

SCIENCE COUNCIL OF THE CGIAR

THE ROLE OF SYSTEMWIDE INITIATIVES IN IMPLEMENTING THE CGIAR'S RESEARCH AGENDA

An Assessment of Current Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs (SWEPs)

SC Secretariat, February 7, 2008

Introduction

This document discusses the need for and potential of systemwide initiatives as mechanisms for implementing the CGIAR endorsed System Priorities (SPs) for Research. This paper is an element of a broader description yet to be developed of the various research instruments that may be used in the CGIAR for various purposes. It builds on the Meta-Review of CGIAR Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs (SWEPs) finished in 2007.¹ The paper considers the value of the operative model of systemwide initiatives in the context of the System's future needs drawing on the experience from current SWEPs. It suggests profiles for future needs and assesses the current programs in the light of those needs.

The Framework Plans to guide the implementation of the SPs are in the process of being prepared under the oversight of the CGIAR Alliance and reviewed by the Science Council (SC). The Center-led programs, which are increasingly being conducted in a more collaborative and programmatic manner, and represent, *de facto*, systemwide approach to conducting research, are likely to remain the core instrument for implementation of CGIAR research in the future. Challenge Programs (CPs)² are gaining prominence as a distinct mechanism for addressing clearly defined globally relevant research challenges in the context of SP research involving partnerships with a wide range of institutions. The number of global challenges that can effectively be addressed by this means, their size and funding requirements, all suggest that though quite visible, the CPs will remain as a select group and not the major vehicles for addressing CGIAR research. Therefore collective systemwide action needs to be promoted to apply to all SP research.

The SWEPs began as a means for collective action among the Centers aimed at taking advantage of potential complementarities, avoiding duplication of activities, encouraging specialization among Centres, economies of scale in activities, and to internalize externalities. Along with the establishment of the Alliance of the CGIAR Centers the operational mode of the Centers has become increasingly collaborative. Today the Centers, through the Alliance, are well placed to develop efficient mechanisms for the implementation of the SPs relying increasingly on

¹http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/meetings/meeting/SC7/Meta%20Review%20SWEPs%20Final%20Report_March07.pdf

² The CPs are also instruments for conducting research in partnerships. The CPs operate on a larger scale than most SWEPs. CPs were approved at AGM'01 to bring a new programmatic approach to CGIAR research; they were designed to be time bound and impact oriented, to increase external partnerships and attract funding for major research problems. They usually have an "independent" structure for management and oversight and with that higher overhead costs. The first CPs begun in 2003. The specific characteristics of these two types of multi-partner programs—CP and SWEPs—have not been fully analysed and the potential for matching the appropriate implementing vehicle with the CGIAR SPs has not yet been explored.

systemwide collective action. The SC can provide some guidance from a System's perspective for strengthening particularly the Center based research implementation through formal systemwide initiatives³, including some of the current SWEPS, for which the CGIAR System has more than 15 years of experience. However, there is also need to consider the roles of the current SWEPS in the context of the implementation of the CGIAR's research agenda and recognising the change towards predominance and multiplicity of collaborative approaches to research in comparison with the past.

Background

Systemwide Programs emerged in the CGIAR in the 1990s with a main goal to increase the efficiency of the research by the Centers. Research focused on particular research themes and problems common to all or a group of Centers and programs developed as communities of practice sharing approaches to common subject matters. They served to link pockets of (disciplinary) expertise present across the Centers. These programs therefore were intended to develop global research applications in relatively narrowly defined areas.

Systemwide programs with an ecoregional approach (Ecoregional programs) were initiated at the same time to ensure sustainable improvement of productivity as part of the evolution of the CGIAR Centers' research agenda, as the CGIAR was expanding its research remit to natural resource management (NRM) and issues of sustainable agriculture. They were designed as an operational mechanism for undertaking research on NRM at a "system level" in priority agroecological zones, and for forging closer integration of crop genetic improvement and NRM research and as a means to enhance outcomes. They involved several CGIAR Centers and NARS partners and hence were coordinated at a functional level. The challenge was to address sustainability through resource management, particularly on water, soils, and other natural resources in different production systems and to provide feedback to crop improvement programs on cultivars needed at a system level (rather than as a single commodity). The systemwide program approach was considered optimal for addressing global strategies and drawing broader lessons from research that had strong local attributes. Synergies and improved coordination/cooperation were to be gained from different Centers' crop genetic improvement activities in defined "ecoregions". The programs were intended to be well grounded in the national and regional priorities with a strong component on capacity building and coordination to enhance developmental outcomes.

The Netherlands and Switzerland contributed to funding ecoregional programs by establishing in mid-1990s the Ecoregional Fund that operated till 2005. The aim was to stimulate ecoregional initiatives within or outside the CGIAR with the purpose of developing new methodologies in research of ecoregional scope and enhancing new approaches to NRM and rural development. Most of the 5-year ecoregional projects supported by the Fund had one or more CGIAR partners.

There are currently 15 CGIAR Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs.⁴ They have been developed over time with different motivations and have been formally approved by the CGIAR. They are convened by a nominated lead Center of the CGIAR. Some of the older SWEPS underwent review, reorganization and renewal around 2000. In 2006, the SC commissioned a Meta-Review of the SWEPS that concentrated on the post 2000 period up to mid 2006. The 17

³ Established by a formal decision of the CGIAR.

⁴ At AGM'07, the Group agreed to transform one System Office Unit, the Gender & Diversity Program into a Systemwide Program.

SWEPs operational at the time of the Meta-Review are listed in [Table 1](#). They comprised eleven Systemwide and six Ecoregional Programs, established from 1993 to 2001.

Table 1. Summary of CGIAR SWEPs

SWEPs	Started	Convening Center [latest EPMR]	SWEP-specific External Review by TAC/SC or the Convening Center
Systemwide Programs			
Alternative to Slash and Burn (ASB): Partnership for the tropical forest margins	1992	World Agroforestry [EPMR 2006]	CCER 1995 TAC 2000; SC 2005
Systemwide Genetic Resources Research Program SGRP	1994	Bioversity [EPMR 2003]	TAC 1999
Systemwide Livestock program (SLP)	1995	ILRI [EPMR 2006]	2000 (Hybrid: CCER with TAC input)
Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI)	1996	IFPRI [EPMR 2004]	TAC 2003
Systemwide Program-Integrated Pest management (SP-IPM)	1996	IITA [EPMR 2007]	TAC 2003
Global Mountains Program (GMP)	1997	CIP [EPMR 2007]	TAC 2000
Participatory Research and Gender Analysis program (PRGA)	1997	CIAT [EPMR 2007]	CCER 2000, SC 2007
Urban Harvest, the Systemwide Initiative on Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture (UH)	1999	CIP [EPMR 2007]	
Systemwide Initiative on HIV/AIDS and Agriculture (SWIHA)*	2000	WARDA [EPMR 2007]	
Systemwide Initiative on Water Management (SWIM-2) **	2001	IWMI [2006]	
Systemwide Initiative on Malaria in Agriculture (SIMA)**	2001	IWMI [EPMR 2006]	CCER 2002, Water, Health & Environment
Ecoregional Programs			
Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion CONDESAN	1993	CIP [EPMR 2007]	CCER 1996 TAC 2000
Consortium for Sustainable Development of the Inland Valley Agroecosystem in Sub-Saharan Africa (IVC)	1993	WARDA [EPMR 2007]	CCER 2004
African Highland Initiative (AHI)	1995	World Agroforestry [EPMR 2006]	CCER 1996
Rice-wheat Consortium for the Indo-Gangetic Plains (RWC)	1995	CIMMYT [EPMR 2004]	TAC 2000 CCER 2003
Desert Margins Program (DMP)	1997	ICRISAT [EPMR 2003]	TAC 2000
Collaborative Program for Sustainable Agricultural development in Central Asia and the Caucasus (CAC)	1998	ICARDA [EPMR 2007]	CCER 2003, ICARDA's Outreach activities

* WARDA is passing the role of convening SWIHA to IFPRI in 2008.

