

AGR/TAC:IAR/88/26

TAC Working Document
(not for public citation)

THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Forty-Seventh Meeting, Washington, D.C., 25-29 October 1988

THIRD EXTERNAL PROGRAMME REVIEW OF CIP

PROGRESS REPORT

(Agenda Item 5(b))

Objectives of the Discussion

At TAC 46 the Committee confirmed its decision to undertake the CIP External Programme Review in April-May 1989. It then gave guidance to the Secretariat for further development of the programme.

The Committee is invited to approve the general outline of the programme, the timing, and the panel composition, and to review the list of specific questions relating to the Centre.

TAC SECRETARIAT

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

September 1988

THIRD EXTERNAL PROGRAMME REVIEW OF CIP

Progress Report

Background

At TAC 45 in March 1988, TAC approved a schedule of external reviews which indicated that the Third External Programme Review of CIP should be undertaken in the spring of 1989. This proposal was communicated to Dr. Richard Sawyer, CIP Director General, who signified his agreement, and provided the Secretariat with suggestions for panel chairman and members.

Panel Composition

At TAC 46, the Committee also considered candidates for panel chairman and the profile of a five-member panel. It short-listed the candidates for panel chairman and although it also considered panel membership, decided that the number of candidates should be expanded. The Committee therefore agreed that the Secretariat, in consultation with the chairman of the Standing Committee for Reviews, should recommend to the TAC Chairman additional names for the panel slots. Subsequently, Dr. William Tossell, Canada, agreed to chair the panel. Panel members were still under recruitment at the time of writing and the list will be tabled at TAC 47.

Terms of Reference

TAC agreed that the Interim Terms of Reference would be used for the CIP EPR. The Interim Terms of Reference and a preliminary list of questions, compiled by the Secretariat, are attached as Annexes I and II.

Timing

In consultation with Dr. Sawyer, it was agreed that the main phase would take place over a 20-day period between 17 April and 12 May 1989, at Lima, Peru.

Programme

(a) Preparatory Activities. TAC accepted Dr. Sawyer's invitation to have the panel chairman and panel members attend CIP's Annual Review on 5-9 December 1988.

(b) Country Visits. TAC agreed that country visits would be included in the panel's programme and undertaken by the panel chairman, all or part of the panelists. CIP has proposed visits to Chile and Colombia (to take place following the Annual Review), and to the

Philippines, Indonesia, Egypt, Kenya, Burundi and Rwanda, and possibly India in January or February 1989.

(c) Other Visits. Consideration could also be given to visits/discussions with AVRDC and IITA on their respective agreements with CIP on sweet potato. In addition, consideration could also be given to contacting other CGIAR Centres where CIP has placed its regional teams.

INTERIM TERMS OF REFERENCE
FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEWS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) has charged its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to conduct External Program Reviews (EPRs) of the CGIAR-supported International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs) 1/ to determine their efficiency and effectiveness in reaching the CGIAR goal:

"Through international agricultural research and related activities, to contribute to increasing sustainable food production in developing countries in such a way that the nutritional level and general economic well-being of low income people are improved."

The Objectives of EPRs are:

1. - to evaluate for the CGIAR the program of the Center, in particular with respect to:
 - (a) the current and future relevance to the CGIAR goal of the Center's mandated activities;
 - (b) the appropriateness for support by the CGIAR of the Center's research and other activities, and the amount and scope of the Center's efforts devoted to them;
 - (c) the past achievements of the Center and the probable dimensions of the return to further efforts in research and related activities or, where appropriate, the introduction of new activities;
2. - to assess for the CGIAR, in the context of its goal:
 - (a) the appropriateness and effectiveness of the Center's policy and strategy for the development of its program;
 - (b) the standing in the world of the Center's program and staff in research, training, and related activities, and its relationships with other IARCs, national and international organizations, and private interests concerned with the research;

1/ "Center" for the purpose of this document comprises the Board, the Director and staff of all CGIAR institutions, whether designated as Association, Board, Center, Institute, Laboratory or Service.

- (c) the priorities for research, training and related activities of the Center and the means to address them;
- (d) the progress of the Center's efforts to assist appropriate institutions in developing countries to assume responsibility for location-specific research, training, and related activities, including networks or wider research where feasible;

3. - in light of 1 and 2 above, to review and comment on the effectiveness of the Center's provisions for:

- (a) developing and updating its objectives and the strategies to reach them (operational mandate, long-term plan, medium-term projections);
- (b) measuring results and impact of past efforts and, as a consequence, adjusting priorities by dropping, adding or modifying activities as required;
- (c) ensuring appropriate allocation of resources to: research programs; training; assistance to NARS; networks; genetic resources conservation, if appropriate; data processing and other forms of research support; information and documentation; etc.;
- (d) ensuring staff competence and quality;
- (e) ensuring operational efficiency and effectiveness;

4. - to advise the CGIAR on:

- (a) the Center's actions on the recommendations of the previous review as approved by the Group;
- (b) constraints to achievement of stated objectives at the Center, program, and activity levels, and means to overcome them;
- (c) the need for any monitoring, interim, or supplementary review, and on the objectives, dates and schedule of such review;
- (d) specific questions or issues raised by TAC, CGIAR Members, the Center, and others, as assembled and appended to this document.

