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Executive Summary: Conclusions and Recommendations

Review method
Bioversity International in Rome hosted the Review Panel during a five day visit from 20 to 24 October 2008. During this period, interviews were conducted with SGRP staff, Bioversity International staff, Global Crop Diversity Trust staff (during a visit to their offices) and CGIAR Secretariat staff (phone and video conferences). The outcome of the study of the background documents and interviews were discussed within the SGRP Secretariat.

The Panel Review report starts with general observations of the Review Team during its review, and continues with findings for each of the six elements specified in the Terms of Reference:
- Progress since the completion of the GPG1 Project (2003-2007) and the impact of GPG2
- Efficiency and Effectiveness of Collective Actions
- Sustainability Plan - Relevance and Implementability
- Project Coordination
- Financial Management
- Recommendations to the Project’s Final Review

Project structure
The GPG2 Project has been implemented through Task Forces coordinated by 28 Activity Coordinators, responsible for the execution of 28 workplans for Collective Activities and 10 upgrading plans for Centre-Own Activities. The Project is organized into 6 Outputs implemented through 21 Activities with 47 Sub-activities. The Project is administrated through 38 contracts (Letters of Agreement) signed between Bioversity International on behalf of the SGRP Secretariat and the participating CGIAR Centres, specifying the work to be undertaken, conditions for disbursement of funds, and requirements for annual technical and financial reporting and detailed workplans to SGRP.

The Project consisted of two major elements: the Centre-Own Upgrading Activities and the Collective Activities. The Centre-Own Upgrading Activities encompass the upgrading of facilities, the elimination of regeneration backlogs, securing safety backup of collections, including the Svalbard Global Seed Vault.

The Review Panel expresses its strong concern about some Centres not being able to eliminate their regeneration backlogs or complete some planned activities/sub-activities during the Project, despite using all the allocated funds.

The Collective Activities are aimed at facilitating strategic thinking and planning among the Centres’ genebanks, and creating the tools and resources allowing for a more rational management of the genebanks.

Progress made
The Review Panel was impressed by the progress made in most areas covered by the Project. Given that the Project effectively started six months into 2007, it is remarkable that delays are so limited. Most activities are largely on schedule, and some are already having impact. Also the performance of the under-funded Project Coordination was applauded. In terms of products, the Review Panel was concerned about their availability and in some cases their quality. To optimize the potential impact, appropriate quality assurance measures should be implemented and access should be maximized by presenting the Projects products in an accessible way on the Internet.
**Sustainability Plan**

The initiative of developing a ‘Sustainability Plan’ is strongly applauded by the Review Panel. Also, the elements of the vision for 2020, and the division into and definition of ‘Custodian operations’ vs. ‘Impact-focused operations’, are fully supported. However, the Review Panel believes that the draft text provided is too financially-oriented, and lacks the necessary vision and overarching roadmap for success. The Sustainability Plan should present a brief overall vision of the global PGR conservation effort in ex-situ collections, in which the CGIAR is ‘just one’ but an important actor. The Plan should describe the current situation of global PGR conservation (spectrum of actors, level of coverage and redundancy), the foreseen developments (increased access to PGR, increased quality of PGR management) and the role of the CGIAR genebanks (major actor with large collections, possible coordinating role, safety net, aiming at efficiency). The Review Panel recognized the difficulty of making cost estimates for the required activities across Centres, and that different crops have different requirements in terms of inputs for maintenance. However, a transparent and comprehensive costing exercise should be included in the Plan. Finally, the Review Panel stresses the importance to reflect in the Sustainable Plan the possibility to re-introduce the genetic resources into the local/rural communities if traditional farmers need or request them.

**Project management**

The Review Panel expresses its concern about the timeliness and distribution of the funds within Centres. In some cases problems were observed regarding the Project’s money reaching the intended activities. The Project’s Final Review should make critical comparisons of the products actually delivered with those listed in the GPG2 Project Proposal and insure that the funds transferred to the Centres have actually been spend on the Activities they were meant for.

The Review Panel had the strong impression that in most cases the CGIAR Centres had not adequately considered that accepting responsibilities requires careful planning and recognition of what the commitment entails, thus avoiding over-commitment. Also, basic project management elements such as realistic start dates, milestones, and completion dates, as well as the allowance for start-up time, were evaluated as being weak. In the planning for a project like GPG2, coordination activities including arranging contracts, facilitating communication and making products accessible, need to be appropriately budgeted, but were not in GPG2.

A better organizational hierarchy in the GPG2 project would have allowed for more effective monitoring of activities and to avoid the cascading effect of delays and allow for better outputs’ quality and access to products, essential to achieving optimal impact.
Recommendations

**Recommendation 1**: The actual use of GPG2 funds in some Centres needs to be clarified via financial audits before funds for the third year of the project are released and SGRP needs to work with the Internal Audit Unit (IAU) of the CGIAR to review all Centres’ progress reports and the IAU needs to carry out audits on a few selected Centres.

**Recommendation 2**: Outputs of GPG2 should be checked for quality and made accessible to the partners and rest of the world as soon as practicable via the website of SGRP.

**Recommendation 3**: SGRP should create a system of evaluation of GPG2 products to ensure proper quality and optimal impact of the products.

**Recommendation 4**: SGRP should actively stimulate strategic thinking and planning among genebank managers and develop programs aimed at exploring relevant issues.

**Recommendation 5**: Centres need to assure that all roles and responsibilities - including System-wide - of genebank managers and associated personnel are accurately reflected in their job descriptions and performance evaluation processes.

**Recommendation 6**: The Sustainability Plan should be revised to more clearly reflect the future Custodian Role of the CGIAR genebanks in the conservation and use of PGR, within the context of a rational global system comprised of a collaborative network of national and international actors.

**Recommendation 7**: The Sustainability Plan should contain a robust estimation of costing of the Custodian Role of the Centers based on a transparent costing model.

**Recommendation 8**: The Sustainability Plan should include a vision for the future role of the Centres in their ‘Impact-focused operations’, that involve not only their genebanks, breeders and crop scientists, but also their enhanced interactions with NARS and other users.