** SWIM-2 and SIMA ceased to be SWEPs at the end of 2006.

The current status of formally recognised SWEPs has recently been documented in a SC working document.⁵

⁵<http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/publications/pdf/SC%20Draft%20Status%20of%20M&E%20of%20CGIAR%20SWEPs.pdf>

In addition there are several other collective action initiatives which often are also referred to as systemwide initiatives.⁶ Also Centers operating in SSA are engaging in a new planning activity for collective action at the region level (Regional Plans) which may facilitate systemwide activities. The SWEPS complement the Center-specific programs and also the newer CPs as operational mechanisms for collective action among the Centers.

The formally recognised SWEPS have been monitored and evaluated primarily by external reviews commissioned by either the SC or the convening Centers (Center Commissioned External Reviews or CCERs) although not at a regular interval. Thirteen of the 15 current SWEPS have been reviewed by an external team. In addition, to facilitate monitoring of research planning and evaluation, the convening Centers report on the SWEPS for which they are responsible as part of the Center's rolling three year Medium-Term Plans (MTPs).

In 2006, the SC revised its guidelines for assessing SWEP proposals (Annex I).⁷ SWEPS were originally intended to be long term research programs and, as such, time limitations were not part of their design. However the CGIAR TAC's (2000) review recommended that each program should undertake a 'sunset review' every ten years to assess whether it should continue or close, either because it has met its objectives or because it is no longer viable.

With this background, the SC commissioned in 2006 a panel of experts to review the formal SWEPS using existing review reports of individual SWEPS, Center EPMR reports, available summary reports, MTPs, the document on CGIAR Priorities and other relevant documentation available at Centers with the objective of providing strategic recommendations for the future of the current CGIAR SWEPS and for defining the potential role of SWEPS in the implementation of System Priorities.⁸ The panel was tasked to identify which instruments were working well but not to judge each SWEP *per se*. The main issues to be addressed in the Meta-Review of SWEPS as defined by the SC were:

1. How successful have SWEPS been; in contributing through joint research and capacity building to achieve CGIAR goals? Identify the key research elements for a successful SWEP profile. Have SWEPS contributed to regional capacity building?
2. How can the SWEP research modality best contribute to the implementation of CGIAR

⁶ The following systemwide initiatives, not included as SWEPS, are in operation

- Agricultural Science and Technology Indicators (IFPRI) (called SWEP at the Website) <http://www.asti.cgiar.org/>
- The Global Open Food and Agriculture University (called SWEP at the Website) <http://www.openaguniversity.cgiar.org/>
- Consortium for Spatial Information <http://www.csi.cgiar.org/index.asp>
- International Crop Information System <http://www.icis.cgiar.org:8080/>
- Systemwide Information Network for Genetic Resources (SINGER; part of SGRP) <http://singer.cgiar.org/>
- Integrated Natural Resources Management <http://www.icarda.cgiar.org/INRMsite/index.htm>
- Institutional Learning & Change <http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/index.php?section=1>

⁷ CGIAR Science Council (2006): Criteria for Assessing Proposals for new Systemwide Programs <http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/Publications/pdf/SWEPS.pdf>. The criteria include consistency with CG System Priorities, fixed time lines and whether the expected results could be achieved by other research mechanisms such as regular partnerships agreements. These criteria are additional to those on which the original proposals have been assessed.

⁸ This review was organized jointly with the CGIAR Secretariat, particularly regarding governance and management aspects of SWEPS. The Alliance Secretariat provided additional information on strategic, governance, financial and other key issues regarding CGIAR SWEPS. Four consultants (three senior experts and a resource person) undertook the Review, working in virtual mode.

System Priorities? What are some advantages or disadvantages of using the SWEP structure as an instrument for implementing the System Priorities as compared with other partnership programs e.g. Challenge Programs? Identify those SWEPS that with no, or some, modification could serve as vehicles for the implementation of any of the 20 CGIAR system priorities.

3. To what extent have the existing SWEPS contributed to the pool of knowledge on research management and how have they influenced current research management practices in the CGIAR Centers? Identify best practices as well as bottlenecks to successful implementation of SWEPS.
4. Identify the key institutional factors of a successful SWEP, in terms of resulting in effective and efficient inter-center management arrangements and in attracting financial and human resources. Analyze the specific role of the convening Center, as this Center generally has higher responsibilities and transaction costs with respect to the SWEP.
5. How well has the governance structure of each SWEP worked in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? Are there clear roles and responsibilities of all partners that also reflect their respective complementary advantages? Is there clear evidence of a consultative process among research partners and stakeholders? Is the governance and coordination structure of each SWEP suited to meet its research objectives?
6. Comment on whether the incentives currently in place in the CGIAR are effective in encouraging scientists (CGIAR and partners) to engage in collective action for their research and fund raising activities.
7. Are there adequate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to assess the performance of each SWEP? How can planning, monitoring and evaluation of SWEPS be improved in future?

The Meta-Review panel had a complex task due to the high level of heterogeneity in topics and program structure between SWEPS. The panel completed its work in March 2007 providing several recommendations.

As a general finding regarding the evolution of the SWEPS, the Meta-Review concluded that the SWEPS have moved their research paradigm from variable interpretations and success in application of ecoregional and systemwide approaches with primarily a biophysical emphasis to the adoption of participatory action research and learning approaches within the integrated natural resources (INRM) framework and leading the INRM concept evolution in the CGIAR. The SC agrees to some extent with this notion with the caveat that not all SWEPS operate within an INRM framework.

Several of the findings from the Meta-Review bolster the view of future systemwide initiatives as tools for implementing CGIAR research, and the profiles of such initiatives.

- The review acknowledged the value of participatory integrated natural resource management research as a concept that should be adopted in future systemwide initiatives with an NRM focus.
- The review team recognised the potential for confusion between the CPs and SWEPS and considered it essential that the appropriate modality for collaborative programs should be clearly defined. It considered SWEPS and CPs complementary and recommended steps to minimize overlap in scope, function and operations for eliminating competition for funding and conflict of interest between Centers involved.
- The review identified several aspects that it considered as having contributed in general to the success of SWEPS for delivery. The SC believes that the following characteristics, depending on the program's orientation, have merit in any collaborative research

approaches:

- a. Building on existing successful programs or international initiatives;
 - b. Adopting partnerships and consultative planning process;
 - c. Involving participatory research approaches within an INRM framework;
 - d. Working at benchmark reference sites with standardized methods;
 - e. Engaging the private sector and encouraging self-funded partners;
 - f. Adopting competitive grant funding.
- Capacity building in general has been well included in the SWEPs' objectives involving different modalities and this has been valuable. The team emphasised the importance of considering comparative advantage and subsidiarity in integrating capacity building into the programs.
 - The team noted the variable record of SWEPs regarding publishing their outputs and recommended formal publication for generating global public goods and for facilitating the monitoring and evaluation of research output quality, relevance and quantity. Regarding monitoring, the team also noted that the MTPs are often inadequate; for example responsibilities of partners are seldom articulated.
 - The team considered that adequate and committed multi-year funding based on an approved concomitant first phase multi-year research plan and budget were an essential prerequisite for starting any new initiatives. Similarly subsequent phases should depend on a favourable review of past performance and funding committed against an approved multi-year plan. Critical mass and capacity were seen essential critical criteria for deciding on continuation of any SWEP.
 - The review made several observations and recommendations about the program management and role of convening Center, observing overlap and lack of clarity in some cases between the roles of the SWEP and the Center. There were also useful recommendations about the governance and consortium arrangement. These lessons need to be taken into account in considering the optimal operation of this research implementation mechanism.

The SC subsequently decided to use the external review as an input to extend the analysis of what currently is working well and what may be not working well in order to provide clear, strategic recommendations about systemwide initiatives as mechanisms to implement System Priorities and how these mechanisms might differ from a CP. Thus the SC has utilized the Meta-Review report on SWEPs as an input in the preparation of this report.

Assessment of the current CGIAR SWEPs

In order to harness this operational tool optimally for the implementation of the SPs, the SC considers it timely to test the relevance and appropriateness of the current SWEPs within the context of Framework Plan development for the SPs. The scope and orientation of any current SWEP should be reassessed as part of the SP implementation process.

