SDR/TAC:IAR/00/19

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

# DRAFT REPORT OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHT MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC SECRETARIAT

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

September 2000

# DRAFT REPORT OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHT MEETING

# OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Table of Contents


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| **SUMMARY** | | v |
| | Opening Session | v |
| | CGIAR 2010: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR | vi |
| | CGIAR Research Agenda 2001-2003: Medium Term Plans | vi |
| | External Programme and Management Reviews | vii |
| | a) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of WARDA | vii |
| | b) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of ICARDA | vii |
| | c) Second External Programme and Management Review of IWMI | vii |
| | Report from Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) | viii |
| | Future Reviews | viii |
| | • External Programme and Management Reviews | viii |
| | • Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies | viii |
| | • Follow-up of First ILRI EPMR | ix |
| | Future Meetings | ix |
| | Other Business | ix |
| **RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS** | | 1 |
| | **Opening Session (Agenda Item 1)** | 1 |
| | **CGIAR 2010: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR (Agenda Item 2)** | 1 |
| | **CGIAR Research Agenda 2001-2003: Medium Term Plans (Agenda Item 3)** | 8 |
| | **External Programme and Management Reviews (Agenda Item 4)** | 9 |
| | a) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of WARDA | 9 |
| | TAC Commentary on the WARDA EPMR | 12 |
| | b) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of ICARDA | 16 |
| | TAC Commentary on the ICARDA EPMR | 19 |
| | c) Second External Programme and Management Review of IWMI | 21 |
| | TAC Commentary on the IWMI EPMR | 23 |

Page

**Report from Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) (Agenda Item 5)** 27

**Recent Reviews (Agenda Item 6)** 27

- External Programme and Management Reviews 27
- Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies 27
- Follow-up to First ILRI EPMR 27

**Future Meetings (Agenda Item 7)** 28

**Other Business (Agenda Item 8)** 28

**ANNEXES**

**Annex 1: List of Participants**

**Annex 2: Agenda**

**Annex 3: List of Documents**

**CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH**

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**TAC 78**

**The World Bank, Paris – 27-31 March 2000**

# REPORT OF THE MEETING

## SUMMARY

## Opening Session

The TAC Chair, Dr. Emil Javier, opened the meeting of TAC 78 by welcoming the twelve TAC Members present and acknowledging apologies received from Drs. Michael Cernea (Romania) and Hirofumi Uchimiya (Japan), He then noted with appreciation the presence of the Chairs, respectively, of the CGIAR Finance Committee, Centre Board Chairs Committee, and Centre Directors Committee; Ravi Tadvalkar and Shey Tata representing the CGIAR Secretariat; several Centre Directors General and Board Chairs; External Review Panel Chairs; observers from Germany, France, Italy, Netherlands, Thailand, and United States; and staff of the TAC Secretariat. He announced that Chairman Ismail Serageldin would join the meeting for Agenda Item 2. Finally, he introduced two new TAC Members: Drs. Hans Gregersen (United States) and Vo-Tong Xuan (Vietnam). The report of TAC 77 was adopted without amendments. There were no matters arising from the report of TAC 77. The provisional agenda for TAC 78 was adopted without amendments.

On behalf of the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR, Mr. Tadvalkar reported on major developments in the System since ICW'99. Highlights included planning for the April meeting of Consultative Council, FAO, Rome, which would consider TAC's draft CGIAR 2010 Vision and Strategy paper and for MTM'00, Dresden, which would consider the final draft of that paper, the EPMRs of ICARDA, IWMI and WARDA, and the CGIAR 2001 Research Agenda and initial proposals for 2003. Mr. Tadvalkar also briefed TAC on the activities of other CGIAR Committees, new senior appointments by Cosponsors, Centres and Boards, membership developments, and efforts to secure longer term financing. CGIAR funding for 2000 was projected to be on target at $340 million.

## CGIAR 2010: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR

TAC deliberated on the first draft of a paper outlining a new CGIAR Vision and Strategy toward 2010, prepared following the special TAC meeting of 25-27 January 2000 and the joint meeting with Centre Directors. It recommended that the System adopt as its mission the achievement of sustainable food security and poverty reduction in developing countries through scientific research and research-related activities in the fields of agriculture, forestry, fisheries, policy, and environment. A strategy comprising six elements was advanced to realise this mission: sharply focusing System activities on the reduction of poverty, hunger, and malnutrition in developing countries; bringing modern science to bear on difficult productivity and institutional problems that have proven intractable in the past; giving highest priority to the research needs of South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa where poverty is concentrated and growing; adopting a regional approach to research planning and poverty reduction in order to better address the heterogeneous nature of poverty; diversifying and closely integrating partnerships; and adopting, under certain circumstances, a task force approach to the organization and delivery of CGIAR products and services.

The draft paper was debated with CGIAR stakeholders attending TAC 78. TAC's Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies will prepare a second draft of the paper for consideration by the CGIAR Consultative Council at a special meeting on 10-11 April 2000 at FAO, Rome. Subsequently, TAC will prepare a third draft of the document for consideration by the Group at MTM'00.

## CGIAR Research Agenda 2001-2003: Medium Term Plans

TAC considered proposals from the 16 CGIAR Centres for the 2001 Research Agenda and initial proposals for 2003 in the context of CGIAR priorities and Centre Medium-Term Plans for the period 2001-2003. The Committee then prepared a report to the Group providing an overview of the criteria used in its analysis, highlights and evaluations of Centre proposals, and an analysis of the implications of the proposals for CGIAR priorities. Overall, TAC noted that shifts in programmatic emphasis from the already endorsed 2001 plans were justified in terms of the criteria applied. The Committee found that projections to 2003 were, in most cases, largely consistent with established guidelines. As in the past, some individual Centre shares of the CGIAR Research Agenda diverged from Group-endorsed levels, allocations to CGIAR outputs were significantly off target in the case of germplasm improvement and strengthening NARS, and proposals for sectors were not always on trend toward endorsed levels, particularly for livestock and water. TAC noted that while rice and wheat continued to be oversubscribed in 2001, new plant types currently under development for both crops as well as development of interspecific rice varieties offered potential for breaking yield ceilings in the medium-term.

The TAC Chair will present TAC's report to the Group at MTM'00. It should be read in conjunction with the document prepared by the CGIAR Secretariat on *The Financial Requirements of the 2001 CGIAR Research Agenda.*

## External Programme and Management Reviews

### a) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of WARDA

The report of the Fourth EPMR of WARDA was discussed at TAC 78 in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Mandi Rukuni, the Chair and Chair-designate, respectively, of WARDA's Board of Trustees, Drs. Just Faaland and Lindsay Innes, and the Director General of WARDA, Dr. Kanayo Nwanze. TAC accepted the report subject to a revision to incorporate a new section on the Center's Mission, Strategy and Priorities. The Committee agreed, in general, with the recommendations of the panel and prepared a commentary for consideration by the CGIAR at MTM'00. TAC concurred with the Panel's positive assessment of the quality and relevance of science conducted by the Centre as reflected, for example, in the development of interspecific rice varieties. TAC also shared the panel's view that WARDA had successfully crafted partnerships for greater effectiveness and efficiency, but that it needed to strengthen its capacity to monitor and assess impact. The Committee agreed that expansion of WARDA's mandate to East, Central and Southern Africa should be treated cautiously and was conditional on resources, demand, and the role of IRRI. In TAC's view, the unique character of WARDA's regional model presented opportunity for drawing lessons on how small centres could be cost-effective in harnessing good science to the problems of small-holder farmers in low-income, food-deficit countries. TAC observed that underlying this success was the strong sense of ownership by the stakeholders that created accountability.

### b) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of ICARDA

The report of the Fourth EPMR of ICARDA was discussed at TAC 78 in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Donald Plucknett, the Chair of ICARDA's Board of Trustees, Dr. Robert D. Havener, and the Director General of WARDA, Dr. Adel El Beltagy. TAC endorsed, in general, the recommendations of the panel and prepared a commentary for consideration by the CGIAR at MTM'00. The Panel found that ICARDA had undergone an impressive transformation in its programmes and strategies since its last EPMR. Its mission continued to be appropriate and its germplasm enhancement and genetic resources research programmes were considered to be of world-class quality. TAC shared the panel's view that ICARDA should consolidate and focus its activities primarily on the CWANA region. It also agreed with the need to develop a strategy for the natural resources management programme and to improve the quality of social sciences research. ICARDA was commended for the effectiveness of its partnerships, the innovative nature and quality of its collaboration with NARS, and the standing of its subregional strategy and programmes. Nevertheless, TAC was concerned about the limited impact of the cereal and legume programmes and encouraged the Centre to conduct impact studies of its major technologies. With adequate attention to the issues raised by the review, ICARDA would be well positioned to effectively address the challenges of agricultural development in the CWANA region. TAC recommended that Members of the CGIAR continue to provide strong support to the Centre.

### c) Second External Programme and Management Review of IWMI

The Report of the Second EPMR of IWMI was discussed at TAC 78 in the presence of the panel Chair, Dr. Michel Petit, the Chair of IWMI's Governing Board, Dr. Klaas Jan Beek, and IWMI Deputy Directors General, Drs. Douglas Merrey and David Governey. TAC endorsed, in general, the recommendations of the panel and prepared a commentary for consideration by the CGIAR at MTM'00. TAC was pleased to note that a major transformation had occurred at

IWMI over the last six years . Of note was the panel's positive assessment of the quality and international acceptance of the science conducted at IWMI. TAC commended the Centre and, in particular, its outgoing Director General for these achievements. At the same time, the Committee endorsed the panel's recommendations that IWMI strengthen its priority setting and impact assessment processes, its mechanisms for monitoring the quality of its science, and its collaboration with CGIAR Centres and NARS. TAC concurred that IWMI was now well positioned to provide research leadership on issues related to improved management of water resources for the benefit of present and future generations. It recommended continued strong support from the CGIAR Members for IWMI and its work on water management related issues.

## Report from Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)

Dr. Hans Gregersen, former Chair of IAEG and present Chair of TAC's Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA), reported on the integration of IAEG and TAC which became effective on 1 January 2000. He also introduced a paper that briefed TAC on progress of SPIA impact studies and that outlined future workplans. IAEG had started its work in 1996 by undertaking a baseline review of Centres' impact assessment and evaluation activities as an aid to setting its work priorities and building capacity in these areas. It had also organized a workshop that involved all stakeholders. SPIA's current portfolio included impact assessments and evaluations of CGIAR activities in the areas of germplasm improvement, integrated pest management; implications of CGIAR innovations on the environment; contributions of agricultural research to poverty alleviation; training and strengthening national scientific capacity; and use of logframes for impact assessment. A major state of the art paper on impact assessment in agricultural research had also been prepared. SPIA was also organizing a workshop involving Centre representatives, CGIAR stakeholders and outside experts that would be held from 3-5 May 2000 at FAO on the future of impact assessment in the CGIAR. A synthesis of the findings of the germplasm improvement impact project would be presented at MTM'00.

## Future Reviews

- **External Programme and Management Reviews**

The Committee considered progress in the implementation of the Fifth EPMR of CIAT which will be discussed at TAC 79 and ICW'00; planning for the Fifth EPMR of IITA which will be considered at TAC 81 and ICW'01; and the planning and organisation of the Fifth EPMR of CIP to be conducted in 2001-2002.