**Recommendation 9**: In light of the volume of activities and structural complexity of this project, measures should be taken (including a possible budget revision) to provide additional support to the overall coordination to help ensure the delivery and quality of and increased accessibility to the GPG2 products, to improve internal communications, and facilitate the adoption and implementation of the other recommendations of this external review.

**Recommendation 10**: The Change Management Initiative should recognize the essential Global Public Goods value of the genetic resources collections held in-trust by the CGIAR, and establish a dedicated funding window to sustainably support the critically important genetic resources Custodianship and Impact-focused activities system-wide, across all the Centres holding these collections.
1. Preparing the External Mid-Term Review

1.1 What we evaluated: GPG2 in brief

Budget: USD 10,458,490
(Year 1: 3,931,97USD – Year 2: 3,819,323USD - Year 3: 2,707,197USD)

Contacts: Secretariat of the System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP)
c/o Bioversity International, Via dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese,
Rome, Italy
David Williams, SGRP Coordinator and Brigitte Laliberté, GPG2 Project Coordinator

The project is implemented, monitored and regularly discussed by the Inter-Centre Working
Group on Genetic Resources (ICWG-GR), which is the Steering Committee of the SGRP. The project is implemented in close collaboration with a number of international, regional and
national partnerships.

Development Goal: Crop genetic resources and associated biodiversity are put to use in
developing countries to fight poverty, enhance food security and health, and
protect the environment.

Intermediate Goal: Creation of a comprehensive, effective and sustainable global
conservation and use system.

Purpose: The CGIAR Centres achieve effective stewardship of their in-trust collections
and provide leadership to partners in developing a global crop-based
conservation and use system.

Output 1: Uniform risk management procedures developed and implemented in all
CGIAR genebanks

Activity 1.1: Development and implementation of risk-management procedures for
individual genebanks and for collections in common.
Activity 1.2: Refinement and standardization of storage procedures for clonal crops.
Activity 1.3: Upgrading of genebank storage facilities and the processing of accessions
into storage to agreed standards.
Activity 1.4: Development and implementation of safety backup procedures for the in-trust
collections.

Output 2: Best practices for genebank management developed and implemented in the
CGIAR Centres and made available to partners

Activity 2.1: Consolidate, refine, disseminate and promote best management practices for
collections, including germplasm health in storage.
Activity 2.2: Develop and implement inventory management systems for in-trust
collections.
Activity 2.3: Processing accession backlogs to ensure quality according to best practices.
Activity 2.4: Develop and disseminate decision-support tools to enhance the cost-
effectiveness of collection management.
Output 3:  **Unified protocols for locating and delivering germplasm, and for sharing information on common crops in place at all CGIAR genebanks**

Activity 3.1: Development of a collaborative platform in support of best practices in safe movement of germplasm.
Activity 3.2: Design, implement and promote one-stop entry point for information on and access to the in-trust collections.
Activity 3.3: Design and validation of a crop registry model for priority collections and collections in common.

Output 4:  **Strategies and tools for enhancing knowledge on the diversity held in the in-trust collections**

Activity 4.1: Assess knowledge and gaps in the diversity and genetic quality of the collections.
Activity 4.2: Facilitation of crop group-based diversity research.

Output 5:  **Recommendations for the wider involvement of the CGIAR genebanks in addressing genetic and genomic stocks, associated biodiversity, and underutilized species**

Activity 5.1: Inventory of Centre genetic and genomic collections and development of related management procedures.
Activity 5.2: Survey of available microbial, fungal, insect and nematode collections, and analysis of the CGIAR's comparative advantage for involvement in their management.
Activity 5.3: Optimise the CGIAR’s contribution to global efforts on the conservation and sustainable use of underutilized plant genetic resources.

Output 6:  **Mechanisms for improved collective action among the CGIAR genebanks in the delivery of global public goods and promotion of international collaboration on conservation**

Activity 6.1: Effective project management and promotion of impact.
Activity 6.2: Strategic planning for enhanced CGIAR System capacity to address research.
Activity 6.3: Strategic planning for enhancing human capacity within the CGIAR System and the wider plant genetic resources community.
Activity 6.4: Supporting and monitoring the development and implementation of a crop-based global system and the CGIAR performance therein.
Activity 6.5: Project evaluation.

The GPG2 project is implemented through Task Forces coordinated by 28 Activity Coordinators, responsible for the execution of 28 workplans for collective activities and 10 upgrading plans for Centre-own activities. The project is organized into 6 Outputs implemented through 21 Activities and 47 Sub-activities. The GPG2 Coordinator is responsible for monitoring the overall progress and supporting the general implementation of project Activities, as well as the direct coordination of the following Activities, Sub-activities and Tasks. The project is administrated through 38 contracts (Letters of Agreement) signed between Bioversity International on behalf of the SGRP Secretariat and the participating CGIAR Centres, specifying the work to be undertaken, conditions for disbursement of funds, and requirements for annual technical and financial reporting and detailed workplans to SGRP.

1.2 Why this evaluation now and how the Panel went about it
The Review Panel received the main background documents by email in October 2008 and the rest of documents when the Panel arrived to Rome. Bioversity International in Rome hosted the Review Panel during a five day visit from 20 to 24 October 2008. During this period, interviews were performed with SGRP staff, Bioversity International staff, Global Crop Diversity Trust staff (during a visit to their offices) and CGIAR Secretariat staff (phone and video conferences). For the documents consulted, activities studied and persons interviewed during the visit to Rome see Annex 3 to 5.

The outcome of the study of the background documents and interviews were discussed within the Review Panel and the results were drafted in a report that was sent to the SGRP staff for factual correction. The changes were approved by the Review Panel, and a few additions were made to result in this final report.

