

**Notes by the TAC and CGIAR
Secretariats
on the draft medium-term proposals of
CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICRISAT, IIMI
IITA AND ISNAR**

October 1992

CIAT

1. General

CIAT's draft medium-term plan reflects the implementation of the strategic plan discussed by TAC and endorsed by the Group during 1991. It entirely reflects TAC's recommendations on CGIAR priorities and strategies. CIAT has made a substantial effort to reconcile its proposals with TAC's concepts on activities, regions and agro-ecological zones. CIAT's proposals reflect the incorporation, in a comprehensive way, of resource management issues into the Centre's activities.

The major issue in considering CIAT's proposals is whether the Centre will have critical mass to undertake a total of seven major programmes. The core resources necessary to undertake these programmes are 18% above the base envelope assigned by TAC. CIAT is building its resource management programme by scaling down its commodity activities, particularly in its beans and tropical pastures programmes.

CIAT states that unless it receives funding of at least the level of the envelope +10%, it will not be able to implement the proposed resource management programme. The Centre indicates that, if funding were to be below this critical level, it would have to revise its strategic plan, revisit with national programme partners, reassign priorities, and substantially alter its medium-term proposals.

CIAT's base envelope of US\$27.5 million represents an increase of 4% over the 1992 funding level.

2. Programme Issues

- a) CIAT's statement that it will not be able to sustain its resource management programmes unless the Centre is assured of funding at the top of the bracket, stresses the issue of to what extent these

resource management programmes are self-contained. What is CIAT's strategy to integrate commodity research with resource management research?

- b) Resource management research is to be funded largely through complementary resources. This is in contradiction to CIAT's definition of core resources that "are considered to constitute the minimal resources necessary to achieve the stated objectives".
- c) The proposed programmes in resource management are conceptually sound but much more work and thought is needed on how they can be operationalized.
- d) If CIAT cannot implement its seven programmes simultaneously, is there an option for implementation at different speeds if resources were to be limited.
- e) What is the evidence of adoption of forage germplasm by smallholder farmers? Is there sufficient justification to continue the forage germplasm programme at this scale? Would there be a justification to address livestock issues in a broader way?
- f) Should research on cassava explore its potential for animal feed?
- g) How will CIAT explore with sister institutes the potential of other crops in the production systems under study? How will it implement an ecoregional mandate?
- h) Only 15% of CIAT's resources are allocated to category 3, and 25% to category 1. Is there a major overlap in the activities of both these categories?
- i) Would there be a role for CIAT as a Global Centre for Roots and Tubers Research?

- j) CIAT has been generally complimented for integrating its economics work in commodity programmes. To what extent will this positive synergism be affected by the proposed reallocation of social scientists across the Centre?

3. Financial Issues

- a) **Inflation:** In the short term CIAT projects inflationary cost increases at twice the system level. Since donors agencies provide resources only reflecting their own inflation, higher costs of doing business can be covered either by reallocation from other centres or by slowing down CIAT's own expenditures. The latter implies that CIAT's implementation of its MTP will be delayed. In any event, since about 60% of CIAT's total spending is in the currency of its host country, any further adverse changes in local inflation/exchange rates will have significant impact on CIAT's flexibility.
- b) **Spending patterns:** CIAT's personnel spending in 1992 occupies 62% of the total thereby limiting operating spending. CIAT plans to reduce this ratio to about 60% by the end of the planning period. This pace is reasonable, however, since typically, personnel spending represents longer-term commitments, CIAT remains exposed to the risk of budgetary inflexibility in case of future budgetary shortfalls.
- c) **Capital:** CIAT's capital spending plans for renewing its current capital stock (US\$20 million) are in line with its depreciation allocation. Only modest amounts of new capital spending (US\$300,000/year) is proposed.
- d) **Staffing:** CIAT's total staffing is expected to remain at about the 1992 level of [1,400] staff. International core positions are planned in the range of [70-90] corresponding to the different financial assumptions. About 85% of these positions are allocated

to research programmes. On the average each international position is backstopped by four supervisory staff members and 14 support staff members. For each international research position the numbers are three and ten respectively.

- e) **Total unit operating costs:** CIAT's total operating costs can be expressed in terms of total international positions at about US\$385,000 in 1992 dollars. About US\$230,000 are budgeted for personnel costs of which those associated with an international position amount to about US\$100,000.
- f) **Administrative costs:** As defined by CIAT, administrative costs amount to 26% of the total. About a quarter is allocated for capital renewal (depreciation) while the remainder represents on-going costs of physical plant operations, administrative support and senior management and the board. CIAT's crude "overhead ratio" (administrative costs in terms of research and training) is about 35%.
- g) **Working capital:** CIAT will begin 1993 with total reserves of about US\$3.5 million, most of which represents future staff liabilities. In relation to planned operating spending of about US\$30 million, this represents a reasonable level of about 42 days of cash requirements.
- h) **Funding flexibility:** After an extended period of strong donor support (as evidenced by low rates of balancing funding) CIAT is increasingly relying on balancing funding to meet its approved budget. (1992 ratio estimated at about 20%.) Restricted funding amounts to about 15% of core funding.
- i) **Complementary programme:** CIAT plans a complementary programme which will involve 20-25 senior positions and amount to about US\$9 million actually, on the average, through the planning

period. This represents about 20-25% of CIAT's planned activities.

CIMMYT

1. General

The CIMMYT MTP proposals have built on the Centre's previous Five Year Budget 1990-94 and assumes continued relevance of its 1989 strategic plan: "Toward the 21st Century: CIMMYT's Strategy". The proposals have also taken into account recent changes in the CGIAR particularly the expansion of the System; its broadened mandate; resource constraints; and the 1992 revision of CGIAR priorities and strategies.

The Centre argues for a resource base 3% larger in 1998 than its 1992 budget level of \$25.6 million and considers the TAC 1998 indicative resource envelope of \$24.1 to be below the minimum critical mass for CIMMYT's viability as a global centre for maize and wheat improvement. CIMMYT claims that the 1993 estimated funding level represents a 20% reduction in Senior Staff Year (SSY) relative to 1990 and 25% down on the projected 1994 staffing based on the 1989 MTP. The Centre has had to cut down its programme staff from 93.2 SSY in 1990 to an estimated 74.3 SSY in 1993.

These reductions have apparently forced CIMMYT to reduce its activities in crop management research and related training; eliminate training in experiment station management; discontinue work on quality maize protein; close two regional offices, one each for wheat and maize; and reduce research support across all programmes. CIMMYT's Board and management consider that any further reductions in the level of support would seriously curtail programme activities, and make it difficult for the Centre to maintain its current effort to expand into research on natural resources management. Consequently, CIMMYT proposes to start its MTP in 1994 with a minimum of 75.7 SSY -- 1.4 SSY above the estimated 1993 level.

2. Programme Issues

- a) Why is CIMMYT still using the term "Essential" to describe core activities?

- b) According to TAC's Medium and Long Term Visions of the CGIAR, CIMMYT fulfils the criteria for a global commodity Centre. This would imply that CIMMYT's principal role in the long term should be conservation, management and evaluation of maize and wheat genetic resources and germplasm enhancement. However, CIMMYT plans to have significant involvement in activity categories 1.1., 3 and 5 in addition to 1.2 and 2. Is this a proper trend for CIMMYT?
- c) CIMMYT plans to increase its activities in category 1 from 12.4% of the core resources in 1992 to 20% of core resources in 1998 with ecosystem conservation and management accounting for approximately 79% of the resources allocated to category 1. Should CIMMYT play a dual role as a global commodity centre and a global centre for strategic research in natural resources management, physiology and CMR related to wheat and maize?
- d) Socio-economics has been one of the three major programmes of CIMMYT for many years. By 1998 according to the new MTP proposal this activity category will require only 1.6% of CIMMYT's core resources. By contrast research in the proposed Natural Resources Unit would require 10 times more core resources than the socio-economics programme. Why is economics being retained as a separate programme?