THIRD EXTERNAL PROGRAMME REVIEW OF CIP

PRELIMINARY LIST OF SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Strategies for the Future

1. What role have interested and collaborating national programmes had in the preparation of CIP's strategy? What are their opinions on the future planned by CIP?
2. Recently CIP activated the option in its mandate to work on other roots and tubers and initiated research on sweet potato. How should this work develop in the future in relation to the work on potato? Should CIP consider adding additional tuberous crops to its research portfolio?
3. Is CIP giving sufficient consideration within its research programme and priorities to (a) the role of women in the agriculture; and (b) ensuring that the technologies it is developing benefit women? How are these considerations affecting CIP's research activities?
4. How has CIP responded to the CGIAR concern for sustainable production in its research and training programmes? How does CIP ensure that the specific systems it is promoting and the technologies it is developing are ecologically and economically sustainable?
5. What mileposts has CIP established to measure progress towards its goals for potato and sweet potato? How does CIP measure the impact of its research and training programmes?

Research

6. Does CIP have the appropriate mix of specialized disciplinary staff (e.g. physical, biological and social sciences) at headquarters to conduct/support the research that is being proposed for its future programme? Is the balance between the headquarters and outposted staff appropriate for the projected research and related activities?
7. Is there scope for better characterization of the different agro-ecological zones/production environments for potatoes and sweet potatoes? To what extent can San Ramon, Huancayo and Yurimaguas, substitute for the varied environments in which potatoes and sweet potatoes are grown?
8. What is the nature and magnitude of strategic research (including biotechnology), undertaken at CIP or through contract? What is the pay-off from contracted research? What are the plans for undertaking strategic research in the future? Are these plans appropriate in light of the needs of CIP's collaborating national partners and for the overall balance of CIP's programme?

9. What research does CIP undertake to prevent post-harvest losses? What progress has been made in the spread of low-light intensity rustic storage facilities? What research does CIP have on food quality and on processing of potatoes and sweet potatoes into convenience foods?

Genetic Resources

10. To what extent is CIP making use of wild potato and sweet potato germplasm in its breeding programmes? What particular problems are being encountered in the use of wild germplasm? What particular successes has been achieved through its use?

11. What is CIP's approach to long-term conservation of potato and sweet potato germplasm? What problems have to be faced with respect to in vitro storage? How is the collection replicated and what evidence does CIP have that the replications are properly cared for?

12. What progress has been made with the preparation of the monographs on potato species recommended by the last external review?

Relationships with National Programmes

13. What are CIP's relationships with the Government of Peru? What constraints, if any, impede seriously the work of the Centre in its host country? What types of collaborative or other research linkages exist between CIP and the national agricultural research and educational institutions in Peru? What has been the impact of these linkages in terms of Peruvian research and training capability?

14. How effective is the influence of national programme leaders on CIP's programme development? To what degree do CIP's programmes (a) duplicate, (b) complement and support, those of the national systems? How does CIP address the needs of national programmes given the variation in capability of the national systems? How does CIP deal with the different languages of national programmes? To what extent is CIP sharing its international responsibilities with national programmes?

Training

15. CIP is currently concentrating on short-term intensive training in specialized fields and does not offer longer-term production courses; even the short-term production courses are now conducted by the national systems. Is CIP making the best use of its training funds? Should CIP be offering advanced degree training? What arrangements should be made to accommodate requests for students to undertake thesis preparation at CIP?

Quarantine

16. In the second External Programme Review of CIP, the panel commended CIP on its phytosanitary standards but indicated that less time-consuming methods and better facilities were needed. What progress has CIP made in streamlining its phytosanitary methods for potatoes? What changes are needed for sweet potato?

Size of CIP

17. Since 1980, CIP has foreseen a gradual reduction in its potato research from the early 1990s as the capacity of national programmes increased. Now that research on sweet potato has been initiated, CIP has proposed that total resources should increase by 15% over the next five years, and that of this, potato research should receive 60% and sweet potato 40%. What is the panel's opinion of this proposal and the likely effect on the essential potato research that is in CIP's comparative advantage to undertake?

18. Given the size of CIP and the level of achievement of national programmes in potato research, how are proposed changes in the research programme related to the total size of the Centre, and to activities undertaken by the information, and training programmes?

19. Should the level of resources remain static over the next five years, what priority would the panel assign to the different elements of CIP's programme? How should the proportion of effort devoted to potato change vis-a-vis sweet potato under a no-growth scenario?

Relationships with other research institutions

20. CIP spends 50% of its core support outside headquarters, either in the regions or on contracted research in developed or developing countries. What is the panel's opinion of this strategy and its pay-off? Is the balance between essential headquarters research, that undertaken on contract by various institutions around the world, and the research undertaken by outposted staff in the field adequate?

21. What are the agreements between CIP and AVRDC, and CIP and IITA, with respect to research on sweet potato? How are these agreements being implemented?

22. What cooperative research does CIP undertake with other CGIAR and non-CGIAR Centres? What support, reciprocal or otherwise, do other international Centres provide for CIP research teams? Are the arrangements satisfactory to all concerned?

23. How does CIP cooperate with other Centres with respect to cropping systems especially as potato is generally only one of a number of crops grown by farmers? What arrangements are made for testing the different cultivars in association with other crops?

True Potato Seed

24. What advances has CIP made with respect to True Potato Seed (TPS) technology? To what extent has the technology spread in national systems since it was first introduced? What proportion of seed tubers is TPS replacing? What in the panel's opinion is its future in developing countries?