2. Review Panel Observations and Recommendations

The presentation of findings is driven by the Mid-term Review’s scope:
- Progress since the completion of the GPG1 Project (2003-2007) and the impact of GPG2
- Efficiency and Effectiveness of Collective Actions
- Sustainability Plan - Relevance and Implementability
- Project Coordination
- Financial Management
- Recommendations to the Project’s Final Review

Some general observations precede and some general ‘lessons learned’ follow the description of the findings

2.1 General Observations

The Project consists of two major elements: the Centre-Own Upgrading Activities and the Collective Activities. Some general observations are presented for each of these. Some observations are expanded under the respective elements of the Terms of Reference.

2.1.1 GPG2 Centre-Own Upgrading Activities

The Centre-Own Upgrading Activities encompass the upgrading of facilities, the elimination of regeneration backlogs, securing safety backup of collections (including the Svalbard Global Seed Vault), theelimination of regeneration backlogs and completion of upgrading equipment and systems. These activities are, obviously, of the highest importance for the long term preservation of the precious resources maintained in the CGIAR genebanks. However, the question needs to be posed how these backlogs could have arisen. Apparently there is too little structural funding for the genebanks in the Centres as a result of Centre decisions on their priorities, financial planning and rationalization. The Review Panel expresses its serious concern about this situation and hopes that the Change Management Initiative going on in the CGIAR, together with changes in the organization of the genebanks themselves will result in a more sustainable situation.

The Review Panel observed that for some of the upgrading activities, some Centres have indicated in their mid-term progress report that they may not be able to complete the Year 2 planned milestones despite foreseeing the full expenditure of the year 2 budget for these activities. The Review Panel considers this a serious problem at these Centres, suggesting
structural problems in terms of planning, access to and use of Project funds assigned to these activities at an institutional level.

**Recommendation 1:** The actual use of GPG2 funds in some Centres needs to be clarified via financial audits before funds for the third year of the project are released and SGRP needs to work with the Internal Audit Unit (IAU) of the CGIAR to review all Centres’ progress reports and the IAU needs to carry out audits on a few selected Centres.

Since the information about the Centre-Own Upgrading Activities was limited, and the Centres involved were not visited, no further investigation was possible given the time constraints of the Review Panel. The rest of this report will therefore concentrate on the second element of the Project (GPG2 Collective Activities).

### 2.1.2 GPG2 Collective Activities

The Collective Activities are aimed at facilitating strategic thinking amongst the Centers genebanks, and creating the tools and resources allowing for a more rational management of the in-trust collections. The Review Panel got the impression that this kind of strategic thinking at the system level had happened only to a limited extent before. For the Centres to be able to play a leading role in the international PGR community, these collective actions are essential. However, due to the work pressure of the leaders involved, mainly genebank managers, and the fact that this part of GPG2 needed to be completed within a limited time span, collective strategic thinking and planning appeared a cumbersome process and the quality of some of the output reflected this. However the start of a strategic planning process that, under guidance of SGRP, should continue after the GPG2 Project is completed was welcomed and highly valued by the Review Panel. The build-up of the strategic tools and resources to support this process has proceeded very well.

The GPG2 Collective Activities clearly will add quality, efficiency and sustainability to the CGIAR Genebank operations. Transparency, and the associated peer review pressure, will lead to higher quality and cost effectiveness of these operations.

### 2.2 Progress and impact of GPG2

The Review Panel was impressed by the progress made in most areas covered by the GPG2 Project. Given that the Project effectively started six months into its first year of implementation (2007), it is surprising to see the limited number of delays in the activities; most activities are largely on schedule, and some are starting to have impact. However, to optimize the potential impact, access to the products created by the Project should be maximized by making them accessible on the Internet.

In the course of evaluating a selection of different Activity products (see Annex 5) the Panel found that in several cases the work plans had been reformulated and the products, despite being reported as finished, had not been produced. In other cases the Review Panel was not able to review the quality of the products since the Secretariat was not able to present them to the Review Panel within the time span of the review. Finally, in some cases the Review Panel was not convinced of the quality of the products, although the Panel realizes that given the on-going nature of the activities, the current quality of the products doesn’t necessarily reflect the quality of the end-products. However, apart from increasing the access to the products, a quality assurance mechanism is essential and must be inserted into the process before the products are released to the public.

**Recommendation 2:** Outputs of GPG2 should be checked for quality and made accessible to the partners and rest of the world as soon as practicable via the website of SGRP.
Recommendation 3: SGRP should create a system of evaluation of GPG2 products to ensure proper quality and optimal impact of the products.

It appeared that in many cases the Project offered the first opportunity for structural, output-oriented strategic thinking among the Centres' genebanks, including some essential aspects of genebank management, such as risk assessment and management, formulation of standard operating procedures and rationalization that had occurred in some genebanks, but was never a topic at the system level. The Review Panel welcomed these initial steps and underlines the importance of these activities for achieving an effective genebank system.

Recommendation 4: SGRP should actively stimulate strategic thinking and planning among genebank managers and develop programs aimed at exploring relevant issues.

The Review Panel appreciates that the essential tools and mechanisms for rationalization of the genebank operations are being created by the GPG2 Project. However, the discussion about actual rationalization, resulting in a reduction of costs, has not yet started as it is only the second year of the project. Obstacles for this rationalization process should be removed, e.g. implied barriers for transferring responsibilities for material (in-trust agreements) should be taken away to allow compliance with the ITPGRFA and the principles of the Global Crop Diversity Trust.

2.3 Efficiency and Effectiveness of Collective Activities

The cross-Centre Collective Activities are taking considerable time of the genebank senior staff, and given the workload associated with going to the meetings, answering the surveys, writing the documents and reporting, the responsiveness has not been optimal in all cases. The Review Panel understands this overcrowded agenda. However, it considers this lack of responsiveness a major issue that can and will impact the outcome of the Collective Actions. This is aggravated by the financial issues (see Section 2.5). The Review Panel thinks that this situation should not be solved by lowering the initial targets, i.e., dropping milestones or compromising quality requirements. The Centres and their Genebanks have committed themselves to delivering these and should be held to the GPG2 Project plan. Therefore, the Review Panel calls on each Centre’s management to enable the staff involved to meet their commitments through provision of additional capacity. Also alternative approaches such as relocation of (sub-) activities and the associated budgets could be considered as long as the final outputs are not compromised.