The discrepancy between the text (page 22) and Tables 1 (i), 2 (i) relating to the number of SSY in the economics programme may explain the apparent shift of resources away from economics programme. The text and Table 1 (i) show 5.3 SSY for the economics while Table 2(i) shows 1.5 SSY for socio-economics (Activity 4.1). Where are the other 3.8 SSY?

- e) In the maize programme more than two thirds of the programme's SSY (15.4) will be allocated to germplasm enhancement and breeding by 1998 (Activity 2) with the rest spread thinly between activity

categories 1, 3 and 5. Table 2(i) shows 1.3 SSY for crop physiology research while the text (page 17) shows 1.5 SSY. Which figure is the right one?

- f) How is the cooperation between CIMMYT and CIAT in the hill side region of Central America on maize production systems expected to function? Is there a joint programme?
- g) In the wheat programme about 50% of its core research resources are allocated for maintenance research. What is the implication of this with respect to critical mass for new and innovative research in the wheat programme?
- h) The current collaboration between IRRI and CIMMYT on wheat/rice rotations research in Asia is welcome and strongly supported. However, what is the rationale for not involving IIMI in this undertaking?
- i) Institution building activities at CIMMYT at the end of the MTP period will still account for 21% of total CIMMYT resources down from an estimated 24% in 1992. This appears to be a proper trend given the System-wide target of 20% by the year 2010.
- j) Research on maize based farming systems in the hillside region of Central America is considered to be a core activity while maize production in the highlands of Eastern and Southern Africa is classified as a complementary activity (Page 9). Using CIMMYT's definition of core and complementary activities, it is not clear why the Central America hillside region and the highlands of Eastern and Southern Africa are treated differently (Page 9).
- k) It is noted on page 8 that CIMMYT wishes to be involved in two ecoregions. How does the mega environmental concept adopted by CIMMYT relate to ecoregional approach advocated by TAC?

- l) CIMMYT does not mention IITA among its collaborators on maize in SSA.
- m) CIMMYT should be requested to elaborate further on its proposals using the tentative resource envelope of \$24.1 million. It states that this would imply a 7% smaller budget for CIMMYT in 1998. The budget should actually be 8.9% smaller since its base envelope is about 5.9% smaller than the estimated 1992 budget of \$26.5 million.
- n) CIMMYT has put an upper limit of 20% of total core resources for its complementary programme. What is the logic for this?

CIP

1. General

Overall, the medium-term proposals reflect the implementation of CIP's strategic plan and of the recommendations of the third external review. The only major deviation appears to be CIP's proposed involvement in the Andean Ecoregion (now defined as covering the wider area of the cool tropics). As with some of the other commodity centres, TAC will have to clarify how to reconcile an ecoregional and a global role for CIP.

A major issue is also CIP's re-estimate of its resource envelope. Whereas TAC had assigned a base envelope for 1998 of US\$14.3 million, CIP claims that due to higher funding levels during 1992, its envelope in 1994 should amount to US\$15.75 million (CIP estimate of the base +10%) increasing to US\$17.6 million by 1998 (CIP estimate of the base +20%), not including depreciation.

Finally, CIP's future will largely depend on the evolution of the internal environment in the host country.

2. Programme Issues

- a) The proposed programme on the Andean Ecoregion requires careful consideration. CIP's original draft proposal was for the high Andes (as still illustrated in Figure 2.2), but it now seems to cover the whole area of the cool tropics. Is there sufficient justification for a CGIAR initiative; what is the meaning of CIP's "catalytic" role; and what exactly does this "ecoregional role" mean? Would this ecoregional programme not be better classified as "complementary"? To date, CIP's work on Andean root and tuber crops has been funded through special projects.
- b) CIP's involvement in research on natural resources amounts to only 3% of its core activities, and even shows a declining trend during

the next five years. How can this be reconciled with its ecoregional focus?

- c) CIP does not explain how it has defined core and complementary activities. It simply refers to the Guidelines issued by the CGIAR Secretariat.
- d) What is CIP's focus in sweet potato research? The future in many countries appears to be its potential for animal feed. What is the implication for CIP?
- e) The proposed allocation of 60/40 between potato sweet potato by 1998 should have been reached by 1992 according to the previous medium-term plan. Moreover, according to CIP's priority analysis this ratio should be more like 50/50? What is CIP's rationale to keep the balance at 60/40?
- f) The estimate of distribution by activity shows that CIP intends to allocate 40% of its resources to germplasm enhancement and breeding and only 3% to natural resources management and conservation research. Is this realistic?
- g) How will resource management issues be integrated in commodity research?
- h) Rationale for complementary programmes is unclear.
- i) About 22% of staff are classified as crop physiologists. During the next five years the number of staff working on post-harvest issues will double. Are these allocations justified?
- j) Outcome of priority exercise as in Annex I is reported cryptically. More results, as well as rationale as to deviations between plan and exercise, if any, would be useful.

- k) CIP could be more explicit about its possible role as a global institute for research on roots and tubers.

3. Financial Issues

- a) How will CIP adjust to a "realistic" resource envelope?
- b) Depreciation should be incorporated in operating funds.
- c) Complementary funding unclear and confused with special projects.
- d) CIP has already assumed that TAC will agree to the US\$2.0 million cost recovery.

ICRISAT

1. General

ICRISAT's draft medium-term plan reflects the implementation of its strategic plan, the results of a recent major priority-setting exercise, and the recommendations of the Centre's third external review. ICRISAT's proposals are made in line with TAC's recommendations on CGIAR priorities and strategies, although the Centre challenges TAC's argument that the allocation of resources to pigeon pea research should be reduced. While ICRISAT proposes to increase its resources allocated to resource management research, it is not clear how the Centre intends to implement ecoregional responsibilities.

About 78% of ICRISAT's research themes are basically a continuation of, or similar to, current activities. About 22% are entirely new. ICRISAT proposes to increase the proportion of resources allocated to resource management and groundnut, reduce sorghum and millet allocations, and keep chickpea, pigeon pea and genetic resources at their current levels. With respect to shares of research disciplines, ICRISAT proposes to increase the number of economists by five, physiologists by three, and breeders by two. Overall, the number of scientists years under Plan A would increase by 9. Plan A refers to ICRISAT's +10% scenario, Plan B is the scenario at the level of the base envelope, while Plan C is Plan A but without pigeon pea plus the lowest ranked themes deleted.

2. Programme Issues

- a) ICRISAT's priority-setting analysis is rigorous, structured and transparent. Although the quantitative analysis is based on the "best" information available, it must be recognized that for most parameters the database is of limited quality and often rudimentary. The estimates by scientists on probability of success, yield gains to be achieved and likely impact are laudable but heroic. There is a major problem of consistency in the estimates across programmes. Legume scientists are clearly very

optimistic about the breakthroughs they will make very soon, while cereal scientists have been far more cautious. As a result, legume themes score much higher than cereal themes. In the top 30 themes, only two refer to cereals but 19 to legumes! Given the poor record of legume research to date in terms of impact, it makes one wonder whether this optimism is justified.

ICRISAT has taken the outcome of the priority-setting exercise largely at "face value". A few themes were deleted because they were considered not to be appropriate for an international institute. ICRISAT's management did not attempt to change the ranking of the themes on the basis of "judgement", and accepted the estimates from scientists as they were.

- b) In the priority-setting analysis, all factors (efficiency, equity, internationality and sustainability) were given equal weight. This is debatable, particularly because of the very rough nature of the database of some of the estimates. It is especially difficult to rationalize the scoring of the contribution to sustainability.
- c) It is not clear how the "new" ICRISAT will change from the "old" Centre.
- d) It is not clear how ICRISAT intends to implement ecoregional responsibility, other than through what it is already doing.
- e) A major issue is the future of pigeon pea research. ICRISAT argues strongly for a continuation of current effort, largely on the basis of greater internationality than acknowledged by TAC, contributions to sustainability, and potential pay off and impact.
- f) The plan lacks a comprehensive strategy on how to integrate commodity research with research on natural resource management, and on the future direction of this research.