The assessments of the individual SWEPs are presented in [Annex II](#). They are based on the information available from the recent Meta-Review of SWEPs, information collected from the Program's MTP (and Web site if not available in MTP); SC MTP commentaries (MTPs 2006-8, 2007-9, 2008-10), recent CCER or EPMR reports and analysis of 5 years of output and output target plans. Center EPMRs have looked at the SWEPs mostly from the Center's point of view, not their value for the CGIAR System. In its analysis of the descriptive information and recent evaluative information, the SC has, in particular, projected the program's potential for facilitating

SP implementation and contributing to SP research. It has also considered the program's merits against the generic criteria for systemwide initiatives to focus on relevant research topics or activities related to the CGIAR mainstream research to foster synergy and enhance efficiency and effectiveness of the System.

The utility of the current SWEPs for implementation of the CGIAR SPs varies. Furthermore, some of them appear more viable in terms of strategy, operations and funding than others. All current SWEPs are older than 10 years, with the exception of CAC (established 1998) Urban Harvest (1999), and SWIHA (2000). In 2006, two SWEPs were terminated: Systemwide Initiative on Malaria in Agriculture (SIMA) and the Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture (SWIM 2). Even for those SWEPs that are judged to be relevant and productive as vehicles for implementing SP research, a reassessment of their activities and research content is justified in connection with the development of the Framework Plans.

Table 2. SC recommendations on the current SWEPs

Program	Comments
<u>Rice-Wheat Research Consortia (RWC)</u>	This has been an effective ecoregional program. It Could be redesigned to undertake significant NRM research within SP Area 4 as an NRM initiative.
<u>Sustainable Agricultural Development in Central Asia and the Caucasus (CAC)</u>	CAC has been an effective multi-center program to coordinate and strengthen research in the CAC sub-region. Pending decisions on the CGIAR role in CAC the program could continue to coordinate CGIAR activities there.
<u>Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI)</u>	CAPRI has been very effective in coordinating research and capacity building on its focus themes and could continue with appropriate refocusing on SP Area 5.
<u>Systemwide Genetic Resources Program (SGRP)</u>	SGRP has been very effective in coordinating genetic resources issues among all relevant Centers and has had a strong role in facilitating framework planning. It could continuously play a strong role, in particular for the implementation of SPs in Area 1.
<u>Systemwide Livestock Program (SLP)</u>	SLP has been effective in coordinating research at the crop-livestock interface and it has potential for the implementation of the SPs.
<u>Systemwide Program on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM)</u>	The SP-IPM had a clearly defined role in its early stage as a coordination program and has more recently attempted to revive its role. As the program is intending to start anew, its goals and purpose need to be reassessed as a new program focusing on specific SP research areas.
<u>Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins (ASB)</u>	ASB has been successful in pioneering research in its focus area and in capacity building. It is currently at cross-roads and potentially overlapping with other NRM research. The newly described program's complementary role should be assessed in the context of implementing SP Area 4 research.
<u>Inland Valley Agroecosystems in Sub-Saharan Africa (IVC)</u>	IVC is largely a coordination vehicle; other regional entities could be explored for the coordination as a sub-regional platform for facilitation. As inland valleys remain a very significant ecosystem for food production in all SSA they may

Program	Comments
	merit a different coherent research approach.
African Highlands Initiative (AHI)	AHI is an ASARECA program and its potential to contribute to SP implementation as a CGIAR program is doubtful.
CONDESAN	Based on results of a recent review and its own analysis the SC does not consider CONDESAN a relevant CGIAR Systemwide program for the implementation of the SPs. CONDESAN has, however, been an effective Andean regional network which should maintain a partnership relation with the CGIAR and which can facilitate the use of IPG research results for local application and outcomes.
Desert Margins Program (DMP)	The DMP does not have clear research or research coordination content and the SC considers its activities outside the SPs. DMP's potential to contribute to SP implementation is doubtful and it could be brought to closure at the end of the current GEF funding period.
Global Mountain Program (GMP)	GMP has little value for implementing the SPs. Relevant research could be identified and implemented as part of FPs within SP Area 4.
Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA)	PRGA was recently reviewed with SC recommendation that the program continue until end of 2009 with activities limited only to documenting the evidence on participatory plant breeding impacts. The activities on NRM should be taken up in the SP implementation and more collective effort be given to gender analysis and research.
Systemwide Initiative on HIV/AIDS (SWIHA)	SWIHA does not contribute to coordinating SP research and HIV <i>per se</i> is not a CGIAR research priority. While SWIHA should cease to be a SWEP, the justification for a revised, IFPRI convened program should be considered under a new strategy, orientation and goals of the initiative to fit better within the comparative advantage of the CGIAR and to define better the program's contribution to the SPs.
Urban Harvest (UH)	The SC has assessed the UH as being outside the SPs and therefore the activities are considered to be part of the 20% agenda. In agreement with the recent CIP EPMR recommendation, the SC recommends that UH ceases to be a CGIAR Systemwide program.

Rationale and profiles for future CGIAR systemwide initiatives

There is emerging collaboration among some Centers built around "value adding" and undertaken by Boards and management. These efforts are applauded by the SC where they improve the efficiency of the research undertaking while minimising transaction costs. The SC believes that the analysis in this paper of the functions of the various SWEPs used by the CGIAR is useful to assist the Alliance in choosing the most efficient means of implementing the SP research as articulated in the Framework Plans. In order to maintain coherence it would be useful to have agreed upon profiles for a few generic vehicles. The "good practice" governance/steering

arrangements would depend on the degree of formality ranging from regular program coordination at Center or Centers' alliance level to a formal program structure, like the current SWEPs have, with administration, steering, fund-raising and image autonomous to a certain degree from the convening Center.

The SC believes that the value of the systemwide approach needs to be reconsidered in the context of implementing the SPs, drawing on the lessons learned from the System's experience with SWEPs in the recent past. Through its analysis of the complementary roles of the different research implementation instruments, the experiences from the current SWEPs and the requirements of the different SPs that might be best served by a systemwide consortium mechanism for implementation, the SC concludes that a formal systemwide initiative structure has merits in some cases, provided that the transaction costs are controlled. The focus on the following is on when a clearly defined and formally managed program with its own administrative structure may be an appropriate vehicle for advancing research purposes in the SP context.

The SC emphasises that the decision to start new formal systemwide initiatives on research needs to derive from the SP implementation planning and analysis of the benefits from a formal program over regular collaboration between an alliance of Centers. Any structure should be subservient to the needs of efficient delivery of research results.

Three main profiles for formal systemwide initiatives are suggested, that partly build on the earlier functions and experiences from them. First, this mechanism could be considered for supporting communities of practice for coordinating CGIAR research (*Systemwide coordination programs*). Second, this mechanism could also be considered in particular for organising research in SP Area 4 where some of the challenges are the development of international public goods from location and case-specific natural resource management research and the delivery of locally applicable results drawing from global models (*Systemwide NRM initiatives*). Third, a systemwide consortium mechanism should be tested for advancing new emerging research ideas where piloting and concerted research investment among key partners can help accumulate experience and knowledge for defining longer term research objectives or, for example, generating a Challenge Program (*Short term systemwide research task forces*). The optimal duration of any initiative would depend on its purpose and all initiative would need to have time-bound objectives.

Some generic characteristics of future systemwide initiatives include:

- The topic is related to Center's mainstream research;
- The partnership involves several Centers that are engaged in the research or activity;
- The synergy from Center collaboration is clear;
- Initiated through an internal CGIAR initiative to build around relevant research topics or activities to foster synergy and enhance efficiency and effectiveness;
- Serve a capacity building role and foster effective communication to enhance NARS, CGIAR and public awareness around the program content;
- Focus can be on scaling up- and out rather than on original research – an outcome oriented program.

The distinction between CPs and systemwide initiatives is very clear; the independently governed CPs focus on a major challenge requiring internal and external research partners to

provide critical mass and time-bound outputs. They are large scale research programs intended to capture “new” money for the CGIAR research agenda and their reviews are commissioned every five years by the SC on behalf of the CGIAR. In contrast the systemwide initiatives enhance collective action mainly (but not exclusively) within the CGIAR System (Centers and NARS); they vary in terms of duration (depending on purpose); they are formally established with independent coordination but rely on Center governance. They should be evaluated more like Center programs with focus on internal mechanisms.