- **Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies**

TAC reviewed progress in implementing the Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies in the CGIAR as endorsed by the Group at MTM'99. The review is assessing the use of various crop improvement methodologies in the CGIAR, with special emphasis on the integration of biotechnology. It is being chaired by Dr. Donald Duvick (USA). A number of sub-panels had visited the nine CGIAR Centres involved in crop improvement activities. A questionnaire survey provided background information for their visits. The reports of the sub-panels, which were currently being completed, provided detailed information on the state-of-the-art of plant

breeding and biotechnology in the CGIAR and on the nature of the strategic partnerships involved. The recommendations would assist Centres in bringing modern science to bear on difficult productivity problems. The final report of the review would be considered at TAC79 and ICW'00

- **Follow-up to First ILRI EPMR**

TAC reviewed the extent of ILRI's progress in implementing the recommendations of the Centre's First EPMR and of TAC's Commentary on the review report. The Committee found that the Centre had produced a Board-approved Strategic Plan and had satisfactorily taken actions on other EPMR recommendations.

## Future Meetings

TAC reconfirmed dates and venues for the following meetings:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| TAC 79 | IITA, Ibadan | 25-29 September 2000 |
| TAC 80 | ICARDA, Aleppo | 26-30 March 2001 |
| TAC 81 | CIFOR, Bogor | 24–28 September 2001 |
| TAC 82 | CIP, Lima | March 2002 |

## Other Business

The Committee considered two CDC presentations concerning, respectively, CGIAR Strategy for Central Asia and the Caucasus (ICARDA), and Strategy for the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa (ILRI). It also considered SGRP's proposed Genebank Investment Plan (IPGRI). The Committee formulated comments on these presentations and shared them with those concerned.

# RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS

## Opening Session (Agenda Item 1)

1. The TAC Chair, Dr. Emil Javier, opened the meeting of TAC 78 by welcoming the eleven TAC Members present and acknowledging apologies received from Drs. Michael Cernea (Romania) and Hirofumi Uchimiya (Japan), He then noted with appreciation the presence of the Chairs, respectively, of the CGIAR Finance Committee, Centre Board Chairs Committee, and Centre Directors Committee; Ravi Tadvalkar and Shey Tata representing the CGIAR Secretariat; several Centre Directors General and Board Chairs; External Programme and Management Review Panel Chairs; observers from Germany, France, Italy, Netherlands, Thailand, and United States; and staff of the TAC Secretariat. He announced that Chairman Ismail Serageldin would join the meeting for Agenda Item 2. Finally, he introduced two new TAC Members, Drs. Hans Gregersen (United States) and Vo-Tong Xuan (Vietnam), and TAC Member-designate, Dr. Oumar Niangado (Mali). The report of TAC 77 was adopted without amendments. There were no matters arising from the report of TAC 77. The provisional agenda for TAC 78 was adopted without amendments.

2. On behalf of the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR, Mr. Tadvalkar reported on major developments in the System since ICW'99. Highlights included planning for the April meeting of Consultative Council, FAO, Rome, which would consider TAC's draft CGIAR 2010 Vision and Strategy paper and for MTM'00, Dresden, which would consider the final draft of that paper, the EPMRs of ICARDA, IWMI and WARDA, and the CGIAR 2001 Research Agenda and initial proposals for 2003. Mr. Tadvalkar also briefed TAC on the activities of other CGIAR Committees, new senior appointments by Cosponsors, Centres and Boards, membership developments, and efforts to secure longer term financing. CGIAR funding for 2000 was projected to be on target at $340 million.

## CGIAR 2010: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR (Agenda Item 2)

3. TAC deliberated on the first draft of a paper outlining a new CGIAR Vision and Strategy toward 2010, prepared following the special TAC meeting of 25-27 January 2000 and the joint meeting with Centre Directors. It recommended that the System adopt as its mission the achievement of sustainable food security and poverty reduction in developing countries through scientific research and research-related activities in the fields of agriculture, forestry, fisheries, policy, and environment. A strategy comprising six elements was advanced to realise this mission: sharply focusing System activities on the reduction of poverty, hunger, and malnutrition in developing countries; bringing modern science to bear on difficult productivity and institutional problems that have proven intractable in the past; giving highest priority to the research needs of South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa where poverty is concentrated and growing; adopting a regional approach to research planning and poverty reduction in order to better address the heterogeneous nature of poverty; diversifying and closely integrating partnerships; and adopting, under certain circumstances, a task force approach to the organisation and delivery of CGIAR products and services.

4. The draft paper was introduced by the TAC Chair and debated with CGIAR stakeholders attending the meeting. Following are highlights of comments from Centre Directors, Board Chairs, and Members:

*General Comments on "A Food Secure World for All: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR in 2010"*

5. Concern was generally expressed that the timetable approved at ICW'99 to develop the new CGIAR vision and strategy had been unrealistic in terms of the need for in-depth analysis of programmatic and structural issues and broad-based stakeholder consultation. However, the potential gains from extending the timetable had to be weighed against the risks of donor withdrawal from the System unless these issues were addressed quickly.

6. The devolution of centre responsibilities to NARS should follow a selective approach based on the strengths of individual national systems. The process should ensure continuity of centre involvement in planning and priority setting and provision of the margin of support necessary to ensure the internationality of devolved research. For certain areas such as natural resources management research, responsibility should be shared by national and international organisations using a consortium or task force approach. The strategic goal of devolution should be to increase the involvement of NARS in global agricultural research rather than to partition national and international responsibilities.

7. To adequately identify the CGIAR's target group of poor beneficiaries, it would be preferable to use a combination of income and social indicators rather than a single income indicator. UNDP's human development and human poverty indices could be used to complement the World Bank's $1 per day income indicator to help specify the regional weighting of CGIAR activities in terms of the incidence of poverty.

8. The causes of poverty were both technical and non-technical (i.e., political, social, and institutional). While the CGIAR's technical research had contributed directly and indirectly to poverty reduction, the scope for research impact on the non-technical causes of poverty had yet to be addressed. In this context, it was emphasised that as agricultural research was only one instrument for poverty reduction, it was necessary to maintain a cohesive research agenda to maximise the System's impact where it had comparative advantage.

9. The proposed vision, goal, and mission statement should include protection of the "environment" as a CGIAR objective contributing to sustainable food security. Given the global impact of agriculture on the environment, it would seem advisable to identify this objective explicitly rather than to subsume it under the concept of "sustainability."

10. Natural resources management work, like that on genetic resources improvement, had upstream and strategic dimensions giving it the character of an international public good. While it was necessary to adapt NRM outputs to regional conditions, the global nature of this work should be recognised in TAC's proposed strategic framework.

11. The structure implicit in TAC's vision and strategy was one of global centres developing and supplying international public goods and regional centres tailoring those goods to needs at the regional level. The institutional feasibility of this structure was questioned as it appeared to break the chain of technology development and delivery. It would be preferable to charge the same entity with responsibility for both research and

partnerships on the basic science side and for adaptation and partnerships on the technology delivery side. The CDC favoured much stronger priority setting at the regional level to enhance the relevance of CGIAR research but did not believe this was a rationale for regional centres.

12. Any consideration of CGIAR structure should distinguish between institutional arrangements appropriate to efficiency as opposed to effectiveness. It may be that the CGIAR's level of effectiveness or impact could be greater if it had more suitable mechanisms to promote efficiency. An analysis of System efficiency and the potential for improving it therefore logically preceded any decisions changing overall structure.

*Comments on Chapter 1: Context*

13. It was suggested that analysis was needed of the implications of changes in the global context for the CGIAR's clientele (millions of small farmers and the poor); the issue of how the System should re-position itself to meet future challenges and opportunities should be addressed in the light of such an analysis.

*Comments on Chapter 2: The CGIAR Today*

14. The GFAR was said to have the potential for becoming the major forum for global agricultural research. In formulating its vision and strategy, the CGIAR should identify the kind of global structure it wishes to see for agricultural research and its own role within that context. However, it was also argued that, to be effective, the CGIAR Centres needed to collaborate with many different research organisations from regional to sub-regional and national levels.

*Chapter 3: Evolving Trends in the External Environment*

15. Globalisation, particularly trade liberalisation, had significant implications for international agricultural research since countries that opened their markets for food commodities shared (via lower prices) the benefits of agricultural productivity increases with the rest of the world's consumers, including those in developed countries. These effects might give incentive for providing resources for international agricultural research. However, it was also noted that subsidized food imports by developing countries had negative impacts on small producers.

*Chapter 4: Future Challenges*

16. Poverty reduction needed to be conceptualised in broader terms than income indicators. The social and institutional determinants of poverty also needed to be addressed in order to facilitate a variety of poverty exit strategies. Productivity enhancing technologies were only one tool for empowering the poor to lift themselves out of poverty.

17. Although irrigation was seen as a future challenge, an explicit analysis was needed of the magnitude, types, and location of irrigation that would be warranted for future agricultural development, taking into account potential environmental impacts. The issue of access to water both for productive and human uses should also be addressed. These issues were matters of serious debate at the recent World Water Forum and should figure in the CGIAR's assessment of future challenges.

*Chapter 5: Vision, Goals and Mission for the CGIAR in 2010*

18. It was noted that the mission statement's treatment of natural resources management implied that the CGIAR would not engage in NRM research for environmental purposes, but only to achieve sustainable food security and reduce poverty. This point had been made more explicitly in the Summary section of the document and represented a major departure from CGIAR policy. Concern was expressed that, if this change were agreed, the consequences for CGIAR funding could be negative given donor emphasis on environmental protection. Moreover, there were technical reasons for adopting a more balanced approach since healthy ecologies and healthy agriculture were highly interrelated. It was acknowledged that there was lack of consensus on this issue within the CDC.

*Chapter 6: Setting CGIAR Priorities for 2010*

19. In setting new priorities for the CGIAR, it would be necessary to identify activities that would be phased out or no longer pursued. The CDC believed it would only be possible to identify such activities after regional prioritisation had been agreed. It would then be possible for centres to identify opportunities for reducing research and related activities that did not contribute to CGIAR objectives in regions of priority.

20. Successfully devolving or sharing research responsibilities with NARS depended on the effectiveness of the national systems rather than their relative size. Thus, it would preferable for the vision statement (section 6.5) to specify strength or effectiveness of NARS as criteria for sharing responsibilities with them. In this context, it should be recognised that the elements comprising national systems varied in degree of effectiveness (e.g., technology development vs. policy advice) which, in turn, influenced the kinds of research to be devolved. Finally, it was re-emphasised that whether large or small, weak or strong, all NARS were partners together with the CGIAR in the global agricultural research system and stood to contribute to, as well as to gain from, that system.

21. The CGIAR's global advocacy role for agricultural research needed greater emphasis in the vision statement. The System's links to the international conventions affecting agriculture, its integral relationship to global action plans concerning genetic resources for food and agriculture, and its ability to influence policy decisions affecting the allocation of resources for international agricultural research needed to be articulated more strongly in its vision and strategy.

22. While a sharper focus on integrated natural resources management research was envisioned, the emphasis appeared to be mainly on biophysical processes in the context of the natural landscape. It was necessary as well that INRM research take into account the cultural context, i.e., the infrastructure and institutions, which interacted with the natural environment.