In some cases it appeared to the Review Panel that some of the genebank curators may not be adequately staffed and resourced to fully take part in genebank-related, impact-focused activities such as the development of most GPG2 products. To ensure that the genebank staff are committed to the collective actions (including GPG2 activities) and are able to deliver on their commitments, a performance evaluation system should be implemented and improvements be recommended where appropriate.

Recommendation 5: Centres need to assure that all roles and responsibilities - including System-wide - of genebank managers and associated personnel are accurately reflected in their job descriptions and performance evaluation processes.

The Review Panel recognizes that delays of various kinds, such as slow start-up, and non-delivery of some products have a cascading effect on other linked activities and the delivery of their products. These system failures are causing delays of some GPG2 activities and may penalize those scientists and Centres that do complete their activities in a timely manner and compromise the entire project’s success.
Within the SGRP, and possibly the CGIAR as a whole, it should be emphasized that accepting responsibilities requires careful planning and recognition of what the commitment entails, thus avoiding over-commitment.

SGRP needs to seek assistance from the CGIAR Alliance Executive Committee (AE) and the Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC) to address some system-level issues that SGRP cannot resolve by itself. For example, signals reached the Review Panel that not all Centres are abiding by the ITPGRFA in the sharing of in-trust genetic resources, or having a security back-up site for their collections. The GPG1 project supported the establishment of a safety back-up duplicate collection at another site to ensure that the collections are not at risk due to accident, sabotage, civil unrest or environmental disasters. The valuable but vulnerable rice collections at WARDA do not have a security back-up and the Review Panel understands that the Centre seems resistant to taking this step. It must be clarified whether this collection is, or is not, an in-trust collection maintained under the custody of WARDA and the CGIAR [All collections supported by the CGIAR are considered to be in-trust and following the CGIAR commitments to free availability and secure backup.] This issue has a considerable impact on the financial obligations of the CGIAR to the Centre, and also has implications for the global strategy for rice and its funding by the Global Crop Diversity Trust. Negotiations must be undertaken quickly to rectify this situation and the Centre should take necessary actions to comply with its obligations to the global community. This will not only enhance the Centre’s effectiveness in the system-wide activities led by SGRP, but may also impact future support for maintaining its collections through the respective funding window established by the Change Management Initiative.

2.4 Sustainability Plan—Relevance and Implementability

2.4.1 Sustainability at What Level

The initiative of developing a ‘Sustainability Plan’ is strongly applauded by the Review Panel. Also, the elements of the vision for 2020 and the division and definition of ‘Custodian operations’ vs. ‘Impact-focused operations’ are fully supported. The Review Panel believes that the present draft of the sustainability plan is too financially-oriented and should be strengthened by including a more coherent description of where the CGIAR intends to go within the context of an emerging global system of genetic resources conservation and use, and should provide the necessary vision and overarching roadmap for its success in that regard. For example, the plan should include the expected role of the Centres in implementing the regional and global crop conservation strategies, to ensure appropriate links and partnerships outside the CGIAR. The professional expertise and available infrastructure in many of the Centres is far greater than just that related to their Centre’s specific mandate. Are the Centres in a position to provide advice, guidance and other assistance beyond the scope of their mandate crops and those on the ITPGRFA Annex 1 list? But on the other side, do the Centres have to maintain all the tasks that they are currently performing or are other actors able to do it more efficiently or cost effectively? With respect to the 1994 Stripe Study’s proposals, how many Centres are or are planning to be interacting with and supporting the regional networks and NARS for not only the conservation and utilization of plants but other genetic resources as well?

The Review Panel believes the Sustainability Plan should present a brief overall vision of the global PGR conservation system (Custodian role), within which the CGIAR and the in-trust germplasm collections, constitute ‘just one’, but a very important, actor. The Review Panel suggests that the Plan should describe, within this vision, that of a rational, sustainable, effective and efficient Global system as provided by the ITPGRFA and Global Plan of Action:

- The current situation such as reported for several crops in the Regional and Global Crop Conservation Strategies, as developed with the support of the Global Crop Diversity Trust, in which some Centre’s took an active part in their development and implementation.
These strategies bring together many actors, including national partners, breeders, and the most important germplasm collections.

- **The foreseen developments**, including an increased access to PGR on the basis of the ITPGRFA and information systems and an increased quality of PGR management on the basis of transparency and agreed standards, reduction of redundancy.
- **The role of the CGIAR genebanks**, maintaining large collections with reliable status, a possible coordinating role on the global or regional level for a number of crops, and a safety net for national genebanks. But also (pro-)active participation in the reduction of redundancy, and methodology development.

### 2.4.2 Costing the Sustainability Plan

The Panel appreciates the difficulties faced by the SGRP in estimating sustainability costs given the many issues within the Centres that constrain such an exercise and that need to be solved. The 1994 Stripe Study gave a road map for many of these issues, but Centre autonomy - and particularly issues regarding their internal budgeting - persist as obstacles to good system-wide governance and financial planning for the genebanks.

The development of global information systems, including the crop registries being developed within GPG2, provide excellent tools for rationalization of the collections, decentralized data management, and central access to the information on PGR held not only in the Centers but also outside the CGIAR. Therefore, the costs associated with creating and maintaining these systems should be included as an integral part of the Sustainability Plan.

The extent to which the conservation of PGR is/will become sustainable depends on numerous factors such as political, institutional, economic and financial, technological, socio-cultural and environmental. Given this picture, and especially with better collaboration and reduction of redundancy, it can be foreseen that the costs of the ‘Custodian operations’ on a global level may well decrease. The costs of the CG role will differ by crop. Rough estimates of these costs should be presented in an appendix possibly reflecting different scenarios. If inefficient custodial operations of in-trust collections are identified, they should be reviewed, and solutions should be sought that might include relocation of responsibilities and/or operations to other CGIAR genebanks or outside the CGIAR system. The objective is, and should be, to organize a reliable and cost effective PGR conservation system involving and building on those that efficient operators can play a role in it, and avoiding inefficiencies.