The SC has identified 3 profiles for future systemwide initiatives that could increase the System’s efficiency in its operations and serve implementation of the CGIAR System Priorities.

1. Systemwide coordination programs

Systemwide coordination programs are a suitable vehicle for strengthening communities of practice for linking CGIAR science. Some of the existing programs have been instrumental for coordinating the framework planning. These programs predominantly provide a coordinating platform for communities of practice. They can contribute to catalysing SP research and to gluing together expertise and actors in different Centers and partner organisation around global topics where the global, regional and national policy implications may be particularly relevant. Thus they can help indirectly implement CGIAR’s SPs by facilitating Center and partner activities for addressing specific SPs. Systemwide coordination programs may also be a suitable vehicle for coordinating research that is not exclusively addressed by any Center and falls in the interface of different research mandates such as animal feed issues addressed by the current Systemwide Livestock Program (SLP).⁹

Profile:

- Several Centers are engaged in the same activity or research theme which significantly benefits from coordination or operating in a region where political and institutional characteristics provide commonality;
 - There are CGIAR level policy implications that the program can handle
 - There are best practice issues where Centers need uniformity in their approaches
 - There are economies of scale and universal lessons that can be captured through coordination
 - The research environment is characterised by political, social and institutional conditions such that coordination adds value to CGIAR operations
 - The research area is not a single Center responsibility but best elevated to a topic of importance in a coordinated program (e.g. SLP)
- The program provides a continuous structure and platform for facilitating individual Center research and research related activities;
- The program may have a role for identifying new challenges in the thematic areas or in the region for responding to changing demands;
- There are effective and clearly identifiable partnership linkages with ARIs and other global agencies engaged in the topic; and with NARS and other research agencies in the region, with complementarity of functions across the partners;
- Close linkages are fostered with global strategic commodity/subject matter research;

⁹ The SC recognises that some System wide initiatives are for purposes other than IPG research. For example, the Gender & Diversity Program has a coordination role and deals primarily with capacity issues.

- Program products can be guidelines, harmonization of best practices, steering of joint activities, synthesis, information and guidelines or capacity building through small grants, catalysing research and networking; some of these products can be IPGs in their own right;
- While the programs might not be time-bound the research objectives and planned output are;
- The over head costs are low and are born by the participants;
- Membership voluntary.

2. Systemwide NRM initiatives

Systemwide “NRM initiatives” would be a vehicle for organising natural resource management research that can address issues at a strategic level and can generate international public goods. Global models derived from location and case-specific natural resource management research can be a component of such initiatives and provide a basis for collaboration and capacity building. Research on the SP Area 4 may benefit from implementation through a small number of inter-Center programs, the “NRM initiatives”, at regional or sub-regional level, rather than addressing each SP through a large global approach where each Center would need to identify its contribution to the global effort.

While such an initiative draws much from the ecoregioanl initiative of the past, it would differ on the magnitude of the research domains. NRM and the sustainability of agroecological systems may be best defined at the landscape to river basin levels. Typically several Centers conduct research on NRM and sustainable productivity enhancement issues in the same river basin area where the NRM issues in particular benefit from an integrated and coordinated approach. The analysis of natural resource flows, and causal linkages between human interventions and natural events and sustainability of agricultural systems require a broader view than an “ecoregion” might represent, let alone a single agroecology. A systemwide “NRM initiative” would aim at linking the global aspects of NRM research as specified in the SP objectives and goals to the needs and application at the program’s operational scale which is transboundary, cross-sectoral and across topo- and clinosequences. Commodity oriented research such as development of seed-based technologies should be integrated to the natural resource-based productivity and sustainability research at the Center-Program interface.

Profile:

- Research addresses landscape or river basin units that encompass agroecological zones of high priority for the CGIAR;
- A key tool for addressing specific research goals and objectives within SP research Area 4;
- There are effective and clearly identifiable partnership linkages with NARS and other research agencies within the basin to enhance outcome, with complementarity of functions across the partners;
- Joint research efforts of several Centers with a limited number of external research partners;
- Involvement of other partners is required because of the geographical research domain relevance and as identified in the impact pathway;
- Close linkages are fostered with global strategic commodity/subject matter research;
- Program research is defined within a 5-10 year time frame, the researchable problems are clearly defined and the research outputs are time bound;
- The programs’ continuation is subject to newly defined objectives and time-bound outputs;
- The program may have a role for identifying new researchable challenges to sustainability for the CGIAR to address on the nexus of agricultural and natural resource management research;
- There is a realistic budget plan for the duration of the program;

- Plausible impact pathway accompanied by identification of key NARS partnerships and essential capacity building;
- While it may not be advisable to establish NRM programs for a fixed short term, the need for and role of an NRM program should be periodically reassessed – for example in synchrony with re-assessment of the SP goals.

3. Short term systemwide research task forces

A research task force is a mechanism that enables the Centers' to nimbly respond to specific research opportunities, to scope new emerging research ideas where piloting and concerted research investment among key partners can help accumulate and synthesize experience and knowledge for defining longer term research objectives or, for example, generating an embryo for a potential Challenge Program. The CGIAR does not currently have these types of formal initiatives in its tool kit and it could use them for stimulating activity in any area where short term impetus and testing of hypotheses can help determine subsequent research opportunities and potential.

Profile:

- Joint research effort of two or more Centers with a limited number of external research partners;
- Research is conducted on technical and human dimensions of problems that have global relevance;
- Research problem requires concerted effort of two or more CGIAR Centers with selected partners for solving particular clearly defined aspects of the research problem, for piloting new research or for catalysing or kick-starting research in the problem area;
- The research benefits from the facilitation provided by a formal consortium arrangement;
- The research topic fits within the context of an SP but may be a blue sky area potentially relevant for solving SP research problems;
- Program research is defined within a very short time frame—max. 5 years—and the researchable problems are clearly defined;
- Funding can be secured for the duration of the program;
- An exit strategy is formulated in the beginning.

Developing appropriate monitoring and evaluation

The increasingly collaborative mode of conducting research needs to be taken into account in monitoring and evaluation that traditionally have had Centers as the unit of focus. There is a parallel between formal CGIAR programs—the SWEPS and CPs—and other systemwide and multi-partner approaches that may be based on different kinds of consortium agreements. With the increase of a System's approach to all research, the need for transparency in research planning, monitoring and evaluations in terms of division of duties, budgeting and allocation of resources, accountability, and sharing credit of results will be even greater than before.

With systemwide initiatives program monitoring should be the responsibility of the convening Center. The program funding and the distribution of resources to different partners should be transparent. The Meta-Review identified clear deficiencies in the MTPs of SWEPS and recommended improved protocols for MTPs to reflect a) the collaborative nature and special relationship of SWEPS with the convening Center and b) the priority setting and program planning. The MTPs protocol should facilitate their use for program coordination, monitoring progress and evaluation and impact assessment. The SC has also commented on these kinds of

problems in its MTP assessment and will consider specific changes in the guidelines for systemwide initiatives to improve planning, transparency and accountability.

There is need to agree on a new, systematic and relatively light evaluation of systemwide initiatives where the main responsibility should be with the convening Center as it is for Center programs. The current monitoring and evaluation practice has involved SC commissioned external reviews of some SWEPS that, in terms of costs and time requirement, may be a disproportionately massive effort considering the volume of work in the program. Other SWEPS have been outside this review process and have been evaluated through CCERs or not at all. The Meta-Review made several suggestions for improving the monitoring and evaluation processes of systemwide initiatives that should be considered; many of the suggested steps are internal best practices of self-monitoring.

ANNEX I

Criteria for Assessing Proposals for new Systemwide Programs SC Secretariat, January 2006

Suggested **general outline:**

- Project summary (not to exceed one page).
- Project description and business plan including letters of intent by all partners.
- The **rationale** for the program including an elaboration on the type of collaborative arrangement among all partners.
- Description of any prior work and achievements to-date.
- List of senior scientists involved in the program from all participating Centers and organizations.
- Budget; current and pending support.
- Governance and management plan including arrangement for coordination, advisory mechanisms and secretariat.
- Facilities, equipment, and other resources (Appendix).