23. It was acknowledged that the list of proposed specific themes (section 6.4.1) to be addressed by the CGIAR towards 2010 lacked aggregation and prioritisation. It was, therefore, agreed that representatives of TAC and CDC would jointly review and revise these themes with a view to developing a strategically focused research agenda closely linked to the proposed mission statement.

*Chapter 7: A Proposed Operational Strategy Towards 2010*

24. The feasibility of the proposal that the research agendas of "global" centres would be partly set by the demands of "regional" centres was questioned. It was necessary to ensure that the conduct of "high science" was not confined to global centres while regional centres had a more applied/adaptive role. This risked disconnecting global research from regional needs and lowering the quality of science conducted at the regional level. The CDC believed that while improved regional priority setting was needed, the structural implications of this objective should be considered in the second phase of the vision exercise. It was, therefore, premature to propose both the concept of global and regional centres and the allocation of resources between these entities.

25. The proposed regional approach to research planning and implementation would require governance mechanisms, networks, and partnerships whose transactions costs had not yet been estimated but which would, based on experience with Systemwide programmes, be difficult to fund and operate. The approach also risked involving centres at the regional level in non-research activities (i.e., technical assistance) in which they lacked comparative advantage. It would be more efficient to strengthen the capacity of emerging regional research organisations to utilise global science, rather than create new regional structures within the CGIAR.

26. Strategically, the choice appeared to be between TAC's recommended structure of global and regional centres versus a system of global centres operating regionally. While it was perhaps not necessary to operationalise these alternatives in a strategy document, it was felt that both required further analysis to facilitate the CGIAR's consideration of structural options.

*Chapter 8: Special Decade-Long Effort for NARS in Transition*

27. In recommending that the CGIAR's operational objective be to lift most, if not all, of 1.2 billion poor people out of poverty, TAC recognized that some 82 percent of this population group were located in eleven countries. The latter had fairly well developed NARS owing to investments by the countries themselves and to heavy CGIAR investments in NARS training and institutional capacity building over the last two decades. If these systems could be made more effective, then the magnitude of the challenge could be more easily managed.

28. Question was raised as to whether NARS generally had grown in strength sufficiently to accept responsibility for conducting research currently undertaken by international centres. It was argued that despite the increasing capacity of some national systems, the overall strength of NARS was uneven and some programmes were actually in decline. Even in those cases where NARS seemed strong enough to accept responsibility for international research, experience suggested that lack of commitment to poverty reduction, inherent institutional weaknesses, and national political instability lessened their chances of success. Finally, regional political realities, especially trade competition, could adversely affect the leadership of a national programme at regional level. If a special programme to strengthen NARS were put in place, it was suggested that it focus on low-income food-deficit countries rather than the larger countries.

*Concluding Discussion*

29. Based on TAC's consideration of the foregoing discussion, TAC Member Alain de Janvry summarised for participants the Committee's tentative conclusions with respect to the first phase of the visioning exercise. The conclusions were premised on the view that the CGIAR was a dynamic system that had evolved as a set of highly complex centres that were partially coordinated. The System was now challenged by a powerful set of new opportunities deriving from new science, trends in external environments, emergence of new institutions/actors, and changes in the nature of poverty, food insecurity, and the natural resource context. Given these changes, there were significant net gains for the System as a whole to be realised by adjusting the CGIAR's programme to a new vision of the future.

30. Six areas of change influencing the CGIAR's future vision and strategy were identified:

i. Certain types of research activities - e.g., molecular biology, mathematical simulation of natural systems, information and communications technologies - had potential for large economies of scale through consolidation. These activities had high fixed costs and did not attach to a particular physical environment. Their location was a function of the creativity of the research rather than the immediate use of its products. Further, these activities cut across commodities/crops, required a critical mass of scientists, and called for new forms of partnership particularly with the private sector but also with universities and Northern platforms. With appropriate leadership, this research could be expected to provide the scientific basis for quantum leaps in productivity in both favourable and marginal lands, the development and delivery of new genetic traits of importance to the poor not only as producers but consumers, and more effective instruments for natural resources management.

ii. Given the heterogeneity of poverty, decentralising the CGIAR's research activities with a strong regional focus would permit the System to customise its products to the location-specific needs of the poor, drawing upon information accessible only at the grass roots level through the participation of local agents. Technologies would thus be tailored much more specifically to particular users, opening up new horizons for productivity gains, stronger impact on poverty, and better natural resources management. The heterogeneity of poverty would be addressed by comprehensive, multi-partner approaches involving an explicit division of labour between actors. The CGIAR would be linked more closely to other agents in the field of international development as well as to local governments, NGOs, and grass roots organisations. A regional development focus would create new opportunities for rural development to promote poverty reduction and extend the benefits of scientific "micro-revolutions" to regions less benefited by earlier technological advances in agriculture. In addition to new, more sustainable productivity gains in marginal lands and peasant farming systems, the approach would promote greater ownership of programmes through the participation of local actors, greater accountability deriving from the participation of the agents involved, more direct response to demand-led initiatives in research and delivery, and better coordination and division of labour with relevant actors in the regions. Regions could be defined in ecoregional as well as territorial terms to capture not only their biophysical characteristics but also their institutional and governance dimensions; both kinds of constraints had to be dealt with to come to grips more effectively with the problems of productivity and poverty.

iii. The CGIAR needed to be able to deliver quickly when it faced situations where there were crises to be managed or new opportunities to be seized. TAC proposed a task force approach for rapid, coordinated responses to these situations. The world's poor were increasingly vulnerable to phenomena like climate change, natural catastrophes, epidemics, and political transitions which often resulted in irreversible loss of capital assets - natural, financial, and human. There was need for the CGIAR to mobilise resources within its capacity to deal with these kinds of situations. Task forces would facilitate rapid responses by, for example, quickly testing in pilot form new scientific advances that would prevent irreversibility

iv. The partners with whom CGIAR traditionally worked were changing. Many of the NARS in particular could and would become integral partners in the global agricultural research system, resulting in a redefinition of the division of labour between the CGIAR and the NARS. While some national programmes were becoming stronger, others were deteriorating. The System needed to ensure that strong NARS assumed partnership roles in global agricultural research. As roles were transferred to local agents, the CGIAR would need to reinvent itself within the new division of labour. In the longer run, the System could be expected to focus increasingly on core international functions, while other functions were assumed by the NARS.

v. Compared to earlier years, the CGIAR had become increasingly dispersed, in part, in response to opportunities that had emerged in a diffuse way. There would be benefits from having a coordinated priority-setting mechanism to integrate global and regional activities and pursue in a more systematic fashion priorities that mobilised the System as a whole. The problem of dispersion within the CGIAR needed to be redressed through economies of scale in the delivery of research to achieve greater impact. More consolidated approaches that could sustain large-scale enterprises with significant time horizons would provide donors with better options for resource allocation in the expectation that these initiatives would result in new rounds of major achievements complementing centre-specific types of research.

vi. There were new opportunities for the CGIAR to work more cost-effectively than before through better Systemwide coordination, partnering, and use of new information and communications technologies to realise a new round of efficiency gains in research consistent with the CGIAR's mission. The expectation here would be improved products, faster delivery, and cost reduction.

31. Following Dr. de Janvry's summation of TAC's thinking, stakeholders made the following points/observations:

32. The vision's conceptual integration of global challenges and regional specificities was commended as a sensible approach. The fact that the challenges TAC had identified were aimed not only at the centres but the broader group of CGIAR stakeholders was considered key to the vision's successful implementation. However, concern was expressed that the System's work at the regional level, as framed by the vision, would depend significantly on the construction of regional development plans in partnership with other development agents. The magnitude, complexity, and costs of such planning would be high and could delay or impede implementation of CGIAR programmes.

33. Two CGIAR Members expressed caution on the global/regional dimensions of TAC's proposed vision. The full implications of their implementation could not now be known. Therefore ownership of the new vision by CGIAR investors in the longer run could not be predicted with certainty. Moreover, there were drawbacks to having programmes with too strong a regional identity: the relevance of research beyond the region of origin might be problematic, and decentralised governance could prove to be a formidable problem. Conversely, one ought not to lose sight of the advantages of programmes having an international identity but working regionally. It was not necessarily a given that CGIAR priorities should be demand-driven; there was need to balance the research needs of regional and national partners with the objective of producing globally relevant research. Both Members cautioned that regional centres could not be funded by multilateral/global (i.e., core) resources, but only by regional/bilateral resources. The units within their respective agencies dispensing the latter funds tended not to finance long-term strategic research.

34. The CDC reiterated its position that creation of regional centres would erect a barrier between global centres and the national research programmes. It would be preferable to have a system of global centres with some having ecoregional responsibilities, thus ensuring the internationality of CGIAR research.

35. In concluding discussion of this Item, the Chair noted that TAC's Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies would prepare a second draft of the paper for consideration by the CGIAR Consultative Council at a special meeting on 10-11 April 2000 at FAO, Rome. Subsequently, TAC would prepare a third draft of the document for consideration by the Group at MTM'00.

## CGIAR Research Agenda 2001-2003: Medium Term Plans (Agenda Item 3)

36. TAC considered proposals from the 16 CGIAR centres for the 2001 Research Agenda and initial proposals for 2003 in the context of CGIAR priorities and centre Medium-Term Plans for the period 2001-2003. The Committee then prepared a report to the Group providing an overview of the criteria used in its analysis, highlights and evaluations of centre proposals, and an aggregate analysis of the implications of the proposals for CGIAR priorities at the centre, activity, commodity and sector levels, relying on data and analysis supplied by the CGIAR Secretariat.

37. Overall, TAC noted that shifts in programmatic emphasis from the already endorsed 2001 plans were justified in terms of the criteria applied. The Committee found that projections to 2003 were, in most cases, largely consistent with established guidelines. As in the past, some individual centre shares of the CGIAR Research Agenda diverged from Group-endorsed levels. The programmatic implications of divergences in proposed proportional allocations to activities in the 2001 Research Agenda were broadly similar to those noted in TAC's analysis of the 2000 agenda:

- a continuing shortfall in the proposed share of resources allocated to germplasm improvement, compared to the Group-endorsed level; this, at a time when new developments in molecular genetics offered opportunity for investment in breeding for

traits to overcome yield and productivity constraints in favourable and less favourable environments;

- a larger than endorsed share for strengthening NARS at a time when it was important for the CGIAR to rethink the geographic and thematic focus of its capacity strengthening, to devolve certain strategic activities to strong NARS, and to seek new, non-traditional national partners in key areas such as natural resources management;

- continued underinvestment in livestock research at a time when significant production increases would be needed to meet future livestock demand by 2020, given rapidly diversifying diets in the developing world;

- proposed investment in the water sector approaching target, but the actual and estimated outcomes for 1999 and 2000, respectively, still below it, at a time when lack of access to fresh water was rapidly becoming a key constraint to global food production requiring urgent attention to water management issues; and

- continued oversubscription to rice and wheat in an allocational sense, although new plant types currently under development for both crops as well as development of interspecific rice varieties offered potential for breaking yield ceilings in the medium-term.

38. TAC also called attention to the significant impacts the sudden reduction in member contributions had had on centre programmes. The MTPs of most centres showed not only drawdown of reserves, but shrinkage and delay of projects. New projects, in particular, had been delayed.