**Recommendation 6**: The Sustainability Plan should be revised to more clearly reflect the future Custodian Role of the CGIAR genebanks in the conservation and use of PGR, within the context of a rational global system comprised of a collaborative network of national and international actors.

The Review Panel recognized that it is very difficult to make the comparable costing of custodianship activities across crops and Centres, and that different crops have different requirements in terms of inputs for maintenance. However, the Review Panel encourages further attempts to make transparent and realistic estimates of the true costs of conservation in the Centres using an agreed common baseline, taking into account that GPG1 took care of most facility costs to advance to the GPG2 Project. Input from the Directors Generals as to a common baseline for overhead costs associated with the institutional costs should be determined.

**Recommendation 7**: The Sustainability Plan should contain a robust estimation of costing of the Custodian Role of the Centers based on a transparent costing model.

A clear vision should also be presented for the CGIAR’s ‘Impact-focused operations’, recognizing that this concept is open-ended and scalable to any size. The possible role(s) of the CGIAR could be briefly presented, again stressing the collaborative elements allowing for
an increase of efficiency through partnerships in the global system. Partners in this collaboration (inside and outside the CGIAR) could include breeders (commercial, not-for-profit, and NARS) and scientists (agronomic, genomic, economic, social).

Given the importance of genetic resources for development and poverty reduction, and taking into account that climatic changes are causing losses of genetic diversity at the local level in rural communities and natural ecosystems where the many genebank accessions originated, the Review Panel stresses the importance to reflect in the Sustainability Plan the opportunity to restore the genetic resources conserved ex situ back to the rural communities and local environments, should the traditional farmers want or need them.

The process of developing the ‘Sustainability Plan’ with a broader perspective should result in a more realistic vision of the role of the CGIAR in the global efforts aimed at conserving PGRFA. To assure this, experts from outside the CGIAR should also be involved. (Much of this was elaborated in the Stripe Study of Genetic Resources in the CGIAR)

**Recommendation 8:** The Sustainability Plan should include a vision for the future role of the Centres in their ‘impact-focused operations’ that involve not only their genebanks, breeders and crop scientists, but also their enhanced interactions with NARS and other users.

### 2.5 Project Coordination

The GPG2 project proposal is of very high quality, both in terms of content and structure. The Review Panel recognizes that at the beginning of the implementation of the Project, the SGRP Secretariat was reduced in staff by the departure of the SGRP Coordinator and the Information and Communication Assistant. In addition, the first 6 months of implementation of GPG2 was coordinated by an interim Project Coordinator. The preparation of detailed workplans was done by the respective Activity and Sub-activity Coordinators and reviewed against the GPG2 project document by the ICWG-GR Executive Committee, (and particularly its chair, Dr Jean Hanson), whose ad hoc contribution is highly valued.

The Review Panel recognizes that the complexity of Outputs, Activities, Sub-Activities, and Tasks each with its associated coordinator, task forces, budgets and contracts, makes the overall management of this project a very complicated undertaking. The Project-level coordination of the Centre-Own and the Collective Activities is part of activities under the output 6 (Sub-activity 6.1.1) and was not budgeted separately. The Review Panel was impressed by the efforts of the project coordinator, despite staffing problems at the start of the project and the complexity of some of the Collective Activities, and would like to congratulate the SGRP Secretariat and the ICWG-GR Executive Committee on their performances.

Currently, the SGRP Secretariat is well organized, and doing a good job in the coordination of the GPG2 Project despite the (too) limited funding for coordination. The project management application (dotProject) that was created seems very efficient. Also, the project monitoring and self-evaluation appeared to be at an appropriate level. Therefore, the Review Panel wants to congratulate this team for its efforts. However, the Review Panel encourages the SGRP Secretariat to search for ways to create more resources for this coordination effort.

Communication and information exchange between and among all Activity and Sub-Activity Coordinators and all the Task Force members were rather limited due to the structure of the Project Plan and the many reports and surveys. The Review Panel hopes and trusts that this will improve as the newly developed SGRP website (www.sgrp.info) becomes operational and is used as an effective communication tool amongst the Project participants. It is expected that the Project management software application that has recently been made
available will also be used and consulted by all participants with a resulting increase in communication and efficiency across all the project Activities. However, ensuring fully effective communication within the Project can be expected to remain an issue that needs attention from SGRP since the complexity of the Project can not be reduced at this stage of its implementation.

**Recommendation 9:** In light of the volume of activities and structural complexity of this project, measures should be taken (including a possible budget revision) to provide additional support to the overall coordination to help ensure the delivery and quality of and increased accessibility to the GPG2 products, to improve internal communications, and facilitate the adoption and implementation of the other recommendations of this external review.

### 2.6 Financial Management

The Panel expresses its concern about the timeliness and distribution of GPG2 Project funds within Centres, and what appear to be weak System-wide monitoring methods (apart from its internal audits) to ensure that the Project’s funds are spent on the intended activities. For example, the Panel has gained the impression that genebank managers sometimes feel obliged to use GPG2 funds to replace shortfalls in their incoming budgets, and that they do not have sufficient control over their budgets. In addition, transaction costs associated with Centre and inter-Centre financial rules are too high (in part due to the large number of small contracts between SGRP and each of the Activities, and between many Activities and other implementation partners). This is of grave concern to the Review Panel, since it appears to also impact other, non-GPG2, genebank activities. This apparent fungibility problem needs to be solved given the general importance of all genebank activities, and the Review Panel recommends finding alternative funding mechanisms for the genebanks in the Centres.

The Global Crop Diversity Trust was established to provide, in perpetuity, a dedicated, sustainable funding window for the in-trust collections through its endowment fund. Until the endowment fund reaches its target goal to provide that funding, the Change Management Initiative, in establishing funding windows for the CGIAR, should realize the immense Global Public Goods value of the genetic resources collections held in-trust by the Centres and create a dedicated funding window to ensure their sustainability in the interim. It would seem prudent that the window addresses the CGIAR Centres’ essential Custodianship activities and their appropriate indirect and overhead costs, including system-wide coordination and information management. The Impact Focus funding component of SGRP would likely take two forms: first, the SGRP’s own Impact Focus activities at each Centre’s genebank and, second, the potential for mega-programs to support their Impact Focus activities of interest at the genebanks over and above the SGRP’s activities.

