT	The quality of ICT Projects is not adequate to achieve the programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Management • Project leader support from secretariat. • Steering committee for 	CIO		10	6	<u>Needed</u> - Proposed steering committee for large

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
---------------	-------	-----------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------	--	---

projects	strategic goals and objectives	large complicated projects					risky projects (Recommendation 7)
----------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	---

EFFICIENCY RISKS

ICT-KM Program activities take account of and leverage on efforts already undertaken or being implemented by the Centre's	The Program and Projects duplicate existing efforts in the Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project implementation Advisory Group feedback 	CIO AG		6	4	<u>Needed</u> Restructured more effective AG (Recommendation 2)
---	--	---	-----------	--	---	---	--

PEOPLE

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
---------------	-------	-----------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------	--	---

EFFECTIVENESS RISKS

The ICT-KM Program draws on world class expertise and Centre research staff to enable the Program vision	There is a mismatch between the skills required and what is available to undertake ICT-KM projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competitive Project grant process 	CIO		8	2	<u>In Place</u> Centre staff initiate proposals for ICT-KM Projects External Program Review
Centres deliver projects on time and according to the agreed specific outputs.	Projects are delayed or Centres are unable to deliver agreed outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Management at ICT-KM secretariat ICT-KM program secretariat actively backstopping and supporting project 		- Continuous monitoring of project deliverables	8	4	<u>In place</u> Project monitoring by secretariat <u>Needed</u>

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
		leaders					<p>More dedicated project Leaders (Recommendation 6)</p> <p>Steering committee for large risky projects (Recommendation 7)</p> <p>Upfront agreed sanctions for delayed project reporting and deliverables</p>

INTELLECTUAL ASSETS

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
EFFECTIVENESS RISKS							
There is effective use of the project outputs collected in ICT-KM projects	Project learning and outputs is lost or not shared within the CGIAR system	Tools developed by ICT-KM PROGRAM adopted by all CGIAR Centres and communities of practice for the benefit of the entire system.	CIO		9	7	<p><u>In place</u></p> <p>Community of Practice champions</p> <p><u>Needed</u></p> <p>Centre Champions at the Centre level to promote ICT-KM tools and outputs. (Recommendation 2)</p>

Opportunities	Risks	Processes/ Systems	Mgr(s) Resp.	Recent/ planned reviews	Risk impact Rating (1-10)	Risk likelihood Rating (1-10)	Risk mitigation - recent achievements/ plans / further attention required
IP generated by the ICT-KM Program is widely disseminated and used	Centres put restrictions on the use of intellectual property produced with ICT-KM Projects	Contract agreement with Centres (should have an IP clause)	CIO		7	3	<u>Needed</u> IP guidelines to be developed through CAS-IP

LEGAL COMPLIANCE RISKS							
The ICT-KM PROGRAM Secretariat program readily produce complete, accurate and timely project technical and financial reports to fulfill contractual obligations associated with donor financing	Donor confidence is damaged due to late, incomplete or erroneous project reports	Record keeping carried out by Centres and reporting monitored by secretariat.	CIO and Program Assistant	ICT-KM Review in 2006	8	8	<u>Needed</u> Sanctions for Centres' that are late in reporting

No.	Recommendation / action	Responsible Manager / Unit	Management comment	Target date
-----	-------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------	-------------

ANNEX I – Actions Plan

REPORT ON A REVIEW OF THE ICT-KM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE

Annex II: ACTION PLAN

No.	Recommendation/Action	Responsible Manager / Unit	Management comment	Target Date (During 2006)
1	<i>We recommend that the CIO's tasks are reviewed with a view to providing appropriate assistance to the CIO through a fulltime staff appointment.</i>	CIO	Agreed	
2	<i>We recommend that the AG's effectiveness is addressed through an in depth evaluation of its desired role, past practice compared to this role and desired modus operandi in light of the results of the in-depth evaluation.</i>	CIO	Agreed	
3	<i>We recommend that the Program develop its own recommendations for a Governance structure that will better contribute to its Program objectives in order to influence any ongoing initiatives.</i>	CIO	Agreed	
4	<i>We recommend that the initially envisaged individual and joint roles and responsibilities (CIO and Advisory Group) be reviewed in the proposed in-depth evaluation with a view to rationalizing them for greater practical application within the desired objectives of the Program.</i>	CIO	Agreed	
5	<i>We recommend that the Program sign an official hosting agreement with IPGRI</i>		Agreed	

No.	Recommendation / action	Responsible Manager / Unit	Management comment	Target date
-----	-------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------	-------------

ANNEX I – Actions Plan

6	<i>Recognizing that Project Leaders have their normal duties in their Centres, we recommend that the projects the Program funds budget adequate resources to pay for sufficient dedicated time from the Project leaders.</i>	CIO	Agreed	
7	<i>We recommend that for the larger risky projects, the Program appoints Project Steering Committees to mitigate the risks of project delays and or failure.</i>	CIO	Agreed	
8	<i>We recommend that a formal communication strategy is developed with clear definition of stakeholders and plans on how best to communicate to them.</i>	CIO	Agreed	
9	<i>We recommend that the CIO and Program staff and consultants review the draft risk analysis and use it in the future implementation of the program.</i>	CIO	Agreed	

MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF THE ICT-KM PROGRAM

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Introduction

The CGIAR ICT-KM Program seeks to demonstrate and stimulate new ways of generating, storing, sharing and using information in CGIAR organizations. It is one of several initiatives intended to help the CGIAR evolve into “one system”: an internationally distributed, efficiently integrated, knowledge sharing system that operates effectively.