39. The TAC Chair would present TAC's report to the Group at MTM'00.

## External Programme and Management Reviews (Agenda Item 4)

### a) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of WARDA

40. The report of the Fourth EPMR of WARDA was discussed in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Mandi Rukuni, the Chair and Chair-designate, respectively, of WARDA's Board of Trustees, Drs. Just Faaland and Lindsay Innes, and the Director General of WARDA, Dr. Kanayo Nwanze.

41. Dr. Rukuni briefly summarized the main findings and recommendations of the review. The panel found that since its last review WARDA could be credited with two major achievements: the development of inter-specific rice hybrids which had won international scientific recognition, and the crafting of effective partnerships that promoted the centre's new mission which now addressed the food security needs of West and Central Africa directly. WARDA's scientific achievements were found to be well documented and spanned the areas of crop improvement, crop and natural resources management, integrated pest management, social sciences and post-harvest technology. The centre had also contributed to the human capital building and institutional development of its NARS partners, and engaged effectively in policy dialogue, partnerships, training and information dissemination. While the panel considered the potential impact of WARDA's work on food security, poverty reduction, and natural resource conservation to be quite high, it found that the centre's actual impacts had not

been sufficiently documented. In the panel's view, the growing importance of rice production and consumption in WCA justified continued investment by the CGIAR in international rice research to meet the needs of Sub-Saharan Africa. However, expansion of WARDA's activities to Eastern, Central and Southern Africa (ECSA) would require caution and informed judgement in building partnerships.

42. The panel found that WARDA's rainfed and irrigated rice programmes were well established and executing world class science. It recommended that greater emphasis be given to crop and natural resources management research since future gains on the yield gap would come from improved management. On irrigated rice, the panel felt that WARDA needed to go beyond the Sahel environment with emphasis on breeding for the humid and sub-humid zones. The centre's research on policy and technology transfer was quite limited in scope. It was recommended that a strategic, more coherent research agenda be developed to address issues of food security, post-harvest opportunities, sectoral policy, and seed marketing. Similarly, WARDA's social science research needed to focus strategically on the social and institutional constraints to technology adoption. The centre should also strengthen its capacity to monitor and assess the impact of its activities. Finally, the panel recommended that that the efficiency and effectiveness of managing research and partnerships be improved, and that the programme committee of the Board play a more active role in providing guidance and oversight to the centre in programme strategies and priority setting. The review concluded that WARDA was well positioned to contribute more towards a rice-based green revolution in WCA.

43. The Chair thanked Dr. Rukuni for his presentation and recognised Drs. Faaland and Nwanze who presented the response of the WARDA Board and management to the review.

44. WARDA found the panel's report to be clear, perceptive, constructively critical and helpful to the centre's future progress. Some of the review's suggestions and recommendations were already being wholly or partly implemented; others under review were dependent on available funding. The results of the review would also be taken into consideration in the development of WARDA's 2001-2010 strategic plan now in preparation.

45. In terms of specific recommendations, the centre agreed that impact assessment was a priority as reflected in existing projects to assess the impact of technologies developed by the centre; a full-time position would be allocated to impact assessment as soon as possible. The recommended priority to crop and resource management research for rainfed rice complemented the emphasis of the centre's current medium-term plan, although a balance with varietal improvement work would be maintained. WARDA welcomed the recommended expansion of its irrigated rice programme beyond the Sahel, noting that it was already addressing irrigated systems in all agro-ecological zones in the WCA region; a modest expansion in this programme was envisaged. The recommendation to develop a strategic agenda for policy support work was also endorsed; potential regional and international partners for this research were being identified. WARDA recognised the need for a more strategic focus on social and institutional constraints to technology adoption and had taken steps to strengthen these themes. On expanding to ECSA, the centre agreed that it should utilise its limited resources in the most cost effective and efficient manner, noting that the 21$^{st}$ Council of Ministers had recognised WARDA was already extending its mandate to this region through rice task forces and had encouraged the centre to do so. A joint mission with IRRI was planned to consult with NARS and sub-regional organisations in ECSA to explore how best to respond to the region's needs.

46. In the ensuing discussion, a number of observations, issues, and questions were raised concerning the findings and recommendations of the review and the centre's response:

- The panel's rcommendation that WARDA needed to document its impact better in the future was a convincing one. However, more specific guidance could have been provided to the centre on how to do this in a context of scarce resources. For example, independent assessments by other regional entities might be undertaken without drawing on WARDA's resources.

- The review had identified producers and consumers in West Africa as the beneficiaries of WARDA's research. A more disaggregated analysis was needed of the impact on women, given the importance of rice as a women's crop in the region. WARDA might wish to undertake such an analysis.

- Given WARDA's unique system of governance involving as it did not only a Board of Trustees but a regional Council of Ministers, what lessons might be drawn for the CGIAR System? For example, did the COM help to link the centre more directly to other CGIAR stakeholders such as FAO or the World Bank at the regional level?

- On expansion of WARDA's activities to other regions of Africa, both the panel and the centre had taken a cautionary position. Were there political constraints - e.g., at the level of the COM - which would prevent the centre from servicing other rice growing countries in Africa? As well, what criteria were applied by the panel in recommending on expansion vs. consolidation of WARDA's activities?

- Many rice growing countries in Africa grew other crops in a context of scarcity of labour and land. Increased productivity of rice, therefore, often came at the expense of these crops and vice versa. Was there scope for WARDA to develop science-based knowledge of non-rice crops and/or had the centre consulted with other CGIAR centres on this issue?

- Given the scientific importance of WARDA's development of inter-specific rice hybrids, it would be timely to have in place a very strong impact assessment programme so that the impact of these hybrids could be well documented.

- Although the review focused on the relationship between WARDA's rice breeding activities and those of its regional partners, there was little discussion of collaboration with IRRI and CIAT. The views of the panel and centre were sought on this question.

- In planning its future research on new technologies - e.g., for drought tolerance or blast resistance - did WARDA contemplate undertaking such work itself or via partnerships or even outsourcing? How did it calculate its competitive advantage?

- What lessons might be learned from WARDA's successful experience in transferring technologies to farmers fields? What effect had globalisation had on the process of technology transfer?

- It appeared that WARDA planned to conserve indigenous genetic resources exclusively by *ex situ* measures. If so, how would adaptation of these varieties to the environment be captured?

- Given the panel's critical assessment of WARDA's social science research, what was the feasibility of the centre's developing a more strategic agenda focused on social and institutional constraints to technology adoption?

- WARDA's regional/ecoregional mandate might serve as a model for a regional approach to implementing the CGIAR's mission. What lessons could be learned in terms of drawing upon new science produced outside the region and applying it to local problems? What institutional mechanisms were conducive to success?

47. In response to these questions and issues, Dr. Rukuni provided the Committee with the following information:

48. On the issue of impact assessment, the panel chair indicated that the policy support and technology transfer and systems development programmes could link their strategic research at regional level with the task forces working at country level. The latter included national programme scientists who would be better positioned to track impact using key indicators developed in collaboration with the above programmes. Dr. Rukuni agreed that rice production and consumption by the poor was growing in sub-Saharan Africa, but observed that disaggregated data on its impact on women's livelihood was not available. The panel's recommendation that WARDA undertake basic analysis on the role of rice in food security in poor households was designed, in part, to shed light on this question. The panel's caution on expansion to ECSA was based mainly on considerations of financial feasibility which was felt to be problematic and the assumption that if WARDA continued to perform well in West Africa, its research would have natural spillover effects for the rest to the continent. On the impact of globalisation on Africa's rice economy, Dr. Rukuni noted liberalisation of trade regimes had already stimulated importation of low quality "broken rice" into the region, although there was some evidence that higher quality locally produced rice was becoming more competitive. These trends underscored the growing importance of rice to the food security of the poor. The rationale for the panel's recommendation on social science research was to move WARDA away from policy matrix analyses toward more strategic understanding of the rice sector.

49. Given time limitations, the Chair requested WARDA to address the questions raised by the plenary discussion during the working group session for this EPMR. He brought discussion of this Item to a close, thanking Dr. Rukuni and the members of the panel for their report, as well as Drs. Faaland and Nwanze for their contributions.

50. After further consideration and discussion in the working group, TAC offered the following commentary with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat.

## TAC COMMENTARY

*Overall Statement*

*51. The report of the Fourth External Programme and Management Review of WARDA was discussed at TAC 78 in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Mandi Rukuni, the Chair and Chair designate of WARDA Board of Trustees, Dr. Just Faaland and Dr. Lindsay Innes*

*respectively, the Director General of WARDA, Dr. Kanayo Nwanze, the Deputy Director General for Programmes, Dr. Amir Kassam, and the Deputy Director General for Administration and Finance, Mr. Michael Goon.*

*52. TAC thanks the Chair and members of the Panel for the evaluation of the Centre and its future role and strategic importance. The Panel found that WARDA has transformed itself into a well managed scientific institution with an exciting new story to tell in line with CGIAR's goals.*

*53. The Committee notes the report's objectivity and critical style but would have welcomed a more comprehensive analysis of the findings (including documentation of the Panel's analyses in annexes, especially on research products and personnel matters) to augment the conclusions. TAC is pleased with the remarkable progress attained in many areas of the Centre's work since the last EPMR and congratulates the WARDA Board, management and staff. TAC accepts the report subject to a revision to incorporate a new section on the Centre's Mission, Strategy and Priorities (see below).*

*54. The Panel made twelve recommendations and several suggestions. TAC agrees in general, with the recommendations, notes that both the Board and Management of WARDA are in broad agreement with ten and offers a different perspective for two of them. TAC notes the positive spirit, in which the Centre's Management and Board absorbed the recommendations. TAC proposes the following commentary, prepared with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat, to supplement the report.*

*Centre's Mission, Strategy and Priorities*

*55. The Committee notes that WARDA is guided by its strategic plan 1990-2000, which is currently being updated. The Centre's mission statement has been refined to reflect food security and poverty alleviation and natural resource conservation. TAC points out that the Panel report does not comprehensively discuss the Centre's Mission, Strategy and Priorities. In this respect the report appears incomplete and the Committee requests that the report be revised (with assistance from the TAC Secretariat) in time for MTM'00. Also recent developments in the priority and programme strategy should be highlighted.*

*56. TAC is encouraged that WARDA's partners are involved in the formulation and implementation of the Centre's strategy and priorities through the Task Force mechanism thereby benefiting from the dual governance of the institution.*

*57. The unique character of WARDA's regional model presents an opportunity for drawing lessons on how a small Centre can be cost effective in harnessing good science for solving the problems of small-holder farmers in low-income food-deficit countries. TAC observed that underlying this success is the strong sense of ownership by the stakeholders that creates accountability and comprehensiveness.*

*Quality and Relevance of Science*

*58. TAC concurs with the Panel that the quality and relevance of science practised at the Centre is applaudable as evidenced by refereed publications, methodologies, and products of activities. Significant among the Centre's products is the development of the interspecific rice hybrids between Oryza sativa and O. glaberrima. The progenies are already contributing to*

*the rice genepool not only in Africa but also in Asia and they are being used in the development of new plant types. While TAC applauds WARDA for these high quality products, it sympathises with the low critical mass of social science and understands the quality aspects of their output. TAC recognises the Centre's effort in undertaking CCERs, is concerned that these did not assess the quality of science and were not as helpful to the Panel as they could have been. It urges the Board and Management to institute corrective measures to improve the review process. The Committee sought an explanation for the reduced number of publications in 1999, and was informed by the Management that preparation for the 4th EPMR and additional demand for research planning, during that year appropriated more staff time than anticipated.*