- g) ICRISAT's allocation of resources by activity is 11% to category 1, 23% to category 2, 43% to category 3, 8% to category 4 and 15% to category 5. This is a relatively high share to production systems research. ICRISAT also challenges TAC's approach to making these estimates, and claims that it leads to a major under-estimate of contribution to institution building.
- h) The Plan is an excellent reference document for future external reviews as it really provides quantitative baselines against which to judge performance of programmes and projects.
- i) What is the future of the programme in Southern Africa and how are ICRISAT's relations with SACCAR?
- j) ICRISAT uses a very broad definition of basic/strategic research, and as a result 45% of its work is classified as such.
- k) ICRISAT's programme is defined in research themes, and not yet in projects. It is thus not always easy to judge what exactly ICRISAT plans to do.
- l) Is the strong increase in the number of economists justified?
- m) In its complementary programme, ICRISAT assigns three senior positions, unspecified, for spouse employment. Innovative, but?
- n) What is the future of ICRISAT's millet research in India?

3. Financial Issues

- a) **Price issues:** ICRISAT states that the real inflation rate for the Plan period will be in excess of the 4% recommended for budgeting purposes.

- b) **Staffing:** At the 110% level, ICRISAT forecasts an increase of three senior staff (to 100) by 1998, from the 1992 level (and eight over the 1993 estimate). However, there is a significant shift: research programmes gain nine senior staff by 1998, whereas research support loses one position; training etc. loses two, and administration loses three. There are small decreases in supervisory and support positions, but the level of backstopping is still very high at ICRISAT; on average each senior staff member "has" three supervisory staff and 23 support staff.
- c) **Unit costs:** ICRISAT's unit operating costs, as calculated in senior staff terms, is about US\$317,000. There is considerable variability based on location e.g., direct cost per scientist varies from US\$185,000 at Hyderabad to US\$414,000 for staff based at CIMMYT. The share of personnel costs for ICRISAT's core programmes is 55%, a little below the system average.
- d) **Resource shares:** The following table summarizes the allocation of resources at ICRISAT for the 110% level programme:

PROGRAMMES	1992		1994		1998	
	US\$	SSY	US\$	SSY	US\$	SSY
Research	44%	71%	49%	74%	52%	77%
Research Support	7%	6%	6%	4%	6%	4%
Institution-Building, etc.	11%	11%	11%	10%	10%	9%
Research Management	38%	13%	34%	11%	32%	10%

The above percentages are shares of expenditure, not funding.

- e) **Administrative costs:** The figure of 38% (declining to 32%) as research management cost includes depreciation. Excluding depreciation, the figures are 32% declining to 26% in 1998. In 1998, ICRISAT's crude "overhead ratio" will be 35%, comparable to that of CIAT.

- f) **Capital renewal:** ICRISAT expects to spend about US\$0.5 million annually on new equipment for core operations, and between US\$0.8 and US\$1.2 million annually on replacement equipment. This is well within the depreciation allocation. The equipment requirement for Complementary Programmes is variable and somewhat unpredictable.
- g) **Reserves:** ICRISAT forecasts working capital of US\$2 million throughout the Plan period, representing about a half month of operations/cash requirements. However, there will be increasing levels of cash accumulating in the capital replacement fund, and therefore cash reserves will be adequate to meet day-to-day requirements.
- h) **Funding:** In terms of **flexibility and stability** of funding, in 1991 ICRISAT's core funding was 74% in the form of unrestricted grants. The World Bank share of funding to ICRISAT has increased in recent years, to about 13-14% at present. ICRISAT expects to earn about US\$0.7 million annually, from various sources, including overhead recovery.
- i) **Complementary programme:** ICRISAT projects a fairly constant level of complementary programme activity over the Plan period, at about US\$7 million average annually. This represents about 16-17% of the total ICRISAT programme.

IIMI**1. General**

IIMI has carefully followed the guidelines and has presented its proposals based on the assigned planning figure of US\$7.6 million. It has also indicated what additional activities it would undertake at the plus 10% scenario.

The draft medium term plan (MTP) has been prepared in the context of IIMI's most recent strategic plan and takes into account the major recommendations of the 1990 external review of IIMI.

IIMI has accepted global responsibility as a public management and public policy research institute for irrigated agriculture, with the related goals of institution building. What should be the appropriate balance between research and institution building activities? IIMI's relations with IFPRI and ISNAR in particular, and with IRRI and CIMMYT should be further elaborated.

It is noted that IIMI has revised its organizational structure and coordinating mechanisms. The Pakistan operation is retained as a distinct entity. Why does this unit not come under International Cooperation? How different is the Pakistan Unit from the other country programmes?

The proposed reorganization will substantially increase the number of senior staff positions involved in directing and management positions. Is this realistic given the modest size of the Institute?

2. Programme Issues

- a) IIMI distinguishes two types of research methodologies "generic and research" and "collaborative field research". The former relates to core and the latter to complementary activities. It is not clear how IIMI's generic research differs from collaborative research with respect to the type of research, and how the latter

can become generic through the concept of core add on project (CAPs).

- b) Of the five programmes, three have less than 3 Senior Staff Year (SSY) under core. The other two only have 3 SSY (Programme 4) and 5 SSY (Programme 1 respectively) under core. It is obvious that the Institute does not have a critical mass of human resources for programmes 2, 3 and 5. The proposed staffing under complementary activities for these programmes is much greater than the core allocations. Would this not distort the Institute's priorities, since the complementary activities are country specific and therefore demand driven?
- c) The concept of CAPs is innovative. What is the criteria for selecting complementary activities? Unless the collaborative field research projects are in "representative" locations, the "genetic" research from the CAPs may not contribute significantly to IIMI's global role.
- d) The role of the cross cutting themes (environment and health, gender issues and technology choice) is not clear with respect to their impact on research content and outputs.
- e) In the light of the fact that IIMI is a new CGIAR Centre and is still developing its core programme, consideration might be given for an interim MTP pending the outcome of the 1994 External Programme and Management Review.
- f) Based on its mandate, mission and goals IIMI appears to be primarily a social science orientated institute. It would be interesting to know the proportion of socio-economists among its core staff.
- g) Why is the core allocation for conservation and management of natural resources going down during the MTP period?

Institution Building:

- i) Is a proportion of 17% of core resources in 1998 enough for this activity category given IIMI's mission and goals?
- j) Why is the networking only confined to information networks?
- k) Figures given for resources requirements under Professional Development and Organizational Development in the text (pages 43 and 45) differ from those in Table 4.2.

Regional Balance

- l) Over 70% of IIMI's resources for core and complementary activities are allocated to Asia? Is the area under irrigation and population adequate determinants for regional research needs.
- m) What is IIMI's basis for including Sudan under WANA? Does this affect the priority rating (based on area under irrigation) for sub-Saharan Africa? Shouldn't the potential for irrigation also be a criteria for future priority ranking? IIMI has not included Eastern and Southern Africa and Madagascar in its regional considerations.

IITA

1. General

The draft medium-term plan presents proposals at 100% (US\$22.2 million), 110% (US\$24.4 million) and 120% (US\$26.5 million) of the resource envelope. The proposal at the 100% scenario reflects the implementation of IITA's strategic plan and the recommendations of the last external review. Under the 110% scenario, the station running costs of the Biological Control Programme are classified as core. The only major deviation from the strategic plan is the proposal within the 120% scenario to expand the current ecoregional responsibility to include the mid-altitude areas of Eastern and Southern Africa where at present IITA has only a modest commodity focus.