**Recommendation 10:** The Change Management Initiative should recognize the essential Global Public Goods value of the genetic resources collections held in-trust by the CGIAR, and establish a dedicated funding window to sustainably support the critically important genetic resources Custodianship and Impact Focused activities system-wide, across all the Centres holding these collections.

### 2.7 Recommendations to the Project’s Final External Review

- In order to maximize its potential, the final review process should be undertaken once the project’s activities are completed and final technical and financial reports are received at the SGRP Secretariat.
- It should be ensured that all recommendations made in this Mid-Term Review are addressed by the GPG2 Project team.
- Given the preliminary concerns in this report about the delivery and quality of the products, a critical review of GPG2 completed products should be made, taking into account justifiable changes in the approach that accommodate new insights gained during the Project.
- The quality and timely dissemination of Project products should be assessed by the final review.
- Internal financial audit reports commissioned by the Project and any external audit reports should be examined given the concerns raised in this review regarding the flow of GPG2 funds.
- The final review should examine at the Sustainability Plan as a periodically-updated, ongoing initiative and as a dynamic document.

2.8 Lessons Learned

- The strong personal commitment of the people involved tends to buffer most problem areas, including time planning and budgetary, allowing the project to achieve a successful outcome.
- Technical and financial progress reports should be produced (including financial audit reports) and studied by the review panel in advance to plan for possible site visits if judged necessary.
- Any future projects should include an overarching project coordination structure including a steering committee and a stakeholders/users advisory group.
- Adequate feedback from the main actors, including their commitment to accept agreed responsibilities, is an essential part of planning projects such as the GPG2 to ensure that their critical input is obtained and incorporated to avoid over-commitment.
- Accountability of key actors must be clearly established and assurance mechanisms compatible with the framework of a collaborative project defined.
- Milestones should be formulated according to a common base level of significance at the project proposal development stage. During the subsequent elaboration of work plans, the milestones should be assigned delivery dates.
- Project Coordination activities, including reporting, facilitating communication, assured quality and making and disseminating the products, need to be appropriately budgeted and staffed.
- At initial stages, following the proposal and preceding Project implementation, the implementation events should be appropriately defined in terms of budget and time so as to allow the development of detailed work plans. This is of crucial importance to ensure that realistic start/end dates, delivery of milestone products, and staff and budget allocations are properly analyzed and undertaken.
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Annex 1: Terms of Reference of the Review (excerpts)

World Bank-funded Project: “Collective Action for the Rehabilitation of Global Public Goods in the CGIAR Genetic Resources System: Phase 2” (GPG2)

Mid-Term External Review – Terms of Reference

GPG2 Project Monitoring and Evaluation
As specified in the GPG2 Project Proposal document, the Project will be subject to external reviews at mid-term, and again at the end of the project. Measures will be taken to ensure that the reviews be independent and unbiased. The CGIAR Secretariat, on behalf of the World Bank, will be involved in developing the Terms of Reference, in selection of the Review Panels, and in any other areas considered to be critical to success. Also, in support of its independence, the evaluation component of the Project is circumscribed as a separately budgeted Activity (6.5). Reports such as those generated from performance measurement and project monitoring will provide important inputs to the reviews. To help ensure that Centres learn from the reviews, self-assessments will be conducted as a part of the overall review process and will also provide input to the Review Teams. The SGRP Coordinator, the GPG2 Project Coordinator and other relevant personnel will serve as resource persons to the reviews. The mid-term external review will take place during 5 working days in October 2008.

1. Composition of the Mid-term External Review Panel
The Panel will consist of 3 external reviewers who have a broad knowledge and an in-depth understanding of the issues associated with the conservation and use of genetic resources for food and agriculture. In addition to their technical expertise in the areas of work under review, Panel members will also be selected based upon the following criteria:
- Research management experience in an international context, preferably from another CGIAR System-wide Programme and/or Challenge Programme
- Knowledge of the CGIAR genetic resources work, Center genebanks, and their collaboration through global partnerships
- Experience with the GPG1 Project’s final review (one member)
- Ability to act effectively as a member of a team
- Gender balance of the panel
- Balance between developed and developing country representatives on the panel

One of the 3 Panel members will serve as Panel Chair. The Chair will lead the Review Panel and ensure that the process is well organized to achieve the objectives of the review and meet the required milestones and deadlines. In addition to technical expertise, the Chair should have experience in organizing and managing teams and conducting programme evaluations. Conclusions and recommendations from the Review Panel will represent the views of the Panel, not the perspectives of individual Panel members. The SGRP Executive Committee (ExCom) may select one of its members to be an observer during the review. The ExCom observer is not considered to be a member of the Panel and thus shall not take an active part in the Panel’s deliberations. Questions of clarification should be directed to the GPG2 Project Coordinator. The Chair will make a presentation to the ExCom in October 2008 upon conclusion of the review, possibly via telephone or video conference, and respond to any questions the ExCom may have.

2. Review Process
The Panel will convene in Rome for a period of 5 working days in October 2008. The GPG2 Project Coordinator and the SGRP Secretariat will provide necessary logistic support, background documentation and other assistance to the Review Panel. Major activities of the Review Panel are as follows:
- a) The Panel will meet at the SGRP Secretariat, hosted by Bioversity International, in Rome, Italy
- b) The Panel will receive an orientation on the first day that will include the expectations of SGRP from the perspective of the ExCom, an overview of GPG2 project structure and activities and an overview of the issues upon which SGRP seeks input and recommendations from the Panel.
- c) The Panel Chair will prepare a plan for the review including:
  - detailing roles and responsibilities of individual Panel members
reviewing and finalizing the schedule of interactions with GPG2 Project partners and external parties including site visits as deemed necessary

- establishing milestones for the review process to enable completion of the report by the required deadline

- finalizing the panel report and preparing presentation back to the ExCom.

d) The Panel will:

- interact with GPG2 Activity Coordinators and Task Force Members through one-on-one or group interviews

- interview external parties to investigate stakeholder perspectives on GPG2 project outputs’ actual and potential contribution to the work being reviewed

- review supporting documentation, including technical and financial reports, staff and budget records, annual work plans, evaluation reports, and strategies relevant to the area under review.

e) The Panel will discuss its emerging conclusions with the ExCom for clarification and feedback to be taken into consideration in the final report.

f) The Panel will develop a comprehensive report that documents the conclusions reached from its deliberations, to be submitted for comment to the SGRP Secretariat and ExCom by the end of October, and the final version to the World Bank/CGIAR Secretariat by 15 November 2008.