*Achievements and Impact*

*59. TAC shares the view of the Panel that WARDA should strengthen its capacity to monitor and assess impacts, appreciates that the Centre has taken appropriate steps for implementing this recommendation and encourages WARDA to maximise use of internal and external resources through collaboration. In this regard, the Centre should document its impact on food security, poverty reduction and natural resources management through a comprehensive analysis and interpretation of recently available WARDA-survey data that have apparently not been used to assess impact.*

*60. The review Panel assessed WARDA's achievements in areas of scientific leadership, partnership, capacity building and policy dialogue. It placed emphasis on three CGIAR goals of food security, poverty reduction and natural resources management. WARDA presented a long list of achievements to the Panel. The Panel discussed various achievements but did not have in-depth analyses on all of them to adequately relate achievements (outputs) with impact (outcomes).*

*Partnerships*

*61. The Committee concurs with the Panel that WARDA has crafted successful partnerships for greater effectiveness and efficiency. The Centre recently hosted an international workshop on partnership for a global research system focusing on sub-Saharan Africa to share experiences on research coordination and collaboration with sister institutions. TAC noted that WARDA's partnership arrangements facilitate the engagement in participatory plant breeding and selection while allowing the Centre to focus on its programmes yet link with related ARIs.*

*Research Programmes*

*62. During the review of Systemwide programmes with an Ecoregional Approach, and in the Centre's 1999-2000 MTP, it was noted that WARDA incorporated the Inland Valley Consortium (IVC) in its Programme IV to enhance the shift from characterization to technology development. The Centre Management has reaffirmed that the ecoregional approach will not be diluted and that the noble objectives of IVC, which are synergistic to those of WARDA's, will be promoted.*

*63. The Panel did not comprehensively address the gender issue with its attendant benefits to rural producers and consumers. In its discussion with the Panel Chair, absence of hard data was advanced as the major impediment. However, the Committee stresses the*

*importance of gender disaggregated analysis. TAC was informed by the Centre that women are involved in participatory variety selection and the model for exploiting the interspecifics was targeted towards women (and children) in particular regarding reduction of weeding time and variety selection and related documentation.*

*64. The issue of whether WARDA should expand its mandate into East, Central and Southern Africa was examined by the Panel and discussed by the Board and Management. TAC does share the view of the Panel that WARDA should move cautiously conditional on resources, demand and negotiated relationship with IRRI. TAC is pleased that through INGER, SGRP and Task Force arrangements their improved germplasm has been made available to the rest of Africa.*

*65. The Committee notes that WARDA was involved in a leading Consortium on Human Health (HHC), which has been completed. The Panel gave high rating for the Consortium and concluded that its findings were useful although the results have not been published. TAC considers that coverage of HHC in the report is minimal at a time when strategic linkages between health and agriculture are being forged. It encourages the Centre to disseminate the findings.*

*66. The Panel gives credit to WARDA for having played an active role in initiating the development of a national biosafety policy in Cote d'Ivoire. TAC encourages the Centre to be open about the debate on transgenics since Africa can most probably use the experience of WARDA as a reference case on the important aspect of biosafety and yield and quality improvements from application of transgenics.*

*67. Capacity building efforts is an area which many donors of agricultural research no longer find attractive, yet WARDA with its 5% expenditure on training appears successful. TAC is anxious to learn from WARDA's experience with using training workshops and Task Force mechanisms to enhance individual, group and institutional capacity building.*

*68. Sustainability of rice-based agricultural (or production) systems such as the environment in which WARDA works is critical for the future. The Panel's report treats this in chapter 8, and TAC points out that this issue is to be increasingly considered by WARDA. Linked to this is seasonality of rice, which affects food insecurity in the household. TAC would have welcomed a brief synthesis on this theme and suggests to WARDA to explicitly consider the potential of dry season rice in those ecologies where this has potential.*

*Effectiveness and Efficiency of Management*

*69. The management of WARDA is commended for putting in place strategic directions, new policies and procedures for the efficient running of the Centre. Much has been accomplished and TAC is looking forward to the remaining issues being handled for a better working atmosphere. The Committee is confident that Governance at the Centre is solid and will get better as the Board continues to implement its own fiduciary responsibilities. TAC notes that on the basis of a detailed staff survey, the Panel diagnosed some problems of staff morale, which – as TAC was reassured – are currently being addressed by Management.*

*70. The Panel recorded positive interaction between WARDA and its Council of Ministers. TAC considers this as a positive development which can play a critical role in strengthening*

*linkages with policy makers in the region and advancing opportunities for the impact as well as ownership of the Centre's work.*

*71. In 1997, WARDA put in place a five-year financial management plan to address the twin problems of cash flow and operating deficits. While recognising that the persistent cash flow problem would be addressed mainly through more timely release of member pledges, TAC notes that the Centre negotiated a US$2 million standby line of credit that has been drawn on prudently to manage unforeseen fluctuations in member disbursements. On the issue of eliminating operating deficits and building reserves, WARDA put in place a number of cost-control measures and tightened financial management processes to increase operating efficiencies. TAC commends the prudent financial management plan which is expected to eliminate the cumulative deficits and build reserves of about US$2 million. The Committee applauds the effort of particular Member countries for having cleared their outstanding arrears and for paying on time.*

*Conclusion*

*72. TAC believes that the transformation and development of WARDA as an emerging institution of excellence in rice research is a significant turn around. The achievements of increased yields from methods that are less dependent on external inputs deserve much more evaluation and support. WARDA should now consolidate its success by implementing the new strategic directions it has set. The dual status of a CGIAR Centre and an Association within the umbrella of Council of Ministers is conducive for more effective policy intervention as it addresses food security challenges in the West and Central Africa. The Committee encourages WARDA to keep its focus on the impact of the poor as it brings modern science to bear upon CGIAR goals.*

**b) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of ICARDA**

73. The report of the Fourth EPMR of ICARDA was discussed in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Donald Plucknett, the Chair of ICARDA's Board of Trustees, Dr. Robert D. Havener, and the Director General of ICARDA, Dr. Adel El-Beltagy.

74. Dr. Plucknett briefly summarised the main findings and recommendations of the review. The panel found that ICARDA had undergone an impressive transformation in its programmes and strategies since its last EPMR. The centre's germplasm enhancement and genetic resources research was considered of world-class quality, had shifted significantly away from traditional plant breeding to biotechnology, and increasingly emphasised participatory approaches. However, the impact of this work both for legumes and cereals was found to be disappointing, often because of poor in-country infrastructure for seed production and distribution.

75. The review showed that ICARDA's natural resources management work was producing information and improved technologies for land users in its mandate region. However, the panel urged ICARDA to prioritise and integrate this research in order to identify a variety of future land use options under dryland conditions. The current work remained largely applied rather than strategic/holistic research. ICARDA needed to develop an NRM vision, strategy, and implementation plan in consultation with regional stakeholders. Given the critical nature of water scarcity in the CWANA region, ICARDA should also place

more emphasis on strategic issues of water resource use, allocation, and management at rural community level.

76. ICARDA's social science research had shifted emphasis from evaluating technological innovations to participatory research involving resource-poor farmers and to property rights and policy. But the volume of such work had been modest and the record of refereed journal publications was judged to be poor. A programme of focused interdisciplinary social science research for the sub-regions should be developed jointly between ICARDA's social, physical and biological scientists and the NARS. ICARDA should also determine, with its partners, the rural livelihood strategies of the poor in its region to clarify what research options, investments, policies, and technologies were most likely to benefit them.

77. As demands continued to grow for ICARDA's involvement in a number of areas - e.g., Latin America, Central Asia - the panel saw a danger of the ICARDA's becoming "overstretched" and believed the Centre should begin a period of "dynamic consolidation" with a view to serving as the regional node for a consortium of international efforts focusing on the CWANA region and the dry areas.

78. The panel concluded that ICARDA was a well managed Centre with a committed Board and dedicated staff. Its mission continued to be appropriate. CGIAR Members were urged to support the Centre in its research efforts in the harsh, water-scarce environments of the dry areas.

79. The Chair thanked Dr. Plucknett for his presentation and recognised Drs. Havener and El-Beltagy who presented the response of the ICARDA Board and management to the review.

80. ICARDA generally agreed with most of the panel's observations, differing to some degree on a few specific issues; it had begun to implement several of the more urgent recommendations and suggestions. The Centre believed the panel's findings showed its activities were consistent with the recommendations of the CGIAR System Review as they pertained to ICARDA. Of note were the EPMR's positive assessment of ICARDA's germplasm enhancement and genetic resources activities; development of anticipatory long term research in natural resources management; and partnerships with stakeholders in developed and developing countries. ICARDA was gratified the panel had cited its role as a Centre of excellence in the Central and West Asia and North Africa (CWANA) region and had endorsed its decision to work in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Major issues identified by the panel that would be given the Centre's attention included: developing increased capacity in integrated gene management via biotechnology; continuing to focus, refine and standardise multidisciplinary INRM methodologies and tools appropriate to dry areas; articulating an integrated social science research agenda; and further developing farmer participatory approaches. ICARDA emphasised the panel's conclusion that, despite a decline in the share of unrestricted funding from 80 percent to 30 percent, the Centre had reengineered itself and was well positioned to deal with 21$^{st}$ century problems.

81. In the ensuing discussion, a number of issues and questions were raised concerning the findings and recommendations of the review and the Centre's response:

- How had ICARDA taken responsibility for water management issues and what was the role of IWMI? In particular, clarification was sought on whether ICARDA intended to

implement the panel's recommended emphasis on water management research at rural community level, or would continue to emphasise on-farm water management. If the latter, the rationale for the Centre's position was sought.

- As ICARDA had accumulated some experience in developing typologies of poverty, what lessons, if any, might be drawn from this work and how might it be extended beyond its current focus on the rural poor to include both rural and urban consumers?

- Given the very broad and complex geopolitical area within which the Centre worked and the large transactions costs involved, how realistic was it for a Centre like ICARDA to implement an ecoregionally-focused programme globally?

- Explanation was sought as to why ICARDA's social science research was not performing adequately. Was this a matter of the caliber of scientific personnel or were structural/funding issues involved? In this connection, question was raised as to whether the Centre's farmer participatory work could be characterised more as technical assistance than research.

82. In response to these questions and issues, Dr. El-Beltagy provided the Committee with the following information:

- The Centre's poverty mapping work relied on national level income data. It needed to be supplemented by social and environmental indicators appropriate to dry areas, e.g., water poverty, in order to capture the full extent and nature of poverty in ICARDA's mandate area (CWANA).

- The Centre had a very clear strategy for its future NRM research, building on programmatic consolidation carried out since the last review. This involved research at georeferenced benchmark sites located throughout the agroecologies of the dry areas, permitting extrapolation of results to other locations.

- On the feasibility of a global Centre like ICARDA working ecoregionally, it should be recognised that the Centre's mandate area was the largest contiguous dry area in this agroecology. Other, smaller dry areas were located in Africa and Latin America. Covering this agroecology required critical mass for effectiveness. ICARDA could contribute to the global effort but represented a small percentage of that effort. The key to success, therefore, lay in linking with NARS and ARIs.