2. Programme Issues

- (a) Clarification is required on the nature of the proposed "expansion of IITA's ecoregional mandate" into Eastern and Southern Africa, because the institute's interpretation of the ecoregional approach is not clear. Should it be seen as strengthening IITA's ongoing commodity-related activities with crop management work, or should it be seen (as IITA proposes) as an extension of its ecoregional responsibility? Would this expansion be more appropriate as a complementary activity?
- (b) In June 1991, TAC approved the strengthening of the Biological Control Programme and its reclassification from complementary to core, but recommended that these activities be absorbed through shifts in the approved medium-term plan. IITA has not been able to absorb these costs because of the overall decrease in core funding. What is the implication for the Biological Control Programme should the 110% resource scenario not be endorsed?

- (c) The balance of effort by research activity categories for the 100% scenario is 24, 22, 34, 2 and 18% respectively for activity categories 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. How can an allocation of 2% to activity category 4 be reconciled with the provision of three economists and one impact assessment person in the Resources and Crop Management Division?
- (d) Rationale for priority setting is unclear, both within and across programmes and between commodities.
- (e) IITA's plan does not provide annual figures. How will the programmes change over time?
- (f) Criteria used to define core and complementary activities are not stated. What are they?
- (g) Complementary activities have been treated superficially and tentatively. More information on complementary programmes *per se*, and how they relate to core activities, would be helpful.
- (h) The Inland Valleys Programme in the Resource and Crop Management Division proposes to work on the role of inland valleys in the agricultural systems and the dynamics of land-use patterns in the different inland valley systems. This work will include analysing the constraints to agricultural production as a basis for the development of improved technologies in the areas of water management, soil fertility management, weed and pest management, varietal improvement, and land management. The Inland Valleys Programme proposes to work in 11 key areas. The core proposed staffing is 4.5 Senior Staff Year (SSY) including 0.5 SSY from the Crop Improvement Division and 0.5 SSY from the Plant Health Management Division. The remaining 3.5 SSY are from the Resource and Crop Management Division composed of an agricultural economist, a soil fertility specialist, a weed scientist and 0.5 SSY soil microbiologist. The programme does not have an input

from a systems agronomist or a water management specialist. Is this realistic? Should there be a provision for such inputs or should these come through collaboration with WARDA which works on the rice-based cropping systems in the inland valleys?

- i) TAC recommended an increased effort in soybean research. The plan proposes no increase. Also, with regards to yam, TAC recommended that IITA should concentrate on germplasm conservation and focus its research on the critical constraints to germplasm improvement. The plan does not react to these recommendations.
- j) Output and impact information is provided only by agroecological zones/agroecosystems, and lacks specificity. It would be useful to have the information by programmes and by activity.
- k) In view of IITA's interest in crop-livestock interactions, and TAC's views on strategies for livestock research in the CGIAR, should IITA not give attention to the potential of its mandated crops for animal feed?

3. Financial Issues

- a) **Prices issues:** IITA expects the Nigerian inflation rate to exceed 4% annually, but this should be offset by favourable local exchange rate movements. (There is no estimate provided of the share of expenditure at IITA in USD/Naira/CFA.)
- b) **Staffing:** At the 100% level, IITA forecasts an increase of two senior staff members from the 1992 level, one in resource/crop management, two in plant health management, and one less in crop improvement. No changes are projected elsewhere (training/communications/administration, etc.), and the increase to 99 senior staff members will be achieved through reductions in operating costs elsewhere at IITA. At the 110% level three additional staff members are added to RCMD, and at the 120% level

another six research staff members are added, bringing the total to 108. Under no scenario is there an increase in non-research staff. For complementary programmes, no increase or decrease in senior staff is expected (the total is 26 under all scenarios). There is a **significant increase** in the number of supervisory positions starting in 1994, from 212 to 245 (16%).

- c) **Unit costs:** IITA's plan is based on an average cost per senior staff year of US\$175,000 for Nigeria-based personnel and US\$300,000 for staff elsewhere. Thus, the implications for the expanded mandate, i.e., East and Southern Africa, are clear. The share of personnel costs for IITA core programmes is 49%, significantly below the system average.
- d) **Resource shares:** The following table summarizes the allocation of resources at IITA for the 100% level programme.

PROGRAMMES	1992		1994-98	
	US\$	SSY	US\$	SSY
Research	46%	59%	47%	60%
Research Support	7%	10%	7%	10%
Institution-Building, etc.	10%	14%	9%	14%
Research Management	37%	16%	37%	16%

The above percentages are shares of expenditure, not funding.

- e) **Administrative costs:** Management and administrative costs, including depreciation, amount to 37% of the total. About a fifth (8%) represents capital renewal costs. IITA's crude "overhead ratio" is therefore about 58%; this compares with 35% in the case of CIAT. Obviously, part of the discrepancy is due to IITA's accounting practices by which IITA's administrative costs include staff housing costs.

- f) **Capital renewal:** No distinction is made in the financial forecasts between replacement and new capital, but IITA is assuming that all capital acquisitions in the Plan period will be financed through the capital fund which is created by the annual depreciation charge and proceeds from asset disposal. Only under the 120% model would there be an extra capital requirement, for the East/Southern Africa Programme.
- g) **Reserves:** IITA forecasts an average of about US\$4 million in cash reserves throughout the Plan period, representing about 40-45 days of operations/cash requirements. This is reasonable.
- h) **Funding:** An issue is the continued split in the financing of the Cotonou Centre between core and complementary funding, as described above. At the 100% level, core funding needs to be added to by complementary funds of US\$1.5 million, to pay for the support operating costs of Cotonou. In terms of **flexibility and stability** of funding, in 1991 IITA's core funding was nearly 90% in the form of unrestricted grants. The World Bank share of funding to IITA has decreased in recent years, to about 17% at present. IITA expects to receive about US\$1 million from overhead recovery annually, and another US\$750,000 as financial income.
- i) **Complementary programme:** IITA may experience a significant decrease in complementary activity during the Plan period. Currently, only US\$6 million worth of complementary activity is forecast in 1994, declining to US\$2 million in 1996. Also, the joint CIAT/IITA Cassava Plant Protection Project (US\$9.7 million total over five years) has been left out of IITA's core budget.

ISNAR

1. General Comments

ISNAR's MTP proposals are based on its revised strategy for the 1990's, the recommendations of the 1991 External Programme and Management Review, and the reorganised management and programme structure which is intended to integrate more closely ISNAR's research, advisory services and training. The MTP proposals show shifts in relative priority and resource allocation from sub-Saharan Africa towards Asia and the Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean, and from comprehensive analysis of NARS towards components of research policy and research management in NARS.

ISNAR has followed the guidelines for preparation of MTPs and has developed a comprehensive operational plan which describes core and complementary activities based on the indicative 1998 resource envelope of US\$6.8 million. ISNAR has also indicated how its programmes would change at the plus 10% scenario and at a higher level which they consider to be more appropriate for the achievement of ISNAR's mission and goals.

The proposals are ambitious and imaginative. Details have been provided for the first and last year of the MTP under three scenarios: first, using the planning target provided by the resource envelope; second, using the plus 10% scenario; and third, using a higher target figure based on ISNAR's expected programme in 1998 which reflects the evolution within and among programmes and regions and provides for some real growth above the plus 10% scenario.

The plan clearly differentiates ISNAR's core and complementary activities (Table 10.3). Priority activities under the baseline (indicative envelope), expanded funding (plus 10% scenario) and the target for 1988 are illustrated in the text and summarized in Table 10.4.

ISNAR has planned a programme of core activities requiring 38.3 Senior Staff Year (SSY) at the baseline; 43.3 SSY at the plus 10% scenario; and 46.4 SSY for their target programme for 1998.