The full proposal **should not exceed 40 pages** in length, excluding appendices.

The SC will use the following criteria in the assessment of the quality of the proposals:

1. **Relevance of the expected outputs criteria.**

- The proposed research program aims at delivering outputs that very significantly enhance the objectives sought by the CGIAR, namely: poverty reduction, food security, and sustainability of resource use. The proposal shows evidence of consistency with CG System Priorities for research.
- The expected results can uniquely be obtained through such a Program as opposed to the other CGIAR research mechanisms, such as regular partnerships arrangements.
- The research is planned to provide technologies and knowledge of an international public goods nature.
- The program has a fixed time line and the expected outputs are clearly defined and are achievable within the proposed time frame.
- The expected outputs are achievable within the planned budget.

2. **Quality of science criteria**

- The research hypotheses are clearly specified in relation to the proposed challenge, and the proposed research methodology is directly relevant to the outputs sought.
- The research is based on state of the arts knowledge in the domain, and the proposal explicitly places itself relative to the most recent advances in the field.
- The research itself is likely to lead to important advances in science and knowledge.

3. **Strategy for utilizing and applying results**

- The research proposal is accompanied by an explicit plan for delivery, communication, and dissemination of results and outputs, to maximize benefits to CGIAR stakeholders.
- The research proposal addresses not only the fundamental scientific aspects but also the applied and adaptive stages of the research, in a realistic manner and the uptake of research outputs in order to produce high impact outcomes.
- A plausible impact pathway for the delivery of program outputs to the end users is defined.
- A plausible "exit strategy" is defined and is consistent with the research plan.

4. **Collaborative arrangements and beneficiaries involvement in research**

- The program partners include the most relevant CGIAR Centers and external partners to enhance synergy and research effectiveness.
- The synergies, value added and mutual benefits among partners are clear.
- The roles and responsibilities of partners reflect their respective complementary advantages.
- The proposal gives clear evidence that consultations have been held with proposed research partners, in particular in the regions of relevance.

5. **Governance and management criteria:**
- The program is to be coordinated by an agreed management structure endorsed by Director Generals of the Centers involved in the partnership.
 - The arrangements for administrative support (to be provided by one of the core parties) are satisfactory. The Board of each participating Center is accountable for the input resources and delivery of agreed outputs of that core party.
 - There are clear lines of accountability and clear institutional arrangements spelling out roles, responsibilities, rules of operation, and conflict resolution in a formal agreement signed off at the appropriate legal level by each Program party.
 - There are clear and satisfactory arrangements for handling legal responsibilities and there is full adherence to the CGIAR's IPR policy.
6. **Performance evaluation and impact analysis criteria:**
- Internal peer review mechanisms for quality and relevance and for performance evaluation are present and sound.
 - Procedures are in place for the continuing monitoring of progress and adjustments of the program (as needed) In the course of implementation.
 - Indicators are identified and benchmark information is available to measure project impact.
 - The proposal should include an internal time-bound work plan on the project's progress, specifying stages and milestones, with intermediate deliverable products subject to independent peer reviews.
7. **Budget and finance criteria:**
- The business plan outlines a strategy to mobilize new resources (in cash and in kind).
 - The proposed budget and its allocation are appropriate and agreed among partners.
 - There is evidence of availability of sufficient up-front funding for the first 3-5 years of the program.
 - A viable exit strategy is defined.

ANNEX II

SC OBSERVATIONS AND ASSESSMENT OF EACH CURRENT CGIAR SWEP¹⁰

Rice-Wheat Consortium for the Indo-Gangetic Plains (RWC)

RWC was established in 1994 and is hosted by CIMMYT. RWC is a consortium among four South Asian National Agricultural Research Systems (Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan) and five CGIAR Centers (CIMMYT, IRRI, CIP, ICRISAT, IWMI). The partners' role in output and output target delivery is not specified in the MTP logframe. Program **budget** is not given.

RWC's **Goal** is to conserve natural resources, improve livelihoods, and alleviate poverty through sustainable increases in the productivity of rice-wheat systems in South Asia. Its **purpose** is to strengthen existing linkages and partnerships with NARS, IARCs, ARIs and local private enterprises working to develop and deploy more efficient, productive and sustainable technologies for the diverse rice-wheat production systems of the Indo-Gangetic Plains, thereby fostering the production of more food at lower costs, improving the livelihoods of those involved in agriculture, and overall reducing poverty. The development of **IPGs** is not elaborated in the MTP. **SP alignment** is not indicated in MTP

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

The Rice-Wheat Consortium is effective in bringing other Centers, ARI and NARS as full partners. The individual strengths of the partners and how they are contributing to the overall objectives, and how these link to the CIMMYT program, need to be brought out more clearly in the MTP description. RWC interaction with SLP is positive.

MTP 2008-2010

The ecoregional programme on rice wheat consortium for Indo-Gangetic plains is an excellent initiative, which is region-specific in its output but has a larger dimension of its replication in the SSA regions.

IRRI EPMR 2003

The RWC stemmed from the concerns that intensification of irrigated rice-wheat system that occupy one fifth of the grain producing areas of Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan had started to exhaust the soil and was leading to yield decline, particularly in the wet season rice, from an average of 5 t/ha to 3t/ha in twenty years. As it is estimated that the demand for rice and wheat will grow at 2% per annum in the next 20 years in this region, there was a need for a radical reappraisal of the existing production systems. The Consortium has been outstandingly successful in developing more sustainable production systems that will be of benefit to many of the 1.2 billion people who live on the Indo- Gangetic Plain. The challenge has been to adapt the land, puddled for rice in the wet season, into a suitable seedbed for wheat and other crops in the dry season and back to rice in time for the next monsoon. In the wetter, eastern ecoregions of the basin there can even be a third crop, provided the rice crop can be planted, grown and harvested rapidly. When conventional rice and wheat production systems are used sequentially on the same land, both crops suffer yield losses. Despite earlier difficulties in reaching the yields achieved in conventionally puddled systems, yields are now equal to the best conventional crops. Modified irrigation in formed beds, combined with zero tillage and direct seeding, also give substantial savings in water use, labour and fertilizer inputs. This represents a great achievement.

The RWC has emerged as an innovative model for regional and international collaboration, on the basis of its strong and credible record of achievements. Many of these have been compiled and documented

CIMMYT 5th EPMR 2004

The EPMR quotes the CCER (2003) that the RWC had been a successful joint venture between CIMMYT, IRRI and NARS that served as an innovative model for regional and international cooperation with a credible record of scientific and practical achievements. The PEMR concludes that: The rice-wheat system development in South Asia is an outstanding success in the CGIAR System (see Chapter 3 under NRG). This success should be used as an example of technology development and dissemination in collaboration with many partners, and be applied for other regions. However it should be noted that the adoption of the technology is not uniformly distributed

¹⁰ The descriptions are based on Center MTPs 2008-2010 and in some cases on information at the SWEPs Web site. The comments draw from SC assessments of three most recent MTPs, recent Center EPMRs or SWEP external reviews and regarding output and output targets from MTPs 2006-08, 2007-09 and 2008-10.

within the IGP. Rice-wheat system development should remain the priority of the Programme. However, the emphasis should be placed more on the eastern IGP where irrigation water is less available and resource availability is poorer compared with the north western part of the IGP.

MTP output/output target analysis

Outputs changed in 2007. SC considered output targets still vague. In 2006 output targets were downstream and meeting activities. Of new outputs (3) one is about research, others on adoption and information and data management.

SC Conclusions:

- Very little information about the program in the MTP; However recent IRRI and CIMMYT EPMRs and the CCER (2003) indicate the RWC has operated in a manner initially considered for an ecoregional program and been successful
- It has focused NRM and crop improvement research on arresting the decline in factor productivity for this intensive cereal system and has brought new NRM and nutrient and water use methods to increase productivity. It has demonstrated the need for introducing more crop diversity into the system – a need that matches with the SP of higher value crops.
- The RWC covers a major food system; its sustainability depends on water management at the larger basin.
- In the view of the SC the RWS could be designed to undertake significant NRM research for SP. This would mean that the RWC is more proactive in now devolving its promising methodologies in tillage, weed, nutrient and water management, to its NARS partners in order to undertake the new wave of strategic research needed.