3. Scope of the Mid-Term Review

The mid-term review should assess the progress of activities and outputs achieved during the first 20 months of the Project, i.e., the period from January 2007 to August 2008. The review should cover the main 3 components of GPG2: (1) Centre-Own upgrading activities, (2) Collective activities and (3) Project management and monitoring. The Panel will analyze both qualitative and quantitative evidence from presentations, interactions and background documentation, and deliberate to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the implementation of the GPG2 Project Activities and Sub-activities thus far, focusing on the following areas:

a) Progress since the completion of the GPG1 Project (2003-2007) and the impact of GPG2

b) Efficiency and effectiveness of the collective actions towards rationalization of activities and sharing of responsibilities for the conservation and use of PGRFA in terms of collaboration between Centres and with relevant NARS

c) Relevance and implementability of the Sustainability Plan for the long-term conservation and use of the CGIAR in-trust collections, and its potential impact in securing the resources for the custodianship operations. The Panel is expected to explore and make recommendations regarding the prospects of such plan in the context of the CGIAR Change Management Initiative.

d) Effectiveness of communication and information exchange between Activity Coordinators and Task Force members, and the overall Project coordination including the project monitoring and self-evaluation plan

e) Financial management and planning of the Project’s implementation

f) Recommendations on the key issues raised during the self-assessment exercise conducted prior to the mid-term review, and on issues and topics that should be evaluated at the Project’s final review in 2010.

The Review Panel’s report will present an assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the areas under review and present a concise set of recommendations for areas of future emphasis or action to improve the implementation and monitoring of the GPG2 project during its remaining 16 months of activity.

4. Inputs to the Mid-Term Review

The Mid-Term Review Panel will be provided with the following documents as key inputs:

a) GPG2 Project Proposal document of September 2006

b) GPG2 Year 1 Progress Report, submitted to the CG Secretariat on 30 June 2008

c) The CGIAR Genebanks Draft Sustainability Plan, as submitted to the CG Secretariat on 3 July 08

d) Documentation generated in implementing the performance measurement system in activity 6.4.2

e) Report from the project partners’ self-assessment

f) GPG1 Project Final Report, submitted to the CG Secretariat on 13 April 2007; and the report on the use of the carry-forward funds in 6 Centres submitted on 2 July 2008

g) GPG1 Project External Review document

h) Internal and external financial audits and reports, as available

i) Information on the CGIAR Change Management initiative (to be provided by the CGIAR Secretariat)
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 1967-79 Head, Eastern Wheat Research, DEKALB AgResearch, W. Lafayette, IN
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 1962-63 National Science Foundation Fellow, Svalöf, Sweden

HONORS
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    Programme 4: Bioinformatics and Crop Information Systems, part of the GCP Management Team
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    the management of the GCP.
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  ▪ ‘Establishment of an European Plant Genetic Resources Information Infra-Structure (EPGRIS)’
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  ▪ 'International Workshop on Application of Molecular Markers in Plants’ September 2002,
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    chairman)
  ▪ ‘XVIIIth EUCARPIA General Congress: Genetic variation for plant breeding’, September 2004,
    Tulln, Austria
• ‘International meeting "Genomics - based Plant Germplasm Research"’, April 2005, Beijing, China
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• ‘EURISCO Advisory Group’ (September 2003 - March 2008)
• UK project ‘GERMINATE’

Member ‘ECPGR Documentation and Information Network Coordinating Group’ (January 2004 – today)
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Annex 3: Documents consulted by the Review Team

Document Provided to the Panel before Rome:

1. GPG1 project proposal
2. GPG1 external review report
3. GPG1 2003-2006 final report
4. GPG1 2007 carry forward fund final report
5. GPG1 2003-2007 final summary report
6. GPG2 project proposal
7. GPG2 project proposal annexes
8. GPG2 year 1 progress report to the WB
9. List of contacts in GPG2 per activity and sub-activity
10. GPG2 mid-term self-assessment report
11. GPG2 mid-term review terms of reference
13. GPG2 mid-term evaluation report template for the panel

Document Provided on Monday 20 October:

14. GPG2 progress report from January-September 2008 – for the review panel
15. GPG2 progress Jan-Sept 2008 – Gantt charts
17. Power Point Presentation from Brigitte (overview of the GPG2 project)

Printed and copies available to the Panel in the Board Room:

18. External review panel’s discussions notes from Viktor Kommerell – Day 1-4
19. All of the 26 collective activity/sub-activity workplans for year 1
20. Contract (letter of agreement) between the SGRP Secretariat and Bioversity for the collective activity 2.1 on best practices
21. Contract (letter of agreement) between the SGRP Secretariat and ILRI for the collective activity 1.4.1 on safety-duplication guidelines
22. Contract (letter of agreement) between the SGRP Secretariat and ILRI for the centre-own upgrading activities 1.3.1 / 1.3.2 / 1.4.2 / 2.3.1
23. Contract (letter of agreement) between the SGRP Secretariat and Bioversity for the collective activity 2.1 on best practices
27. Global Conservation Strategy document for Musa