2. Programmatic Issues

- a) There is no explanation as to what constitutes a SSY at ISNAR. Further, there is no indication of what ISNAR considers to be the minimum critical mass for its programmes.
- b) ISNAR has responded fully to most of the suggestions made by the TAC working party in August 1992. On a programmatic basis the plan appears to be well developed and argued. However, the plan still makes hard reading, probably due to the abstract nature of the activities.

19.10.92

A CHECKLIST OF ISSUES FOR THE REVIEW OF CENTRES' MTP PROPOSALS

GENERAL

1. What is the complementarity between the centre's proposed activities with those of other centres with similar mandates? To what extent has the inter-centre collaboration stated in the MTP proposals been discussed with the centres concerned? What is the expected division of labour and financial responsibility between centres? What is the modus operandi between the Centres?
2. How were the MTP proposals developed? Who was consulted?

PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES

3. In what ways does the MTP reflect the centre's strategic plan, the revised CGIAR priorities and strategies, and TAC's recommendations on the most recent external review?
4. What is the rationale for the indicated distribution of resources by (CGIAR activity category/region/AEZ/commodity) in the MTP?
5. If appropriate, does the centre have a clearly defined strategy for its commodity research programmes? How is the commodity research approach being integrated with the approach to research on natural resources management?
6. In what ways are the proposed changes in the budget above the base resource envelope consistent with TAC's recommendations on priorities?
7. What does the centre consider to be a reasonable proportion of complementary activities in its total programme? Are the complementary activities broadly consistent with CGIAR priorities and strategies?
8. Has the centre specifically addressed the CGIAR concern for increased efforts in research on natural resources (conservation and) management? What is the centre's approach to natural resources management?
9. What is the relative distribution in the centre's MTP between global and ecoregional activities? What is the relationship between these?

PROGRAMMATIC

10. Has the centre described a programme of activities using the indicative 1998 base resource envelope and the plus 10% scenario? Are these activities within CGIAR's comparative advantage?
11. What criteria has the centre applied to differentiate between core and complementary activities?
12. What is the minimum number of senior staff years required to make the centre's commodity research/natural resources management research effective? How has the centre divided these between core and complementary activities?
13. On the question of scale what does the centre consider to be the optimal scale of activities for each programme/commodity/subject matter area? What are the implications of these numbers for the overall scale of the centre?
14. What is the role and function of networks in the MTP proposals? What proportion of resources has been allocated to networks under activity category 5? What proportion of the networks are complementary activities?
15. What would be the programmatic consequences of the -10% scenario?
16. How reliable are the estimates for expected outputs and impact?
17. What activities has the centre discontinued or transferred to national programmes? How would the centre be different at the end of the proposed MTP?

FINANCIAL

18. What is the centre's unit cost per staff year?
19. What is the share of the total resources that has been allocated for administrative costs? What is the rationale for this?
20. What is the proportion of centre's expenditure on personnel relative to operations?
21. What is the proposed expenditure on new capital items?
22. Does the centre have an adequate working capital?
23. How stable was the core funding of the centre during the last MTP period? How much reliance has the centre placed on the World Bank as donor of last resort to balance its funding to meet its approved budget in recent years?

MEDIUM-TERM RESOURCE ALLOCATION PROCESS

Proposed Process and Timetable

1. **TAC 59, 18-24 October:** TAC considers draft medium-term proposals of CIAT, CIP, CIMMYT, ICRISAT, IIMI, IITA and ISNAR. At the end of the meeting, draft commentaries will be issued on each proposal and shared with centre's board and management.
2. **ICW'92, 26-30 October:** These seven centres present their draft medium-term proposals to the Group. The TAC Chairman presents TAC's draft commentaries. Members of the Group will comment on the proposals.

The Group also considers TAC's proposed strategy for livestock research.

3. **TAC 60, 20 March - 1 April 1993:** TAC considers draft medium-term proposals of CIFOR, IBPGR, ICARDA, ICLARM, ICRAF, IFPRI, ILCA, ILRAD, INIBAP, IRRI and WARDA. These plans will have to be submitted to TAC no later than 20 February 1993. Prior to this date, each of the 11 centres involved will be visited by a working panel consisting of the TAC liaison scientist and staff of the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats in order for them to become familiar with the individual proposal prior to its presentation to TAC. The schedule of these visits is attached in Annex I. At the end of TAC 60, draft commentaries will be prepared and shared with the centres' boards and management.

TAC considers proposals for ecoregional responsibilities. The Committee also develops a proposed strategy for rice research in the CGIAR.

4. **Mid-Term Meeting, 24-28 May 1993:** These eleven centres present their draft medium-term proposals to the Group. The TAC Chairman presents TAC's commentaries. The Group comments on these medium-term proposals. It also discusses TAC/CD's proposal for ecoregional responsibilities. The Group considers TAC's proposed strategy for rice research in the CGIAR.

5. CGIAR Symposium, **29 May 1993, Puerto Rico**: A CGIAR consultative workshop after the mid-term meeting, with donors, centre directors and representatives of NARS to discuss issues with respect to ecoregional responsibilities, progress in proposed restructuring of the CGIAR and emerging trends in the resource allocation process.
6. Centres may prepare a response to TAC's commentary on their draft medium-term plan, including their perception on the implications of TAC's views on the programme and management of their centre. In this response, centres could also react to issues raised at ICW'92 and the Mid-Term Meeting 1993. The deadline for the submission of this response to TAC would be 15 June 1993.
7. **TAC 61, 28 June - 6 July 1993**: TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat consider the responses by the centres and reconciles centre proposals with TAC's recommendations on CGIAR priorities and strategies. The Committee (in collaboration with the CGIAR Secretariat) prepares a final commentary on each proposal, and assigns a budget to each centre (either in terms of an absolute number, or in the form of % share of CGIAR core resources). TAC will develop recommendations for consideration by the Group at ICW'93 with respect to: (a) the programme, management and budget level of each centre; (b) priorities and strategies for the CGIAR, and their implementation.
8. **1 September 1993**: TAC Chair submits these final recommendations with respect to the medium-term resource allocation process to the Group.
9. **ICW'93, 25-29 October 1993**: The Group considers centre plans and TAC's recommendations.
10. Centres revise their proposals in line with the recommendations of TAC and the Group.

SCHEDULE FOR CENTRE VISITS BY TAC LIAISON SCIENTISTS FOR MTPS
(15/10/92)

<u>Centre</u>	<u>Dates visit</u>	<u>Liaison Scientist</u>	<u>TAC Sec.</u>	<u>CGIAR Sec.</u>
1992				
CIP	8-10 June	Arnold	Gryseels	Jacqmotte
CIAT	10-12 June	Muchnik	Gryseels	Tadvalkar
IITA	20-22 July	Musangi	Kassam	Tadvalkar
ICRISAT	24-27 Aug.	Matsui	Gryseels	Tadvalkar
ISNAR	26-28 Aug.	Duda1	Monyo	Jacqmotte
IIMI	31 Aug.-2 Sept.	Duda1	Monyo	Jacqmotte
CIMMYT	9-11 Sept.	Muhammed	Monyo	Tadvalkar
ILRAD	2-4 Dec.	Musangi	Monyo	Jacqmotte
IBPGR	7-9 Dec.	Debela	Kassam	Tadvalkar
IFPRI	14-18 Dec.	Chowdhry	Gryseels	Jacqmotte

1993

ILCA	4-6 Jan.	Toure	Kassam	Jacqmotte
IRRI	13-15 Jan.	Henzell	Gryseels	Tadvalkar
ICLARM	18-19 Jan.	Henzell	Gryseels	Tadvalkar
INIBAP	21-22 Jan.	Budowski	Monyo	Jacqmotte
ICARDA	24-26 Jan.	Hayashi	Timon	MacNeil
WARDA	26-30 Jan.	Huisman	Kassam	Tadvalkar
ICRAF	27-29 Jan.	Gregersen	Kio	Jacqmotte
CIFOR	??	Gregersen	??	Jacqmotte

MEDIUM-TERM RESOURCE ALLOCATION PROCESS

Proposed Process and Timetable

1. **TAC 59, 18-24 October:** TAC considers draft medium-term proposals of CIAT, CIP, CIMMYT, ICRISAT, IIMI, IITA and ISNAR. At the end of the meeting, draft commentaries will be issued on each proposal and shared with centre's board and management.
2. **ICW'92, 26-30 October:** These seven centres present their draft medium-term proposals to the Group. The TAC Chairman presents TAC's draft commentaries. Members of the Group will comment on the proposals.