Collaborative Research Program for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Central Asia and the Caucasus (CAC)

CAC was established in 1998 and it is hosted by ICARDA. CAC covers the eight countries of Central Asia and the Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. All these countries were republics under the defunct Soviet Union. CAC was initiated to deal with the deterioration of the national agricultural research systems and institutions after the collapse of the Soviet Union. **Center partners** involve nine CGIAR Centers; the following are identified in the output/output target lists in ICARDA MTP 2008-2010: ICARDA, CIMMYT, ICRISAT, CIP, IRRI, IWMI, Bioversity. **Other key partners** are as indicated in output list: AVRDC, ICBA, some NGOs, and NARS. **Program budget** is not given in the MTP or in the financial summary tables.

CAC's **role** is: Development and application of cost effective and income generating appropriate technologies, Generating an enabling policy environment together with supporting rural institutions, Strengthening the capacity of NARS. **Research and activities** cover a very wide scope. Productivity of Agricultural Systems (Germplasm Enhancement, Strengthening National Seed Supply Systems, Cropping Systems Management and Agricultural Diversification, Livestock Production Systems and Integrated Feed/ Livestock Management), Natural Resource Conservation and Management (Irrigation, Drainage, and Water Basin Analysis, On-Farm Soil and Water Management, Rangeland Rehabilitation and Management), Conservation and Evaluation of Genetic Resources (Plant Genetic Resources, Animal Genetic Resources), Socioeconomic and Public Policy Research, Strengthening National Programs. The development of **IPGs** is not elaborated in the MTP. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP: CAC addresses 13 SPs (financial allocations not given).

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

The SWEP for Central Asia and the Caucasus includes research, capacity strengthening, and development activities and the three seem to be well integrated. It can be argued that the central Asian region needs a great deal more capacity strengthening than the rest of the eco-region of interest to ICARDA. Thus, as long as the three components are appropriately integrated, there is a good case for a relatively high proportion of capacity strengthening and development oriented activities in this ecoregional program. However a number of the proposed activities are focused on national development (e.g. "four farmer field days on livestock and forage technologies organized in two countries") that presumably should be done by national institutions. It is not clear that ICARDA would have the comparative advantage in doing those kinds of things. They look more like a response to a request for consulting. SC considered many of the CAC activities as non-SP.

ICARDA EPMR:

The CAC program itself was not evaluated in the EPMR; only ICARDA's role and achievements:

Until the arrival of ICARDA in the region, the NARS had little contact with the international scientific community, had few young well-trained staff, had decaying infrastructure, and had lost links with farmers. Further the break up of the collectives into small farms has resulted in former laborers being turned into farmers or shepherds with no expertise in managing land or stock, and with little or no access to reliable information. The Panel sees the PFU [Program Facilitation Unit] as an excellent mechanism to facilitate inter-center collaboration and as a very important focal point for knowledge acquisition and dissemination among all countries in the Region. Furthermore, the PFU has served as a platform for the association of the NARS of the Region that, for the first time, meet regularly and have positive exchanges. Also, the PFU has been instrumental in attracting additional partners to R&D activities, such as the Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center to the Region.

MTP output/output target analysis

CAC has had the same Outputs since MTP 2006-8. Most of the program's work is on adaptive germplasm development for the region with majority of work on legumes and cereals by CIMMYT and ICARDA, with a diversification intention by other Centers on additional crops and on genetic resources conservation (three major outputs). The NRM activities under one output are extension and capacity building (ICARDA, IWMI and CIMMYT involved). Two outputs focus on capacity building, institutional strengthening and institutional co-operation ICARDA did not report on output target achievement for 2006. Generally very high number of output targets relative to funding.

SC Conclusions:

- CAC was established as a unique and unified response by the Centers to the engagement of the CAC states with the CGIAR system. It has a large component in adaptive research and capacity strengthening and thus does not fit well the original concept for ecoregional programs.
- The program's content does not have strong agroecological attributes, but it is rather a sub-regional program characterized by political, social and infrastructural similarities in the 5 countries.
- The program does not have clearly defined research targets; it is strongly focused on germplasm deployment and adaptation on one hand and extension, facilitation and capacity on the other hand – all continuous activities. (The germplasm focus is not surprising because that is what the key Centers, ICARDA and CIMMYT do best.)
- There are no doubt logistical issues involved in any Center having presence in the sub-region in which the program can help. Despite its small NRM component, it should be considered a Coordination program rather than a systemwide NRM-oriented program for implementing SP4 area research. Absence of any budget figures is an omission in the MTP.
- CAC seems to have an important role coordinating the CGIAR activities in the sub-region.
- But, is the CAC region a priority region for the CGIAR? Is CAC a cost-effective means for assisting this region?
- Do the Center activities have a clear poverty focus?
- The program's future should be decided in conjunction with deciding what the CGIAR's role is in CAC in the context of CGIAR's goals.
- With these caveats, CAC could continue as a facilitation program to coordinate CGIAR activities in the CAC sub-region.

Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI)

CAPRI was established in 1996 and is hosted by IFPRI. All 15 CGIAR Centers participate in it. Other key partners identified in the MTP include IDRC, Indiana University and University of California, Berkeley in steering committee; 10 country collaborators in running projects. Partners' roles are defined in the MTP logframe only in generic terms (CAPRI Secretariat or CGIAR Centers). **Program budget** in 2008 is US\$ 0.875 million.

CAPRI aims to facilitate sustainable management of natural resources of particular importance to food, nutrition, and agriculture (land, water, trees, and genetic resources) and to contribute to policies and practices for efficient, equitable, and sustainable natural resource use to alleviate rural poverty. In particular, CAPRI's **objectives** are to:

- Increase knowledge on Collective Action and Property Rights institutions in natural resource management and their effectiveness under different conditions;

- Identify concrete policy instruments that facilitate and encourage the formation, improved functioning, resilience, and spontaneous evolution of organizations of users and property institutions that assure optimal resource use, and promote partnerships between local organizations, states, civil society, and private entities;
- Strengthen the capacity of national and CG research centers, non-governmental organizations, universities, and local organizations.

For developing IPGs, the network provides synthesized the lessons, documentation of general policy implications, influencing policy at international levels, training materials. Outputs from activities are reported by CGIAR Centers. **Research and activities** include: the roles of property rights and collective action in determining agricultural productivity and food security, access to natural resources critical to sustaining rural livelihoods, and the likelihood that resources will be available to meet future needs. CAPRI operates through commissioned and competitive grants.

SP alignment indicated in MTP: 4A, 4C, 5C, 5D (allocation not given at this level).

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

General statement of IFPRI's projects, including CAPRI being well-focused for achieving CGIAR goals. IFPRI's role as leader of CAPRI is well specified and the MTP for that is presented clearly. Output targets are vague.

MTP 2007-2009

The SC finds the CAPRI narrative especially informative on adjustments being made toward SPs, and welcomes the program's new explicit focus on collective action for marketing, with the aim of strengthening CGIAR System Priority 5c, *rural institutions and their governance*, as well as the program's intention to revisit its priority themes to reflect a stronger emphasis on poverty reduction. Otherwise the CAPRI MTP is not very clear and partners' roles are not specified.

MTP 2008-2010

The IPG narrative for CAPRI is good. The output targets related to SWEPs are in general not sufficiently specific. CAPRI will regionalize its activities more and work with regional entities and scale up to cross-regional learning as a way of generating IPGs.

CAPRI review 2003

The Review Panel concluded that CAPRI's thematic foci are highly relevant to the CGIAR goals. The Review Panel is very positive about CAPRI's outputs and their impacts, and particularly CAPRI's role in creating increased awareness by centres and NARS of the role of CA and PR research in natural resource management and technology adoption. The Panel believes that had it not been for CAPRI, the centres would have, at best, paid lip service to the inclusion of CA and PR in their research agenda. Furthermore, as in any Systemwide programme, inter-centre collaboration has enabled the capture of synergies and latent capacities within NARS and other partners. Nevertheless, the Panel encountered disparities in institutional research capacity and centres involvement in CAPRI's research. The Panel considers CAPRI to be an example of an effective and innovative structure for promoting cross cutting research. CAPRI experience with competitive grants is relevant in this period when Challenge Programmes are being discussed. Further the Panel is convinced that without CAPRI, it would have taken many years to produce the same amount of quality research.