- ICARDA's social science research had shifted from a technology adoption focus to work on participatory methods, gender analysis, property rights, evaluation, and impact assessment. These new priorities required research leadership and toward that end the Centre was actively seeking to recruit a senior NRM economist.

- ICARDA continued to emphasise on-farm water management research because of a past agreement with IWMI. That agreement would be discussed with IWMI's new management to ascertain the future division of labour between the two Centres.

83. Dr. Plucknett agreed that the quality of ICARDA's social science research was a matter of providing the right leadership. The problem was not a structural one except, perhaps, in the sense that a reorganisation had occurred and staff adjustment would take time.

The Centre's participatory work was not technical assistance, but genuine research using an experimental design to measure the differential impact of farmer selection of breeding materials. Dr. Plucknett re-emphasised the importance of conducting water management research at rural community level. In dry areas, human use of water was in direct competition with agricultural use. Decisions on water allocation were made at the community level and this was the rationale for the panel's recommendation.

84. The Chair brought discussion of this item to a close, thanking Dr. Plucknett and the members of the panel for their report, as well as Drs. Havener and El-Beltagy for their contributions. After further consideration and discussion in the working group, TAC offered the following commentary with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat.

## TAC COMMENTARY

*85. TAC expresses its thanks to the Chair and members of the ICARDA EPMR Panel for a comprehensive review of the Centre and an analytical and well-written report. TAC is pleased with the Panel's findings that, since the last EPMR, ICARDA has undergone an impressive transformation in its programmes and strategies, and that a dedicated staff, and effective management and governance team, are in place. TAC endorses, in general, the recommendations of the Panel and offers the following commentary, prepared with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat, to supplement the Panel's findings.*

*Priorities and Strategies*

*86. TAC considers that ICARDA's overall mission continues to be appropriate and that it will continue to have an important role in meeting the formidable challenges of poverty and natural resources management in the dry areas of the CWANA region.*

*87. TAC shares the Panel's view that the time has come for ICARDA to begin a period of "dynamic consolidation", and agrees with the Panel about the need for the Centre to focus its activities and scope of work. In this respect, TAC urges caution about ICARDA spreading its resources too thinly across all of the dry areas in the developing world, and thinks it would be more prudent if the Centre were to primarily focus its activities on the Central and West Asia and North Africa region.*

*88. TAC endorses the Panel's recommendation that ICARDA determine, with its partners, the livelihood strategies of the poor in its region to clarify what research options are most likely to benefit them. It expects this study to be conducted as soon as possible, and that TAC will be informed of its outcome. The Committee sees this as an essential part of the strategic planning process. It considers a comprehensive analysis of the determinants of poverty, and development of potential options for alleviating poverty through agricultural research, critical to the formulation of a comprehensive research agenda.*

*89. TAC notes with concern the severe decline in share of unrestricted core funds in the Centre's income in the last five years from 80 to 30%, but draws attention to the fact that growth in the amount of restricted funds has been much stronger than the decline of unrestricted core funds. TAC appreciates ICARDA's innovative approach in responding to*

*this challenge but highlights the need for an adequate priority setting mechanism that ensures all projects, for which funding is obtained, be part of the research agenda.*

*90. TAC is sympathetic to the Panel's recommendation that the Committee undertake a study on the implications of the increasing share of restricted funding for the quality of output of the Centres and will give this issue adequate attention in due course in close collaboration with the Finance Committee.*

*Research Programmes*

*91. TAC notes the Panel's findings that the germplasm enhancement, and genetic resources research programmes are of world-class quality. TAC endorses the Panel's recommendations about the need for a vision and strategy exercise of the natural resources management programme. The Committee is also concerned about the Panel's finding of inadequate quality of the Social Sciences output. TAC urges the Centre to give these two problem areas serious attention and recommends that ICARDA commission a review in about two years time to determine the extent to which the Centre has followed up on the EPMR recommendations.*

*92. TAC commends the Panel for its innovativeness in evaluating the quality of ICARDA's science. TAC is also pleased that the Panel found overall quality of science at ICARDA to be good but notes with concern the decline in publication output over the last five years. The Committee is satisfied however with the Management's explanations that the reason for this decline is due to shifts in personnel and that adequate steps are being taken for its reversal. TAC further notes that this decline is also likely to be associated with the lack of critical mass in some of its research programmes which further highlights the need for the Centre to focus and streamline its research activities.*

*93. The Panel, as well as TAC, give high marks to ICARDA for the effectiveness of its partnerships, the innovative nature and quality of its collaboration with NARS – including its success in decentralising research in a continuum from headquarters to NARS - and the standing in the region for its subregional strategy and programmes. Nevertheless, TAC agrees with the Panel about the need for a strategic review of ICARDA's outreach activities in order to ensure that the Centre does not get overstretched and continues to provide adequate scientific and logistic support to those activities.*

*Impact and Achievements*

*94. TAC is impressed with the many achievements of ICARDA as reported by the Panel, in particular in view of the harshness of many of the environments in which it works. Nevertheless, TAC is concerned about the limited impact of the cereal and legume programmes that have been reported to date. TAC reiterates the recommendation of the 1994 EPMR that "ICARDA should conduct impact studies of its major technologies" and which was not fully implemented. The Panel has provided useful suggestions as to how the Centre could go about doing this, and these are linked to the need to improve the quality of the social science programme.*

*Governance and Management*

*95. TAC is satisfied that ICARDA has effective governance and management systems in place but would urge the Centre to address the remaining problems of low staff morale. TAC understands that many of the issues involved are resulting from the period of transformation under very difficult conditions that ICARDA has gone through. However, the Panel has also pointed to the need to further improve human resource management, professional development opportunities and performance evaluation processes at the Centre.*

*Conclusions*

*96. TAC is convinced that if adequate attention is given to the issues listed above, ICARDA is well positioned to effectively address its challenges of agricultural development in the CWANA region. It has good research capacity, much appreciated relations with partners and stakeholders and effective governance and management. TAC recommends that Members of the CGIAR continue to provide strong support to the Centre.*

**c) Second External Programme and Management Review of IWMI**

97. The Report of the EPMR of IWMI was discussed in the presence of the panel Chair, Dr. Michel Petit, the Chair of IWMI's Governing Board, Dr. Klaas Jan Beek, and IWMI Deputy Directors General, Drs. Douglas Merrey and David Governey.

98. Dr. Petit briefly summarised the main findings and recommendations of the review. The panel found that over the last five years IWMI had established itself as a strong science-based organisation concerned with the more effective management and productive use of water as a key resource to ensure continued increase in world food production. The Centre had developed research capacity in irrigation and water resources; policy, institutions and management; health and environment; and applied information and modelling systems. Areas of emphasis included estimating water scarcity in different regions of the world; valuation of water for various uses, including the environment; control of water-borne/related diseases through improved irrigation water management; and use of information technologies to support analyses of water use and distribution within river basins. An accomplishment of global significance had been the production of a World Climate and Water Resources Atlas.

99. Among other things, the panel recommended that IWMI's irrigation and water resources research give increased emphasis to the problem of groundwater depletion. The Centre should also increase its capacity to research the effects of irrigation on downstream water resources. The panel questioned whether the Centre's policy work should continue to include irrigation management transfer issues in light of potential alternative suppliers. It recommended that IWMI's poverty work focus more precisely on the relationship between poverty, gender and access to water, and that poverty and gender concerns be incorporated more explicitly across the Centre's research programmes. The panel endorsed continued research on the use of relevant information technology, remote sensing and modelling for use in irrigation and water management and IWMI's current practice of using, testing and adapting existing models rather than developing such models itself. The Systemwide Initiative on Water Management (SWIM), for which IWMI serves as the lead Centre, operated on a bilateral rather than Systemwide basis. The panel, therefore, strongly suggested consideration be given to phasing it out and mainstreaming its activities into the regular programmes of the

participating Centres. Finally, the Panel recommended that IWMI adopt more formal procedures for priority-setting and impact assessment.

100. The Chair thanked Dr. Petit for his presentation and recognised Drs. Jan Beek, Merrey, and Governey who presented the response of the IWMI Board and management to the review.

101. The Centre agreed in general with the panel's recommendations and had begun taking steps to implement them. It noted the report had recognised IWMI's transformation over the past six years and had found the Centre well positioned to exert strong leadership in the provision of science-based solutions for the efficient and equitable management of water resources. This transformation had been due to the combined efforts of the current Director General and the Centre's Board of Trustees. With regard to specific panel recommendations, IWMI had already increased its emphasis on groundwater depletion issues by recruiting a leading expert in this field; it would emerge as a major research thrust in 2000. IWMI would not invest further in irrigation management transfer (IMT) but planned to synthesise the lessons of case studies already completed and selectively address issues of institutional reform associated with IMT, focusing on those with highest potential for impact. Poverty reduction had become the central concern of research in IWMI's various programmes, as reflected in projects addressing how poverty could be reduced through small-scale irrigation. The linkages between poverty and gender were being explored for both large-scale and small-scale irrigation in different agro-ecologies. While IWMI agreed on the need to place greater emphasis on water quality and other environmental issues, including downstream effects, funding for environmental work had been difficult to secure. The Institute would develop partnerships with organisations specialised in water-related environmental issues and recruit the necessary expertise to better equip itself for work in this area. Finally, IWMI would review how best to make its priority-setting more transparent and its impact assessment procedures more systematic in the context of an overall review of its programme and strategy, to be led by its new Director General later in 2000.

102. In the ensuing discussion, a number of issues and questions were raised concerning the findings and recommendations of the review and the Centre's response:

- Question was raised as to whether, in defining itself as a global Centre, IWMI intended to be a Centre for global water research or would simply address water issues at the global level. If the former, did the Institute plan to expand the geographic scope of its work beyond the countries in which it currently worked?

- The bulk of the review report's recommendation had favoured increasing or maintaining the current set of research activities carried out by IWMI. Given the Centre's declining resources in recent years, had the panel considered the resource implications of its recommendations?

- Clarification of the panel's rationale for suggesting the phasing out of the SWIM programme was sought, particularly in light of significant new funding for the activity in 2000.

- With regard to IWMI's increasing its research capacity on the downstream effects of irrigation, it was suggested that where this problem involved adjacent countries the Centre could collaborate with concerned regional entities (e.g., Mekong River Commission).

- Question was raised as to whether IWMI could take a more integrated approach to both its strategic and location-specific research by collaborating with other CGIAR Centres active in the fields of irrigation and water management.

103. In response to these questions and issues, Drs. Petit, Jan Beek, and Merrey provided the Committee with the following information:

104. Dr. Petit clarified that the panel considered IWMI "global" in the sense of having developed its niche within the international community to address water issues of global significance, rather than as having the capacity to undertake water research globally. As the Centre's country-specific research was driven largely by funding availability, the panel did not advocate tight criteria for delimiting the scope of its national programmes. With regard to the resource implications of the panel's programmatic recommendations, in most cases, reallocation of existing resources was envisaged to accommodate new activities. On SWIM, problems of incentives in managing Systemwide programmes were the underlying rationale for the panel's recommendation.