The Group also considers TAC's proposed strategy for livestock research.

TAC Chair and the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR issue supplementary guidelines for the preparation of medium-term proposals, particularly with respect to the classification of activities, based on the experience gained during the consideration of the first seven MTPs.

3. **TAC 60, 20 March - 3 April 1993:** TAC considers draft medium-term proposals of CIFOR, IBPGR, ICARDA, ICLARM, ICRAF, IFPRI, ILCA, ILRAD, INIBAP, IRRI and WARDA. These plans will have to be submitted to TAC no later than 20 February 1993. Prior to this date, each of the 11 centres involved will be visited by a working panel consisting of the TAC liaison scientist and staff of the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats in order for them to become familiar with the individual proposal prior to its presentation to TAC. The schedule of these visits is attached in Annex I. At the end of TAC 60, draft commentaries will be prepared and shared with the centres' boards and management.

TAC considers proposals for ecoregional responsibilities. The Committee also develops a proposed strategy for rice research in the CGIAR. Secretariats will begin staff work on reconciliation of CGIAR priorities and strategies with centre proposals.

4. **Mid-Term Meeting, 24-28 May 1993:** These eleven centres present their draft medium-term proposals to the Group. The TAC Chairman presents TAC's commentaries. The Group comments on these medium-term proposals. It also discusses TAC/CD's proposal for ecoregional responsibilities. The Group considers TAC's proposed strategy for rice research in the CGIAR.
5. **CGIAR Symposium, 29 May 1993, Puerto Rico:** A CGIAR consultative workshop after the mid-term meeting, with donors, centre directors and representatives of NARS to discuss issues with respect to ecoregional responsibilities, progress in proposed restructuring of the CGIAR and emerging trends in the resource allocation process.

6. Centres may prepare a response to TAC's commentary on their draft medium-term plan, including their perception on the implications of TAC's views on the programme and management of their centre. In this response, centres could also react to issues raised at ICW'92 and the Mid-Term Meeting 1993. The deadline for the submission of this response to TAC would be 15 June 1993.
7. **TAC 61, 28 June - 6 July 1993:** TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat consider the responses by the centres and reconcile centre proposals with TAC's recommendations on CGIAR priorities and strategies. The Committee (in collaboration with the CGIAR Secretariat) prepares a final commentary on each proposal, and assigns a budget to each centre (either in terms of an absolute number, or in the form of % share of CGIAR core resources). In terms of System recommendations, TAC will prepare two scenarios based on different funding levels (envelope funding and plus 10%). TAC will develop recommendations for consideration by the Group at ICW'93 with respect to: (a) the programme, management and budget level of each centre; (b) priorities and strategies for the CGIAR, and their implementation. TAC approves annotated outline of report to be presented at ICW. TAC Chair prepares draft report by 15 August and circulates for comments to TAC Members.
8. **1 September 1993:** TAC Chair submits report and final recommendations with respect to the medium-term resource allocation process to the Group.
9. **ICW'93, 25-29 October 1993:** The Group considers centre plans and TAC's recommendations.
10. Centres revise their proposals in line with the recommendations of TAC and the Group.

SCHEDULE FOR CENTRE VISITS BY TAC LIAISON SCIENTISTS FOR MTPS
(26/10/92)

<u>Centre</u>	<u>Dates visit</u>	<u>Liaison Scientist</u>	<u>TAC Sec.</u>	<u>CGIAR Sec.</u>
1992				
CIP	8-10 June	Arnold	Gryseels	Jacqmotte
CIAT	10-12 June	Muchnik	Gryseels	Tadvalkar
IITA	20-22 July	Musangi	Kassam	Tadvalkar
ICRISAT	24-27 Aug.	Matsui	Gryseels	Tadvalkar
ISNAR	26-28 Aug.	Dudal	Monyo	Jacqmotte
IIMI	31 Aug.-2 Sept.	Dudal	Monyo	Jacqmotte
CIMMYT	9-11 Sept.	Muhammed	Monyo	Tadvalkar
ILRAD	2-4 Dec.	Musangi	Monyo	Jacqmotte
IBPGR	7-9 Dec.	Debela	Kassam	Tadvalkar
IFPRI	14-18 Dec.	Chowdhry	Gryseels	Jacqmotte

1993

ILCA	4-6 Jan.	Toure	Kassam	Jacqmotte
IRRI	13-15 Jan.	Henzell	Gryseels	Tadvalkar
ICLARM	18-19 Jan.	Henzell	Gryseels	Tadvalkar
INIBAP	21-22 Jan.	Budowski	Monyo	MacNeil
ICARDA	24-26 Jan.	Hayashi	Timon	Tadvalkar
WARDA	26-30 Jan.	Huisman	Kassam	Tata
ICRAF	20-22 Jan.	Gregersen	Kio	Jacqmotte
CIFOR	??	Gregersen	??	Jacqmotte

SYSTEM-WIDE ISSUES

1. Need for a clearer conceptual framework of what constitutes a core vs. complementary activity. What if donors indicate preferences as to the classification of activities?
2. What is TAC's role in promoting inter-centre collaboration? There is at present no mechanism by which Centre Directors can resolve anomalies in inter-Centre coordination and problems of overlapping mandates.
3. What should be the future involvement of crop improvement programmes in livestock research? Does the Group endorse TAC's recommendations for a strategic redirection of plant-oriented IARCs to give greater consideration to animal nutritional needs.
4. How should the System promote collaboration in ecoregional-oriented research and rationalize overlaps in responsibilities? How should ecoregional mandates be institutionalized?
5. Should the System promote greater involvement of NARS in research on natural resources conservation and management?
6. How should the System address the relations between global and ecoregional responsibilities, and the problem of overlapping mandates? What should be the balance of effort between global and ecoregional activities?
7. How should the System address issues with respect to barriers in the devolution process and handing over responsibilities to national research systems?
8. There is a need to more clearly clarify the definitions of research activities.
9. How can the System most effectively address the issue of spouse employment? ICRISAT proposes to assign 3 SSY in its complementary programme for spouse employment. Should this be encouraged?
10. How to address the issue when System priorities differ substantially from individual centre priorities e.g. pigeon pea vs. pearl millet research.

TAC COMMENTARY - CIAT MEDIUM-TERM PLAN

1. TAC commends CIAT's Board and Management for its rigorous and balanced response to the financial crisis faced by the Centre during 1991 caused by the revaluation of the Colombian peso and reduced funding at the System-wide level. TAC notes the rapid process of change that CIAT has undergone during 1992, reducing the number of core international senior staff positions from 82 to 70. This has resulted in a substantially leaner CIAT at the start of this medium-term planning process.
2. The proposals that CIAT submitted to TAC were based at the levels of 118% and 110% of the envelope. Before TAC can complete its analysis of CIAT's proposals, the Centre will need to submit supplementary information, that is Board approved, as to the implications of a budget allocation at the level of the resource envelope, as well as at a level of 10% below this amount, for its programmes.
3. TAC wishes to encourage the Board and Management of CIAT to provide further information on the consequences for the Centre's research programme of any reduction of resources below those sought in the MTP, especially in the balance of effort between germplasm development and resource management research.
4. The proposed agro-ecosystems programmes in resource management may be conceptually sound, but the MTP is not entirely clear as to how they will be operationalized. While TAC considers that CIAT's MTP deals satisfactorily with the question of linkages between resource management and germplasm development research, it does not address adequately the issue of relationships with other centres whose global mandate crops will be important components of the ecosystem studies. TAC notes that close collaboration generally will be vital for the achievement of critical mass in many important areas of CIAT's resource management research.