Although poverty eradication underlies most of CAPRI's work, the Panel believes a systematic study should be carried out on the relationships between CA, PR and poverty alleviation, to strengthen the underlying concept on which CAPRI is based. The Panel notes that CAPRI has developed specific policy findings for certain technologies that facilitate their adoption, and has acquired new insights into the need for CA to improve animal health. This should be expanded to human health issues. The Panel regards the existing best practice on planning research for policy impact to be excellent, as exemplified by the Mashreq/Maghreb project and the subsequent policy workshop. Such best practices should be replicated more widely.

Some of the studies on Gender have been excellent, but the Panel considers that the mainstreaming of these studies and the treatment of Gender as a cross-cutting theme have been only partially successful, and that a more purposeful approach is required.

The Panel concludes that CAPRI has achieved a critical mass and momentum in CA and PR research, which is very relevant to NRM research. Much of CAPRI's payoff will accrue over the next four to five years, and so the continuation of CAPRI as a Systemwide programme would be a strategic decision in promoting the CGIAR's

poverty alleviation focus within the centres and the new Challenge Programme. In the Panel's view, CAPRI should take advantage of its systemwide status by placing increased future emphasis on a) policies to promote genetic resources and NRM technologies requiring collective action that target poor communities, b) developing effective tools for capacity building of weaker centres and NARS, and c) expanding the circle of collaborating centres and NARS. The Panel also suggests CAPRI considers enhancing the impact of its activities through case studies and research into identifying the key decision-makers. CAPRI's Steering Committee decision not to become a Challenge Programme was discerning and far-sighted. The Panel urged that the program should be provided with an annual "core budget" of \$2 million.

IFPRI EPMR 2005

The CAPRI work won the CGIAR's Excellence in Science Award in 2002 for Outstanding Partnership. With respect to water and property rights in CAPRI, the Panel agrees with the assessment of the CCER that through a combination of review papers, workshops and new empirical research, the program has helped to illustrate how institutions of collective action and property rights affect the adoption of agricultural technologies and natural resource management practices.

MTP output/output target analysis

There were two research related outputs in 2006 focusing on conceptual frameworks and impact assessment; these were stopped. The current outputs (two carrying on from 2006) are about capacity, dissemination for informing about CA and PR, networking and knowledge strengthening and only one output has more clear research content (policy options). The output targets are largely related to process or dissemination.

SC Conclusions:

- CAPRI has been assessed to be a successful program coordinating Center activities and awareness on the focus theme.
- Its profile is increasingly in capacity building and facilitation
- It can contribute particularly to SP5C probably less so to SPs in area 4.
- It should continue, with appropriate re focusing on SP 5 as a Coordinating program

Systemwide Genetic Resources Program (SGRP)

SGRP was established in 1994 and is hosted by **Bioversity International**. All CGIAR Centers participate in the program. In the latest MTP most Center partners are listed to have a role in each output. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 6.432 million.

SGRP's **Goal** is: Agricultural, forest and aquatic biodiversity contribute to reducing poverty, enhancing food security and nutrition, and protecting the environment. Its **Purpose** is: Effective management of genetic resources as global public goods and improved generation of knowledge, technologies and information for enhancing the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural, forest and aquatic biodiversity, through System-wide actions. **Research and activities** include: System-wide policies and practices developed; Knowledge, technologies and information generated, Awareness raised and technical contributions made. SINGER, the CGIAR Systemwide Information Network for Genetic Resources, is a SGRP initiative. Development of **IPGs** is through; Facilitating distribution of genetic resources as a public good through policies, practices and operational frameworks that meet international norms; distribution of knowledge and technologies on genetic resources conservation; influencing international development and environment agendas. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% allocation): 1A (60), 1B (25), 1C (3), 1D (1), 2A, 3A, 3D, 4A (4), 5A (5), 5C, new research (1).

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries:

MTP 2006-2008

SGRP, which IPRGI hosts, is a prominent, and very efficient, vehicle to promulgate IPGRI's science.

MTP 2007-2009

The IPGRI-convened SGRP is fully integrated into the Center while apparently enjoying the confidence of the other Centers. The SC commends the work of the SGRP that has now taken on livestock and fish GR strategies in developing the first Priority Frameworks. The approval of the International Treaty is likely to give a boost to several of the program's activities related to policies and acquiring genetic resources. Special focus is needed on collecting wild relatives of crops which have been under-valued and under-utilized by breeders, and are under-represented in current gene banks, but now represent a huge diversity that can be tapped efficiently thanks to new molecular tools. Many of the Center Project outputs involve the SGRP and these are clearly identified in the logframe.

MTP 2008-2010

In the move to the Global System, Projects F09 and SGRP with alignment of CGIAR genebanks with key NARS and ARI banks, the SC sees opportunities to devolve responsibilities from Bioversity and the CGIAR to others. Bioversity's role and involvement in the SWEPS and CPs is very well described. However, it seems that the entire SGRP budget of about US\$ 6.4 million for 2008 is included in Bioversity's total budget and the volume of work done by other program partners is not clear.

IPGRI EPMR

SGRP does not undertake research as part of its own agenda. It promotes, facilitates and coordinates, rather than executes. It does not offer funding. The operation of the SGRP is based on one annual meeting of the Steering Committee composed of Centres' representatives. An Executive Committee (EC) (Chair plus two members) ensures continuity of work between Steering Committee meetings. The necessary technical and policy work is undertaken, on a permanent basis, by IPGRI in interaction with the EC.

Through SGRP, IPGRI has contributed effectively to developing and sustaining CGIAR Systemwide collaboration in the area of genetic resources. It has assisted the Centres in meeting their "in trust" commitments for PGR and supported the Centres' activities aimed at enhancing the management of the 'in trust' plant germplasm collections. It has helped to develop strategies and techniques for managing crop species and helped develop coherent Systemwide policies for the CGIAR in a rapidly changing environment, such as in the areas of IPR, negotiations of the ITPGRFA and conditions for the transfer of materials held by the Centres.

SGRP has also shown leadership in furthering ecosystem approaches to genetic resources management, by promoting the integration of genetic resources within natural resources management strategies. The vision provided by IPGRI in this area has helped to underscore the strategic importance of PGR conservation and use within an ecosystem approach.

SGRP, under IPGRI's guidance, is developing the "gold standard" for germplasm and information management strategies as well as policy issues related to germplasm. The Panel commends the group for its work. Furthermore the Panel **suggests** that SGRP consider ways in which its activities and deliberations can be opened up to a larger audience, including for example NARS policy makers and genebank curators.

Several favourable comments how IPGRI through SGRP has contributed to Systemwide germplasm issues.

MTP output/output target analysis

The outputs have remained the same over three MTPs. They reflect facilitation and relate process rather than research. Many are very vague and generic.

SC Conclusions:

- Fits very well with the profile of coordinating programs.
- Has already had a strong role in facilitating Framework plan development in relevant areas. Has a potential to be instrumental in facilitating implementation. Justification for maintaining SGRP is very strong for the implementation of SP 1A in particular.
- Good record
- According to MTP information the budget is of a different magnitude from any other SWEPS.

Systemwide Program on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM)

SP-IPM was established in 1996 and is hosted by IITA. In the MTP the **Center partners** include CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICARDA, IITA, Bioversity, IRRI and WARDA. Center partners' roles are not identified in output and output target delivery. **Other key partners** are: AVRDC, ICIPE, CABI, FAO Global IPM Facility, World Bank and Crop Life. Program budget in 2008 is US\$ 0.909 million.