105. Dr. Merrey characterised IWMI's global thrust as a shift from localised action-oriented research to a strong emphasis on strategic international public goods, although within the last year a balance between these two kinds of research had been restored. On international river basin activities, the Centre was active together with ICLARM in the Mekong region and would undertake additional regional work in southern Africa. Phasing out the SWIM programme would involve a substantial loss of funding. Dr. Merrey emphasised that the panel's concerns lay in the area of governance and management rather than the quality and utility of the research produced.

106. IWMI's Director General-designate, Dr. Frank Rijsberman, emphasised that IWMI's focus was on integrated water resources management research, an approach combining different disciplines within a systematic framework. Water management issues varied by region but the methodologies and tools that might be applied to them were global in nature. Thus, IWMI envisioned a synergy between its strategic and action-oriented research, the latter always in close partnership with stakeholders at regional and local levels.

107. The Chair brought discussion of this item to a close, thanking Dr. Petit and the members of the panel for their report, as well as Drs. Jan Beek and Merrey for their contributions. He commended Dr. David Seckler for his distinguished leadership in IWMI's transformation and extended TAC's best wishes to the new Director General.

108. After further consideration and discussion in the working group, TAC offered the following commentary with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat.

## TAC COMMENTARY

*109. The Report of the Second External Programme and Management Review (EPMR) of IWMI was discussed at TAC 78 in the presence of the Panel Chair, Michel Petit, the Chair of IWMI's Governing Board, Klaas Jan Beek, and the two Deputy Directors of IWMI, Douglas*

*Merrey and David Governey. TAC wishes to express its appreciation to Dr. Petit and the Panel that conducted the Review.*

*110. TAC is pleased to note that the Panel's report is, overall, very positive. The Report convincingly portrays IWMI transformed over the last six years from an institute focused primarily on irrigation management with a technical assistance orientation to one which is more focused on strategic research and analysing irrigation within an integrated water resources management and river basin perspective. This change is prominently reflected in IWMI's new name, mission statement and adopted paradigm.*

*111. The Panel made 13 recommendations in the Report, four of which relate to governance, one to priority setting and impact assessment and eight covering the research programmes. The Centre is in agreement with all 13 recommendations and in their response describes the steps that are or will be taken to address these. As pointed out in the Centre's transmittal letter, four of the eight programmatic recommendations are in fact endorsements of current thrusts or activities of the Centre.*

*Priorities and Strategies*

*112. TAC agrees with the Panel's assessment of the Centre's need for setting clear priorities in order to focus its research efforts on the most critical issues within a global water management research framework. This is particularly relevant given the breadth of IWMI's mission, the demands from the national programmes and the current financial resource constraints. While senior management has been instrumental in creating the new vision and purpose for IWMI and in promoting specific strategic initiatives, TAC believes the institute would greatly benefit from a clearer and more precise formulation of its strategy. The current draft Strategic Plan does not provide sufficient guidance as pointed out by the Panel. TAC notes that the Centre has agreed to revisit IWMI's strategy for the future, which will be reformulated in a new plan following the arrival of the new Director General.*

*113. TAC strongly endorses the recommendation by the Panel that IWMI adopt and implement a more formal mechanism for priority setting and impact assessment and is pleased to note that the Centre intends to do so.*

*Research Programmes*

*114. TAC is pleased to note the Panel's positive assessment of the science conducted at IWMI emphasising its quality and its acceptance by water management specialists internationally. Of particular importance has been the contribution to the recent World Water Forum. TAC would like to highlight the key leadership role played by the outgoing Director General in enhancing IWMI's capacity to conduct high quality, globally relevant, strategic research. Notable research achievements include the evaluation of the global water scarcity problem; the integrated, holistic approach to water management (river basin perspective); new methodologies of water accounting; and insights on the relationships between water management and poverty, gender and health.*

*115. TAC takes note of some of the initial results and early achievements of the research within the Health and Environment Programme, for example, that related to the impact of agricultural water management on control of malaria. The Committee strongly endorses the Panel's recommendation that IWMI give high priority to work in the area of irrigation related*

*health issues as such research is critical for the provision of safe water to the poor. However, TAC agrees with the Panel that IWMI should confine its efforts to research on the environment and health topics that are endogenous to irrigation.*

*116. TAC notes the Panel's "bold" suggestion that IWMI consider phasing out the Systemwide Initiative on Water Management (SWIM). While TAC appreciates the rationale provided by the Panel in coming to this conclusion, i.e., that SWIM activities be mainstreamed into the regular programmes of the respective Centres--since most are bilateral ventures anyway and do not necessarily foster multi-centre collaboration on specific water-related issues-- the Committee also appreciates the practical dilemma the Centre faces in dealing with this issue. Recognising the early and promising results to-date in terms of achievements in SWIM and cognisant of the Centre's disagreement with the suggestion, TAC intends to revisit the rationale for Systemwide programmes and develop ground rules for the management of such programmes before recommending action.*

*117. TAC believes that inter-centre collaboration is essential in the case of IWMI, given the importance that water management has in the research programmes of many Centres of the CGIAR such as IRRI, IFPRI, ICARDA, ICLARM, ICRISAT, and CIFOR. It is imperative that strategic alliances are built between IWMI and other CGIAR Centres and that new incentives for collaboration are provided in view of the competition problems cited by the Panel on page 36 of the report. Furthermore, while TAC takes note of the strength and effectiveness of many of its diverse partnerships with national programmes, in some cases it appears that collaboration with national programmes may not be satisfactory, i.e., lacks sufficient ownership, and would therefore encourage the Centre to re-assess the way in which it relates to its NARS partners.*

*118. TAC concurs with the Panel view that IWMI needs to strengthen its capacity building efforts. TAC would like to emphasise the importance of effectively disseminating IWMI's research results to increase its impact, but at the same time agrees with the judgement by the Panel that IWMI adopt a cautious approach to expanding in-house capacity for training, in view of the tight and uncertain future funding situation.*

*119. Finally, TAC notes the Panel's observation about the lack of a systematic review process at IWMI that would ensure a continuous monitoring of the quality of science at the project and programme level. IWMI does not have a systematic programme of CCERs. Only a single CCER (in 1999) was conducted since the last EPMR and this was fairly broad in coverage, i.e., the Panel was unable to use this CCER in evaluating the relevance and quality of science, and felt that its own work would have been greatly facilitated and enhanced if CCERs of the various programmes had been available. TAC encourages the Centre to initiate a series of programmatic CCERs in the next few years.*

*Governance and Management*

*120. TAC notes the significant problems detected by the Panel related to Board performance, but is nevertheless conscious of the need to strike a proper balance between the oversight and monitoring functions of the Board and the executive management functions of the Director General as the Panel rightly points out. Indeed, the Panel acknowledges the tradeoff between informality which served to enhance the institutional culture at IWMI, and more discipline-- in this case, in following more rigorously generally accepted rules and procedures for conducting business. TAC considers all four of the Panel's recommendations*

*in the area of governance and management as appropriate and is pleased that these were accepted by the Centre. It welcomes the steps already taken by the new Board Chair for the improvement in Board governance.*

*Impact*

*121. TAC notes with some concern that IWMI has yet to undertake any systematic effort to measure the impact of its work. This seems somewhat surprising given the number and quality of IWMI's research achievements and given the current culture of the CGIAR with its strong emphasis on demonstrating the impact of successful research on the mission and goals of the Centres. IWMI appears to be lagging behind other Centres in this area. Notwithstanding the difficulty in trying to measure the impact of improvements in the way in which a critical input like water is managed, TAC recommends that high priority be given to impact assessment by the Centre.*

*Future Directions/Other Issues*

*122. TAC is pleased to note the Panel's conclusion that IWMI is now well positioned to provide research leadership on issues related to improved management of water resources for the benefit of present and future generations. The demand for more research on water-related issues in agriculture can be expected to increase in the future. This has obvious implications for the size and structure of IWMI and consideration will have to be given for maintaining an appropriate balance between the global and national programmes and between strategic and applied research. TAC recommends that this issue be explicitly addressed in the revised Strategic Plan. Consultation with stakeholders is critical.*

*123. TAC notes that several of the Panel's recommendations appear to have implications for expansion (Recommendations No. 1, 2, 7). While the programmatic rationale for increasing emphasis in those specific areas is clear and supported by TAC, there is uncertainty as to whether such expansion is expected to be achieved via additional funding or through re-allocation of existing funds. In one case (Recommendation No. 1) the Centre intends to respond by strengthening cooperation with interested CGIAR Centres, specialised universities and research institutes and NARS partners, and perhaps with short-term Fellows, rather than with long-term appointments in-house.*

*124. TAC supports IWMI's planned expansion of effort in Southern Africa to develop a regional programme. TAC suggests that, where possible, IWMI's research in the region be in close association with other CGIAR Centres working there.*

*Conclusion*

*125. TAC is pleased to note the major transformation that has occurred at IWMI and endorses the significant changes in name, mission and programmatic focus over the last several years. It believes, as the Panel does, that IWMI has indeed found a niche for itself in research on water management and food security issues in a global context. TAC applauds the Centre, and in particular, the Director General, for the significant achievements made over the last six years. The Committee recommends continued strong support from the CGIAR Members for IWMI and its work on water management related issues.*

## Report from Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) (Agenda Item 5)

126. Dr. Hans Gregersen, former Chair of IAEG and present Chair of TAC's Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA), reported on the integration of IAEG and TAC which became effective on 1 January 2000. He also introduced a paper that briefed TAC on progress of SPIA impact studies and that outlined future workplans. IAEG had started its work in 1996 by undertaking a baseline review of Centres' impact assessment and evaluation activities as an aid to setting its work priorities and building capacity in these areas. It had also organised a workshop that involved all stakeholders. SPIA's current portfolio included impact assessments and evaluations of CGIAR activities in the areas of germplasm improvement, integrated pest management; implications of CGIAR innovations on the environment; contributions of agricultural research to poverty alleviation; training and strengthening national scientific capacity; and use of logframes for impact assessment. A major state of the art paper on impact assessment in agricultural research had also been prepared. SPIA was also organising a workshop involving Centre representatives, CGIAR stakeholders and outside experts that would be held from 3-5 May 2000 at FAO on the future of impact assessment in the CGIAR. A synthesis of the findings of the germplasm improvement impact project would be presented at MTM'00.

## Future Reviews (Agenda Item 6)

- **External Programme and Management Reviews**

127. The Committee considered progress in the implementation of the Fifth EPMR of CIAT which would be discussed at TAC 79 and ICW'00; planning for the Fifth EPMR of IITA which would be considered at TAC 81 and ICW'01; and the planning and organisation of the Fifth EPMR of CIP to be conducted in 2001-2002.

- **Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies**

128. TAC reviewed progress in implementing the Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies in the CGIAR as endorsed by the Group at MTM'99. The review was assessing the use of various crop improvement methodologies in the CGIAR, with special emphasis on the integration of biotechnology. It was being chaired by Dr. Donald Duvick (USA). A number of sub-panels had visited the nine CGIAR Centres involved in crop improvement activities. A questionnaire survey provided background information for their visits. The reports of the sub-panels, which were currently being completed, provided detailed information on the state-of-the-art of plant breeding and biotechnology in the CGIAR and on the nature of the strategic partnerships involved. The recommendations would assist Centres in bringing modern science to bear on difficult productivity problems. The final report of the review would be considered at TAC79 and ICW'00

- **Follow-up to First ILRI EPMR**

129. TAC reviewed the extent of ILRI's progress in implementing the recommendations of the Centre's First EPMR and of TAC's Commentary on the review report. The Committee found that the centre had produced a Board-approved Strategic Plan and had satisfactorily taken actions taken on other EPMR recommendations.