TAC COMMENTARY - CIMMYT MEDIUM-TERM PLAN

Center-specific issues

1. Inflation and currency changes have already forced significant changes in CIMMYT. Senior staff years (SSY) have been reduced from 93.2 in 1990 to 78.8 in 1992, and will reduce further to 74.3 in 1993. The CIMMYT MTP proposals provide financial tables and text for the base plus 10% scenario only. It has provided a short narrative on the impact of a decrease of the budget to base envelope, and a brief verbal indication on the implication of the minus 10% scenario. **[The 1998 SSY for the base + 10%, base, and base -10% scenarios are 77.3, 68.3 and 61 respectively.]**
2. CIMMYT uses the term "ecoregional programmes" to refer to the two programmes of natural resources management and crop research it plans to undertake in agro-ecosystems here its mandate crops are dominant components in land use. One programme is in cooperation with CIAT in the hillside agro-ecosystem of Central America, and the other programme is in cooperation with IRRI in the wheat-rice agro-ecosystem of Asia. These programmes have interesting elements which could well be part of a comprehensive ecoregional approach in these regions. Is this how CIMMYT perceives these initiatives within the evolving CGIAR System philosophy of an ecoregional approach?
3. Is CIMMYT'S role as a global commodity centre compromised by the apparent decrease in allocation to germplasm enhancement and the corresponding increase in emphasis on natural resources management research?
4. What modus operandi is envisioned for administering the CIMMYT/IRRI research in the rice/wheat ecosystem in Asia (possibly also involving IIMI and others)? Is a consortium management approach appropriate? If so, is there a role for ICRISAT? Also, what are the financial, management, and institutional implications?
5. What are the perceived advantages of CIMMYT using consultants to deal with specific research topics within the ecosystem research programmes as compared with the option of hiring full-time staff to carry out the needed functions? What is the difference in terms of budget and commitments?
6. CIMMYT plans to continue major investment in maintenance wheat breeding research. Should not the more routine activities be taken over by national research systems that have the capacity in countries where the breeding results are needed? If there are problems in getting such systems involved with this type of research, should CIMMYT try a pilot programme of contracting such work to capable national institutions (or consortia of such) in these countries, until they work out the means for financing it themselves?

System-wide issues which affect CIMMYT and its MTP

7. Reasons exist why many countries might not initiate research related to agricultural sustainability and natural resources management, e.g., because of lack of national perception of urgency and, thus, lack of political appeal and funding. What is the appropriate role of the CGIAR System in addressing the barriers involved and engaging with NARS in a dialogue regarding this type of research. CIMMYT's maintenance breeding research is only one example of the type of research undertaken by CGIAR centres that often is not appealing to NARS, even to those that have capacity.

8. TAC's medium-term vision of the CGIAR System foresees the system moving towards a clearer division of responsibilities between global and ecoregional activities and a reduction of overlapping mandates, activities, and involvement in given countries. What steps should the System be taking during this medium term planning period to rationalize such overlaps and eliminate inefficiencies involved? For example, should CIMMYT's mandate and activities in relation to those of IITA and ICARDA be reviewed? This issue also should be addressed by the CD-TAC joint working group on ecoregional approaches to research in the System.

9. Irrigated agro-ecosystems are located in several agro-ecological zones, but particularly in the arid and semi-arid zones. In terms of natural resource management research, how should the irrigated agro-ecosystems be treated by centres such as ICRISAT and ICARDA which have traditionally focussed on rainfed systems?

26.10.92

TAC COMMENTARY - CIP MEDIUM-TERM PLAN

Center-specific issues

1. TAC could not judge programmatic implications of CIP's 1998 funding envelope (and the envelope plus and minus 10% scenarios) since the budget alternatives presented in the CIP MTP were on the basis of +/- 10% of the sum of an adjusted TAC envelope (\$15.05m) plus a one-time US\$2m structural adjustment (cost recovery), i.e., a CIP adjusted "envelope" of \$17.05m.
2. Might CIP's global commodity responsibilities be compromised, and would it lose momentum in bringing to fruition the benefits from its strategic germplasm work, by devoting increased emphasis and effort on natural resources management research?
3. TAC notes with interest CIP's proposed coordinating role and research in an Andean ecoregional activity. Several unknowns still surround this initiative. Thus:
 - What will be the full scope of the activity, and how will CIP's role evolve over time within the context of the broader consortium approach proposed?
 - Are the parties that will be "coordinated" in agreement with each other on the initiative and their roles, and with CIP's proposed leadership in it? What will others actually bring into the programme in the way of resources and expertise?
 - Does CIP have the comparative advantage, and will it have the managerial capacity to expand into this activity and still maintain the high level and standard of leadership it provides to its existing commodity programmes?
 - What will be the priority of this activity relative to the other activities which went through a priority setting exercise?

Given the above and given CIP's recognition of the exploratory nature of much of this activity, might it be best to initiate it as a special project rather than immediately putting it into the core programme?

4. TAC cannot accept CIP's unilateral redefinition of its base resource envelope and requests that CIP come back in March 1993 with financial tables related to base and base plus and minus 10% envelopes together with the appropriate parts of the text to indicate the implications of these envelopes.

System-wide issues which affect CIP and its MTP

5. A number of centers are proposing research programmes that involve variations of an ecoregional approach. The question arises as to what *modus operandi* is most appropriate for managing and coordinating this type of initiative? For example, is a consortium approach appropriate? Furthermore, what are the financial and institutional implications? How should the roles and responsibilities of each consortium member and the consortium coordinator be determined?

6. Should TAC give further consideration during this MTP period to rationalizing research across the System in roots and tubers?

TAC COMMENTARY - ICRISAT MEDIUM-TERM PLAN

1. TAC commends ICRISAT for the transparent, structured and analytical process followed in setting programme priorities. The process has involved intensive staff participation and stimulated the development of institutional cohesion. One advantage of ICRISAT's approach is that it provides yardsticks against which the future performance of the Centre can be evaluated.

2. ICRISAT's baseline proposal discussed with TAC would require funding at the level of 110% of the base resource envelope. ICRISAT does provide the analytical framework to assess the programme implications of alternative funding levels, but TAC notes that the Centre will have to give careful consideration to the strengths and weaknesses of the priority setting approach.

3. The methodology used by ICRISAT is, while transparent and systematic, very much dependent upon parameters for which the available database is still rudimentary. Most of the parameters such as the estimates of probability of success, yield gains to be achieved, likely impact or contributions to sustainability are based on qualitative and very subjective judgements made by the scientific staff. TAC has noted an apparent lack of consistency of estimates across programmes. TAC would suggest that the Board and Management give greater consideration as to the implications of the priority analysis for the balance of effort across programmes by commodity and research themes.

4. TAC has carefully considered ICRISAT's disagreement with its recommendations on CGIAR priorities and strategies with respect to research on pigeon pea. TAC recalls its views that in the long term a CGIAR involvement in pigeon pea research should be linked to the maintenance of genetic resource collections. TAC considers that the arguments put forward by ICRISAT are not persuasive enough to make it change its views. However, TAC is sympathetic to ICRISAT's view that during the next five years complete devolution of this research is neither possible nor desirable. Any phasing out involves a gradual process over time and TAC would not recommend that pigeon pea research would be phased out overnight. TAC understands and accepts the need for involvement by ICRISAT in pigeon pea research during the next five years. TAC strongly encourages ICRISAT to intensify its consultations with the Indian authorities for increasing sharing of responsibilities for pigeon pea research.