To help make this new CGIAR a reality, the Program harnesses information technologies and knowledge management practices, and introduces modifications and new approaches aimed at changing long-established organizational practices and related behaviors. In some cases, the Program works to design, implement and report on changes within specific organizational units, individually and within clusters. In other initiatives, it tries to influence changes in practices or relationships across the CGIAR System as a whole.

The vision of the ICT-KM Program is outlined in the 2004 Investment Plan which states:

*“The **VISION** of this strategy is one of a CGIAR without boundaries, an internationally distributed, unified and open knowledge “organization”. CGIAR staff, regardless of their location, will collaborate in science, using high capacity computing and communication. The global public goods the CGIAR manages will be safeguarded, developed and made accessible for use by all stakeholders.”*

The ICT-KM Program will assist the CGIAR to:

- *Transform the way it works, incorporating new ICT and KM practices to preserve, produce, and improve access to the agricultural global public goods needed by the poor in developing countries*
- *Be a leading knowledge broker, bringing together all actors in an open, inclusive community for global public goods research for development.*

If it is to make significant progress towards this vision, the Program has identified the following five outcomes:

- Management framework - A management framework must be established to assist the CGIAR in this ICT-KM-focused, capacity-development and change process;
- Connectivity Infrastructure - All CGIAR staff, regardless of their location, should be able to communicate easily and cost effectively and have access to the tools necessary to accomplish their objectives;

Annex III – Audit Terms of Reference

- Content Management - All data and information produced or managed by the CGIAR should be safeguarded and made openly accessible into the future;
- Work Culture - The prevailing work culture should be one of collaboration and sharing, both within the CGIAR and with partners; and
- Economies of Scale - Operations within the CGIAR relevant to the Program should be made as cost efficient as possible through collaborative actions.

Progress on the Management Framework

The Management Framework established for the Program is relevant to all of the desired outcomes and is, therefore, essential for the operation of the Program. Since the appointment of the CIO in 2002, the following elements of the Management Framework have been put in place:

- CIO hired (manages Program);
- ICT-KM Sub-Committee of the CDC established (governs Program);
- Advisory Group (AG) established with representatives from a variety of Communities of Practice and functional groups (advises Program);
- ICT-KM Program Three-Year Strategic Plan developed and approved by the CDC;
- 2004 Investment Plan developed and approved by the CDC;
- Fourteen projects developed, funded, resources administered and implementation started;
- Integrated M&E plan at Program and project levels developed and implemented;
- Communications plan implemented (website, 12 monthly e-newsletters, quarterly e-newsletter on website, AGM materials, conference presentations, publications);
- Broad consultation process implemented for informing future activities;
- Program human resources expanded.

The ICT-KM Program works through a combination of CIO office efforts and activities, and a portfolio of projects. The office, which comprises a CIO, a Program Manager, a Program Associate and part-time consultants, works with a relatively small annual budget. The Program Manager has only recently joined the office in February 2005 and works to support the implementation of the projects.

Review Objective

The objective of the Management Review is to review the adequacy of the management structures, systems and processes operating in the ICT-KM Program to ensure the achievement of its business objectives in relation to effectiveness and efficiency of operations.

Scope of the Audit

The scope of the audit will include:

(a) Control environment

- Clarity of the Programs objectives;

Annex III – Audit Terms of Reference

- Appropriateness of the organizational structure of the ICT-KM Program Secretariat and governance structure;
- Clarity of staff roles and responsibilities;
- Policies and procedures governing the management of operational, financial, and administrative activities of the secretariat office, and reporting arrangements with the WorldFish Finance Department;
- Hosting arrangements of the Program within World Fish;

(b) Risk assessment

- Assessment with the Program CIO the management of current and emerging key risk areas for the Program's activities and the management of these risks.

(c) Control Activities

- Program management (including processes to manage the 14 ongoing projects)
- Management of donor agreement requirements – Financial and technical

(d) Monitoring

- Methods for management monitoring of the Programs technical and financial progress;
- The operations of the governance and oversight role by the ICT-KM Sub-Committee of the board;
- The operations of the Programs Advisory Group.

(e) Information and Communications

- Management of internal communication processes;
- Management of external communication processes;

The review will cover the period from inception to date. We will interview key Program staff and review relevant documentation.

Audit Administration and Reporting Target Dates

John Mwangi (Associate Director CGIAR Internal Audit) will carry out the audit during the week of March 6 2006 from his office base in Nairobi.

Reporting target dates would be as follows:

Report	Date
Draft Report to the CIO Copy furnish:	31 March 2006
ICT-KM staff	
ICT-KM: FY2006-01 April 11, 2006	

Annex III – Audit Terms of Reference

Final Report to the CIO
Copy furnish:
Recipients of Draft Report

14 April 2006