## Future Meetings (Agenda Item 7)

130. TAC reconfirmed dates and venues for the following meetings:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| TAC 79 | IITA, Ibadan | 25-29 September 2000 |
| TAC 80 | ICARDA, Aleppo | 26-30 March 2001 |
| TAC 81 | CIFOR, Bogor | 24–28 September 2001 |
| TAC 82 | CIP, Lima | March 2002 |

## Other Business (Agenda Item 8)

131. The Committee considered two CDC presentations concerning, respectively, CGIAR Strategy for Central Asia and the Caucasus (ICARDA), and Strategy for the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa (ILRI). It also considered SGRP's proposed Genebank Investment Plan (IPGRI). The Committee formulated comments on these presentations and shared them with those concerned.

# *LIST OF PARTICIPANTS*

## Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

**Ismail Serageldin**
CGIAR Chair
Vice President
Special Programs
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20433
USA

## MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Emil Q. Javier**
TAC Chair
Institute of Plant Breeding
UP Los Baños
College 4031 Laguna
Philippines

**Alain de Janvry**
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
Giannini Hall 207
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
USA

**Lucia de Vaccaro**
Facultad de Agronomia
Instituto de Produccion Animal (IPA)
Universidad Central de Venezuela,
Apartado 4579, Maracay
Aragua
Venezuela

**Maria Antonia Fernandez-Martinez**
Am Büchel 63
53173 Bonn
Germany

**Hans M. Gregersen**
College of Natural Resources
University of Minnesota
Room 115, Green Hall
1530 N. Cleveland Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
USA

**Richard Harwood**
Crop & Soil Sciences Dept.
260 Crop & Soil Sciences Building
Michigan State University,
East Lansing,
Michigan 48824
USA

**Elias Fereres**
Director,
Instituto de Agricultura Sostenible (CSIC)
Alameda del Obispo, s/n, Aptdo 4084
14080 Cordoba
Spain

**Cyrus G. Ndiritu**
Director
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
(KARI)
P.O. Box 57811
Nairobi
Kenya

**Joachim von Braun**
Director, Centre for Development Research
University of Bonn
Water Flex – Str. 3
53113 Bonn
Germany

**Usha Barwale Zehr**
Joint Director, Research
Maharashtra Hybrid Seeds Co., Ltd.
Sardar Patel Road
Jalna 431203
India

**Magdy A. Madkour**
Director, Agricultural Research Center
Agricultural Genetic Engineering Research
Institute (AGERI)
9 Gamaa Street
Giza 12619, Cairo
Egypt

**Oumar Niangado**
Delegation Foundation NOVARTIS Mali
BP E 1449
Bamako
Mali

**Vo-Tong Xuan**
Director
Farming Systems R&D Institute
University of Cantho
Canthon City
Vietnam

## CGIAR COMMITTEES

**Iain C. MacGillivray**
Chair of the Finance Committee
Senior Adviser
Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy
Branch
Canadian International Development Agency
(CIDA)
Place du Centre
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull, Quebec K1A 0G4
Canada

**Kurt J. Peters**
Chair of the CBC
(Chair of the Board of Trustees, ICLARM)
Department of Animal Breeding in the
Tropics
Humbolt University Berlin
Philippstr. 13, Haus 9
D-10115 Berlin
Germany

**Per Pinstrup-Andersen**
Chair of CDC and
Director General of IFPRI
2033 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
USA

## INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES

### Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)

**Joachim Voss**
Director General
Apartado Aereo 6713
Cali
Colombia

### International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)

**Adel El-Beltagy**
Director General
P.O. Box 5466
Aleppo
Syrian Arab Republic

**Robert Havener**
Chair, Board of Trustees
217 Selby Ranch Road #7
Sacramento, CA 95864
USA

**Mohan Saxena**
Assistant Director General

**John Dodds**
Assistant Director General (Research)

### International Centre for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM)

**Peter Gardiner**
Deputy Director General
MC P.O. Box 2631
0718 Makati City
Philippines

### International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

**Hank Fitzhugh**
Director General
P.O. Box 30709
Nairobi
Kenya

**International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)**

**Geoffrey Hawtin**
Director General
Via delle Sette Chiese 142
Rome 00145
Italy

**Jane Toll**
Coordinator
CGIAR System-wide Genetic Resources Programmes (SGRP)

**Trevor Williams**
Consultant to SGRP

**International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR)**

**Stein Bie**
Director General
P.O. Box 93375
2509 AJ The Hague
The Netherlands

**International Water Management Institute (IWMI)**

**Frank Rijsberman**
Director General-designate
P.O. Box 2075
Colombo
Sri Lanka

**Klaas Jan Beek**
Chair, Board of Trustees
International Institute for Aerospace Survey & Earth Sciences (ITC)
Hengelosestraat 99
7514 AE Enschede
The Netherlands

**Douglas Merrey**
Deputy Director General (Programmes)

**David Governey**
Deputy Director General (Operations)

**West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA)**

**Kanayo F. Nwanze**
Director General
01, B.P. 2551
Bouaké 01,
Côte d'Ivoire

**Lindsay Innes**
Chair, Board of Trustees-designate
Scottish Crop Research Institute
Ivergowsie
Dundee DD2 5DA
Scotland, United Kingdom

**Just Faaland**
Chair, Board of Trustees
Chr. Michelsen Institute
Fantoftvegen, 38
N-5036 FONTOFT
Bergen, Norway

**Michael Goon**
Deputy Director General for Finance & Administration

**Amir Kassam**
Deputy Director General for Programs

## OTHER PARTICIPANTS

**Eric T. Craswell**
Director General of the International Board for Soil Research and Management (IBSRAM)
P.O. Box 9-109
Bangkhen, Bangkok 10900
Thailand

**Donald L. Plucknett**
Chair ICARDA EPMR Panel
Agricultural Research and Development International
4200 Evergreen Lane, Suite 324
Annandale, VA 22003
USA

**Michel Petit**
Chair IWMI EPMR Panel
Institut National Agronomique
16 rue Claude Bernard
75005 Paris
France

**Mandi Rukuni**
Chair WARDA EPMR Panel
6, Dorset Rd. East
Avondale
Harare
Zimbabwe

## CGIAR OSERVERS

### France

**Jean Mamy**
INRA
Centre de Versailles
RD 10
F78026 Versailles cedex
France

**Gilles St. Martin**
Délégation aux relations internationales et à la coopération
Ministère de l'éducation nationale, de la recherche et de la technologie
110, rude de Grenelle
75357 Paris 07 SP
France

### Germany

**Marlene Diekmann**
Advisor, International Agricultural Research
BEAF/GTZ
Dottendorfer Str. 86
53129 Bonn
Germany

### Italy

**Marina Puccioni Segatta**
Ministero degli Affari Esteri
Istituto Agronomico per l'Oltremare
Via Antonio Cocchi, 4
50131 Firenze
Italy

**Netherlands**

**Frans Neuman**
CGIAR Liaison
IAC
P.O. Box 88
6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands

**Thailand**

**Vijai Nopamornbodi**
Deputy Director General
Department of Agriculture
Bagkok 10900
Thailand

**USA**

**Robert Bertram**
Multilateral Research Advisor
Office of Agriculture and Food Security
Bureau for Global Programs
USAID
1300 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
20523-33800 Washington, D.C.
USA

## CGIAR SECRETARIAT

**Ravi Tadvalkar**
Finance and Investor Relations Team
TheWorld Bank
CGIAR Secretariat
1818 H Street NW
Washington D.C. 20433
USA

**Shey Tata**
Financial Officer

## TAC SECRETARIAT

**Shellemiah Keya**
Executive Secretary, TAC
SDRC – FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy

**Guido Gryseels**
Deputy Executive Secretary, TAC

**Timothy Kelley**
Senior Agricultural Research Officer

**Sirkka Immonen**
Senior Agricultural Research Officer

**Robert Bordonaro**
Consultant

**Virma Rea Lee Gonzales**
Secretary

**Rosanna Corazzi**
Secretary

# *AGENDA*

**Item 1:** **Opening Session**

a) Opening Remarks
b) Adoption of TAC 77 Report
c) Matters arising from TAC 77
d) Adoption of the Agenda
e) Report from the CGIAR

**Item 2:** **CGIAR 2005-2010: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR**

**Item 3:** **CGIAR Research Agenda 2001-2003: Medium Term Plans**

**Item 4:** **External Programme and Management Reviews:**
a) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of WARDA
b) Fourth External Programme and Management Review of ICARDA
c) Second External Programme and Management Review of IWMI

**Item 5:** **Report from Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)**

**Item 6:** **Future Reviews – Report from SCOER:**
- Organization of the EPMRs of CIAT, CIP and IITA
- Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies
- Gene Bank Investment Plan
- Follow-up to First ILRI EPMR

**Item 7:** **Future Meetings**

**Item 8:** **Other Business:**
a) CGIAR Strategy for Central Asia and the Caucasus
b) CGIAR II in Latin America and the Caribbean: priorities, organization, and financing
c) Strategy for the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa

# *LIST OF DOCUMENTS*

| AGENDA ITEM | | DOCUMENT TITLE | NUMBER/SOURCE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | Draft report of the Seventy-Seventh Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/05 |
| 2 | | CGIAR 2005-2010: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/14 |
| 3 | (a) | CGIAR Research Agenda 2001-2003: Medium Term Plans | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/11 |
| | (b) | Financial Summary of 2001-2003 Center Medium Term Plans | CGIAR Secretariat, Draft 21 March 2000 |
| | (c) | Individual Centre MTPs 2001-2003 | From CGIAR Centres |
| 4 | (a) | Report of the 4TH EPMR of WARDA with Centre Board and Management Response | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/06 |
| 4 | (b) | Report of the 4TH EPMR of ICARDA with Centre Board and Management Response | SDR/TAC:IAR/99/9.1 |
| 4 | (c) | Report of the 2ND EPMR of IWMI with Centre Board and Management Response | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/07 |
| 5 | | Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/13 |
| 6 | | Report on Future Reviews (TAC Secretariat) | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/12 |
| | | Proposal on Genebank Investment Plan | IPGRI |
| 8 | (a) | CGIAR Strategy for Central Asia and the Caucasus | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/08 |
| | (b) | CGIAR II in Latin America and the Caribbean: Priorities, Organization and Financing | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/09 |

| AGENDA ITEM | | DOCUMENT TITLE | NUMBER/SOURCE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | (c) | Strategy for the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/10 |
| | (d) | Synopsis of the Poverty Workshop held in San José, Costa Rica: Key Findings and Conclusions | SDR/TAC:IAR/00/11 |
| | (e) | Reports from TAC Members attending CGIAR related meetings: | |
| | | (i) Report to TAC on the World Water Forum, The Hague 17-19 March, 2000 - Elias Fereres | |
| | | (ii) Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme Meeting, Rome 9-10 February, 2000 – Maria Antonia Fernandez | |
| | | (iii) Genetic Resources Policy Committee, 1-3 March 2000, Rome, - Sirkka Immonen/TAC Secr. on behalf of Usha Barwale, TAC | |