5. The issue of a continuing involvement of ICRISAT in pigeon pea research has raised the wider system-level issue of what happens when the System's perception of the priority of a commodity is substantially different from the perception by the Centre. In the

particular case of ICRISAT, TAC notes that at the System level the priority assigned to research on pearl millet is well above that assigned to pigeon pea. Yet, the priority setting analysis of ICRISAT clearly shows that in a situation of budget constraint (the -10% scenario) research on pearl millet will virtually disappear, while research on pigeon pea would be maintained at a level much higher than that of pearl millet. If ICRISAT would be funded at the level of the research envelope, the pearl millet programme would also be more strongly affected than the pigeon pea programme. How could the System resolve such differences?

6. TAC would also welcome further clarity as to whether the Centre plans to initiate ecoregional responsibilities in mandate areas other than those covered by the ICRISAT Sahelian Centre. TAC also notes an overlap in responsibilities with IITA in the semi-arid and sub-humid tropical areas of sub-Saharan Africa.

TAC COMMENTARY - IIMI MEDIUM-TERM PLAN

1. TAC commends IIMI for being the only one that presented its MTP at the three levels of the envelope recommended by TAC. IIMI has prepared an analytical and well argued MTP proposal which is based on its draft strategy for the 1990's and has taken into account the major recommendations of the 1990 External Review.
2. As a CGIAR institution, IIMI considers that it should work on the efficient use of water for agriculture rather than just irrigation management per se. Consequently, it has changed its mission from the earlier focus on "irrigation systems" to one dealing with "irrigated agriculture". TAC considers that IIMI may have to review the disciplinary balance among its senior research staff in light of this change in focus.
3. TAC would like IIMI to elaborate further on its internal priorities, particularly with respect to the choice among research themes. TAC would also appreciate further justification of the research themes proposed for the plus 10% scenario, relative to those included in the base resource envelope. TAC notes that at the minus 10% scenario IIMI would have to eliminate one of its core programmes and reduce some activities in institution building, research support and administration.
4. TAC would also like to have more information on the criteria used for resource allocation among regions and country selection for collaborative field research. TAC considers that IIMI should strive to achieve a rational balance between regions with respect to collaborative field research projects.
5. TAC notes that two of the five proposed programmes have 1 SSY each under core. It notes further that a Director for research and five programme leaders are currently under recruitment. This raises issues relating to focus and critical mass. Is IIMI trying to spread itself too thin in dealing with so many research themes?
- *6. In the Expansion Report TAC saw great opportunities for close collaboration between IIMI, IFPRI, and ISNAR, which are also involved in research and institution building related to areas of public policy and public management. TAC notes that there is presently active dialogue between these centres for closer collaboration. TAC considers that collaboration between IIMI with CIMMYT and IRRI on wheat and rice respectively, with CIFOR and ICRAF on watershed management, and with ICLARM on aquaculture would also be in the best interest of the System.

* System-wide issues

*7. IIMI has carefully reviewed and redefined its core and complementary activities. This may require some adjustment of the base resource envelope. Similar changes may also need to be considered for the other new CGIAR centres, ICLARM, ICRAF and INIBAP.

* System-wide issues

TAC COMMENTARY - IITA MEDIUM-TERM PLAN

1. TAC notes that IITA's MTP is written in more general terms than some other MTPs that have used more quantitative and transparent approaches to priority setting. As a result, the rationale for IITA's internal priorities across programmes, commodities and activities is not always clear. It would be helpful to TAC if IITA's Board and Management could provide further information on this rationale. Some of the specific aspects that could be elaborated would involve:

- IITA's plans for its future involvement with alley farming, in the light of achievements and impact to date, and including the potential for greater collaboration with ICRAF;
- future strategic direction of the Inland Valley programmes and the implications for collaborative work with WARDA and IIMI;
- IITA's future involvement with soybean;
- IITA's processes for handing over responsibilities, as appropriate, to the national agricultural research systems of the region.

2. The proposals which IITA submitted to TAC were based at the levels of 100%, 110% and 120% of the resource envelope recommended by TAC. TAC has noted that at the level of the resource envelope, IITA proposes to support the biological control programme in its complementary programme from special project funds. TAC would like to have clarification about the implications for IITA's proposals, should the biological control programme be integrated in its core programme at the resource envelope level. More generally, TAC would require greater clarity as to IITA's rationale for classifying its activities as either core or complementary.

3. TAC would welcome greater clarity as to what extent the proposed expansion of IITA's mandate into Eastern and Southern Africa is related to the strengthening of commodity activities or of ecoregional responsibilities. TAC has noted that there is overlap in the agroecological zones to be covered by IITA and ICRISAT, particularly with respect to the semi-arid and sub-humid tropical zones. How does IITA foresee collaboration with ICRISAT and other agencies in the latter zones?

4. What are the implications of IITA's proposals with respect to the medium altitude and highland areas for its collaboration with other centres such as CIMMYT and CIAT.

TAC COMMENTARY - ISNAR MEDIUM-TERM PLAN

1. The ISNAR MTP proposal is based on its strategy for the 1990s, the recommendations of the 1991 External Review, and the 1992 TAC Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies. The MTP provides detail only at the plus 10% scenario which assumes a core funding of \$7.5 million. Consequently it does not show the proposed senior staff allocation for 1994 at the base resource envelope recommended by TAC. Although ISNAR has provided TAC with qualitative supplementary information on the effect which the minus 10% scenario would have on its core activities, it is not clear what baseline this refers to, since ISNAR did not use the base resource envelope proposed by TAC. ISNAR has also provided supplementary proposals for an additional \$2 million to core as recommended by the 1991 External Review. TAC will examine this proposal when it reconciles all centre MTPs in June 1993.
2. ISNAR has differentiated its core and complementary activities, according to scale, scope, and sources of funding. This differs from the TAC definition of core and complementary activities stated in Annex 3 of the TAC guidelines. They consider most of their research and development activities to be core. TAC notes that the Board and Management of ISNAR would like ISNAR to be treated differently from the other IARCs because it is primarily a research-based service. Should ISNAR receive differential treatment with respect to the definition of core and complementary activities?
3. TAC notes that some of the NARS get ISNAR's services free of charge while others pay for such services. The criteria used for determining who gets free services and who pays include the principle of first come first served and the availability of special project funds. TAC considers that ISNAR should develop explicit criteria for country selection to ensure equity among NARS and appropriate regional balance. The criteria for choice among activities should also be more clearly defined.
4. ISNAR considers its advisory services, research and training to be closely inter-related. Since research permeates through all ISNAR's programmes and services, TAC would like to know the proportion of research in each programme and service.
5. The MTP does not have the features of an operational plan but looks more like an elaboration of the strategic plan. There is no indication of how different ISNAR would be at the end of the MTP period relative to the beginning with respect to the number and locations of NARS receiving long-term comprehensive reviews, strategies for and types of training activities, number of trainees, and length of training activities, etc. More concrete information

regarding ISNAR's targets, expected outputs and impact would be helpful.

6. ISNAR does not have a sunset clause for long-term partnerships with specific NARS. What are the implications of this open-ended nature of long-term association with specific NARS in reference to the mandate, scope of activities and impact of ISNAR.

7. TAC notes that ISNAR considers that it should be treated differently from the other CGIAR centres with respect to earned income, which is mostly derived from reimbursements for selling its services to individual NARS. ISNAR's core programme is somewhat more costly than is reflected in the MTP, since service income and the related costs of advisory services are not shown. This obscures somewhat the unit cost structure and scale of operations at ISNAR.

8. The MTP proposal does not clearly define ISNAR's comparative advantage, its role and objectives for the projected involvement in natural resources management policies and biodiversity policies.