1. Brigitte Laliberté, GPG2 project Coordinator, SGRP Secretariat, Rome, Italy
2. David Williams, SGRP coordinator, SGRP Secretariat, Rome, Italy
3. Emile Frison, Director General, Bioversity International, Rome, Italy, Leader of SGRP
4. Toby Hodgkin, Director of the Global Partnerships Programme (GPP), Bioversity International, Rome, Italy
5. Pedro Ferreira, GPG2 Project Management and Communication Assistant, SGRP Secretariat, Rome, Italy
6. Viktor Kommerell, GPG2 / SGRP Consultant on the development of the sustainability plan, Hamburg, Germany
7. Tamara Bruce, Programme Assistant, SGRP Secretariat, Rome, Italy
8. Laura Vuerich, Planning Budget and Finance Assistant, Global Partnerships Programme, Bioversity International, Rome, Italy
9. Jean Hanson, Project Leader, Forage Diversity at ILRI, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Chair of the ICWG-GR, SGRP Executive Committee member, Activity Coordinator for the ILRI Centre-Own upgrading, Sub-activity Coordinator for safety duplication guidelines (1.4.1)
10. Tom Payne, Head of the Wheat Genetic Resources Unit at CIMMYT, Mexico, SGRP Executive Committee member, Activity Coordinator for the CIMMYT Centre-Own upgrading
11. Ruaraidh Sackville Hamilton, Head of the Genetic Resources Unit at IRRI, Philippines, SGRP Executive Committee member, Activity Coordinator for the IRRI Centre-Own upgrading
12. Manny Lantin, Science Advisor, CGIAR Secretariat at World Bank, Washington, USA
13. Harry Palmier, Senior Liaison Officer, CGIAR Secretariat at World Bank, Washington, USA
14. Su Ching Tan, Finance Associate, Information and Corporate Communications CGIAR Secretariat, hosted at the World Fish Centre, Penang, Malaysia
15. Ren Wang, CGIAR Director, CGIAR Secretariat at World Bank, Washington, USA
16. John Fitzsimon, CGIAR Internal Audit Unit (IAU) – Director
17. Cary Fowler, Executive Director, Global Crop Diversity Trust (hosted at FAO, Rome)
18. Jane Toll, Project Manager, Global System Project, Global Crop Diversity Trust (hosted at FAO, Rome)
19. Luigi Guarino, Senior Science Coordinator, Global Crop Diversity Trust (hosted at FAO, Rome)
20. Mellissa Wood, Director of Programme Development, Global Crop Diversity Trust (hosted at FAO, Rome)
21. Hannah Jaenicke, ICUC Director, GPG2 Activity 5.3 Coordinator
22. Ehsan Dulloo, Scientist, Bioversity International, GPG2 Activity 2.1 Coordinator
23. Derek Wheeler, Consultant to GPG2 web development
Annex 5: Reports on GPG2 Activity and Sub-activity Outputs

1.1.2.1 Through desk study and a workshop, develop recommendations for risk management framework/approach at Centre genebank level. Note - this will require close collaboration with Activity 2.1 Best Practices. If possible the workshop will be scheduled to coincide with another workshop for this project.
   ○ Provided by Brigitte and presented by John Fitzsimon on 22 Oct.

1.2.1.5 Develop a multi-crop guideline on state of the art of the development and application of in vitro techniques for the medium and long term storage of clonally propagated crops
   ○ Email to Nicolas Roux and back to office on 27 October

2.1.1.5 Undertake an analysis of germplasm management practices of target crops and prepare a background paper(s) [Further work planned under tasks: 2.1.1.8 and 2.1.1.9]
   ○ Discussed with Ehsan Dulloo and available on the Best Practices – http://kb.inibap.org

2.4.1.4 Decision-support tool for costing genebank operation – framework paper
   ○ Paper provided

2.4.1.7 Draft full methodology paper
   ○ Paper provided

2.4 Decision support tool
   ○ Excel Workbooks Excel files available on board room computer

3.3.1.5 Conduct workshop for representatives of lead Centers and few (3-5) major collections outside the CGIAR.
   ○ Report provided to Theo and also available on-line wiki.cgiar.org/sgrp/ - Crop registries workshop of May 2007 – meeting report

4.1.4.1 Develop an analysis protocol for basic eco-geographic gap identification for wild species
   ○ Requested by Email to Andy Jarvis – CIAT and document provided to the panel.

4.2.1.1 Collating information on existing phenotypic characterization strategies and standards on selected crops (Chickpea, Rice, Maize, Potato, Musa, Pigeon pea, Sorghum, agro-forestry species) from Centers.
   ○ Requested by Email to Hari Upadhyaya – ICRISAT and data provided to the panel.

4.2.2.2 Collate data sources, existing methods and tools used to analyze the data and assess diversity
   ○ Requested by Email to Hari Upadhyaya – ICRISAT and data provided to the panel.

5.3.2.3 Develop checklist/guidelines for assessing the benefits delivered to communities through particular research interventions Revised Task 5.3.2.03 - Develop suitability maps for all species in the GFU list of underutilized species based on parameters related to “climate” and “soil” using the basic ECOCROP approach
   ○ Skype discussion with Hannah Jaenicke, Director of ICUC (Task Leader – Andy Jarvis – CIAT)

6.1.1 Coordination, monitoring and reporting
   ○ Presentation from Pedro Ferreira on the GPG2 project management tool developed in DotProject http://gpg2pc.sgrp.cgiar.org/ Logon: guest Password: gpg2guest

6.1.1.7 Obtain progress reports for all activities and produce consolidated annual report for submission to donor in early 2008
   ○ Year 1 GPG2 progress report to the CG secretariat at the World Bank – June 2008

6.1.2.2 Determine the architecture of the SGRP website and contents outline

6.1.2.5 Develop website content and design. Launch and market the site.
   ○ NEW site demo by Derek Wheeler on 22 Oct. www.sgrp.info

6.1.2.7 Contribute to the development of project sustainability plan

6.3.1.2 Through correspondence, design survey of genebank staff desired and current skill set; carry out survey and analyze results.

6.4.2 Performance Measurement Indicators
   ○ Paper provided

6.5.1.4 Conduct genebank self-assessments / SWOT during ICWG-GR meeting

6.5.1.5 Organize and conduct mid-term review