SP-IPM is being organised anew. Its **Goal** is to increase the quality and usefulness of IPM research and capacity strengthening with in order to increase livelihoods through enhanced productivity, human health and reduced environmental degradation. New areas of **research** are: soil health, climate change, functional agrobiodiversity, food safety/biosafety, education tools, vegetative seed production systems. SP-IPM plans to develop **IPGs** through its platform for comparative analysis of experiences, synthesis and development of widely needed methodologies and policy issues; and cross-cutting institutional analysis. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% allocation) is: 3A (12), 4D (83), 5A (5).

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 206-2008

The MTP for the SP-IPM provides a clear and very detailed presentation of the program. However, IITA's role in the SP-IPM is not clear and needs clarification (*vis-à-vis* CIP's role) by the CGIAR Alliance. The SP IPM was reviewed in 2002 but no reference to implementation of the recommendations is made in the current MTP. Many SP-IPM output targets are simply activities rather than clearly defined outputs.

MTP 2007-2009

The management of the SWP-IPM is now resolved and the new MTP describes the SWP-IPM more completely than previously. Its agenda is refocused on a set of over-arching issues that were identified in an EPMR and suggested by the SC in last year's commentary. The SC welcomes this positive change, whilst noting the relatively small overall budget for the learning and synthesis approaches by IITA. It is assumed, but not directly stated, that the much larger body of IPM research in the CGIAR is still clustered under other Center MTPs whereas this may have been an opportunity for describing a genuine system-wide approach as anticipated by System Priority 4D.

MTP 2008-2010

The SP-IPM has had a difficult recent history which it seems to be overcoming through inter-Center deliberations, and with the benefit of the recent CCER and EPMR commentaries. As with some other Projects, there is still some planning to be done to provide a mature strategy for Project/SWEP activities. However, the encouraging set of activities that the new SWEP may address (pages 46 and 47 in the MTP) are not yet coherently reflected in the outputs given for this SWEP and, if more than information activities are planned in 2008-10 period, IITA's budgeted contribution may be considered low. It is hoped that a further year of planning will allow IITA and its partners in the SP-IPM to bring these aspects into line

IITA EPMR 2007

While there has been continuing enthusiasm by many of the staff involved in this program over its 12 year history, in practice, the whitefly collaborative project appears to be the only significant success story, most of the other initiatives having had short term or limited success, or had limited support from participating institutes. Since 2005, the activity of SP-IPM has been at a low level, associated with administrative difficulties and conflicts. However, despite this chequered past, there still appears to be interest from CGIAR Centers and from donors in continuing the SP-IPM. The report of the CCER (March 2007), notes that the SP-IPM has made a valuable contribution to cross cutting issues associated with removing bottlenecks to IPM implementation. There are two ways in which this has been attempted – through activities focused on collaborative research involving staff from various Centers (and possibly outside the CG system) and activities to communicate knowledge and information to NARES and other agencies involved in IPM implementation. The research related recommendation of a recent CCER was that the focus of SP-IPM projects to be on no more than three priority themes the future of SP-IPM clearly needs to be carefully considered, given the problems previously encountered by this system-wide program. In the past, the SP-IPM has been top heavy with administration. What is now required is a lighter, more streamlined administrative structure – which will provide the encouragement, resources and flexibility to enable interested parties within and outside the CGIAR to collaborate on specific IPM projects. A smaller steering group and the appointment of a full-time Chair and Coordinator of SP-IPM are certainly steps in the right direction. The shift in emphasis recommended by the CCER to focus on just two or three IPM themes is also to be commended. It is suggested that resources previously allocated to overall SP-IPM administration would be better used to free up champions in these two or three focus areas. Collaborative SP-IPM research on pests common across Centers could potentially provide valuable economies of scale - as with the whitefly program. Future possibilities include stem borers, certain diseases and weeds but the potential for adding value is not clear. Perhaps it would be better to focus on common pest management issues – such as improved pesticide use in the context of IPM, including improved pesticide application techniques for chemical pesticides as well as bio-pesticides. IPM related policy is another topic that has been suggested in the past but one which has not been taken up.

The effectiveness and impact of SP-IPM activities are likely to be much greater if key IPM expertise outside the CGIAR is included. The extent to which SP-IPM research and development activities should include practical IPM implementation is another issue that needs to be discussed. Since best practice in IPM is generally site specific, successful IPM strategies need to be designed and adapted to local agroecological systems, current cropping practices, and socioeconomic, marketing and political situations. Therefore, local NARES have a crucial role to play to support the design, implementation and sustainability of IPM on farms in their locality. However, approaches and techniques for facilitating NARES and other stakeholder involvement in specific SP-IPM projects is certainly a topic that would be appropriate for SP-IPM involvement. In its report, the CCER team suggested that SP-IPM can add value by addressing constraints to IPM implementation, such as facilitating the development of regulatory processes for biopesticide registration, promoting skills and documenting evidence that demonstrates the benefits of IPM research. Approaches and methods for determining these constraints, focusing on common issues and devising means of reducing them is another possible generic activity the SP IPM could

perform, involving the participation of socioeconomic expertise from such programs as IITA's "Opportunities and Threats" program. SP-IPM Communication activities have been viewed favorably in the past. Feedback from some of the original participants in SP-IPM indicated that the networking and information dissemination functions of the project were seen as very valuable – with SP-IPM playing the role of an objective, honest broker.

MTP output/output target analysis

Output for 2006 represented the end of the old program. The new outputs and output targets reflect new orientation and focus on collective action, strengthening of IOPM outcomes and impacts, developing guidance material, information and advocacy.

SC Conclusions:

- SP-IPM was approved by TAC as a mechanism to coordinate the CGIAR System's IPM research activities in partnership with other IARCs, ARIs, specialized global IPM implementation agencies and subregional/national partners.
- As the program is intending to start anew; its goals and purpose should be reassessed as a new program. Its functions should be considered in the context of SP implementation for the relevant areas.

Systemwide Livestock Program (SLP)

SLP was established in 1995 and is hosted by ILRI. **Center partners** include: CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICARDA, ICRAF, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IITA, ILRI, IRRI, IWMI and WARDA. The partners' roles are not indicated in the MTP. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 2.033 million.

SLP's **Strategy** is to improve feed systems in mixed crop-livestock systems (small-scale and agro-pastoral). **Research and activities** include: Feed systems in mixed crop-livestock systems (small-scale and agro-pastoral) with focus initially on food-feed crops and now on feeding strategies through integrated approaches. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% allocation) is: 2A, 2D (50), 3B (20), 4A (20), 4C 5D (10).

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

The Systemwide Livestock Program has been active for many years. It is well-articulated and brings together 11 CGIAR Centers in a program with evident complementarities. It has a clear focus on feed resources in small scale crop-livestock systems. Improving the feeding strategies for small-scale crop-livestock farms through the efficient use of water, land, labor, soil nutrients and development of cultivars of dual purpose crops for food-feed would essentially call for the whole of the CGIAR to function as a collaborating network. The current SWEP is well integrated into ILRI's program, but it is difficult to assess from the MTP the status of the involvement of other Centers. To aid understanding and monitoring of progress, it would help to have reference to the specific Centers involved in delivery of specific target outputs in the SLP logframe. It is good to see the outputs of earlier research on feeds being disseminated more globally (through the SLP) than was previously the case, including to those outside the livestock research community. However, the targets of 'feed assessment methods developed...' are similar to historical research targets, so presumably these are novel methods. The difficulty of balancing all the expectations of system-wide programs in a short text is recognized, but it could be strengthened in terms of referring to the *science* that is being undertaken.

MTP 2007-2009

SLP is designed to generate IPGs. In impact pathway descriptions the conditioning factors potentially inhibiting outputs, outcome and impact are best identified in Theme 1 and in the SLP. SLP with its long work history is shown as integral part of the program and appears carefully planned and has benefited from independent evaluation(s). There are very important outputs generated by the program which champions much of the crop-livestock systems synergies which are available in the interface between sectors, disciplines and CGIAR Centers with complementary mandates. Focus is rightly on land-based feed solutions which are increasingly becoming key elements for enabling sustainable livestock sector growth with smallholder participation.

SLP CCER 2000

CCER found the value added in how it sharpened and focused new and existing inter-center collaboration around livestock feed-related and NRM issues that fit within the existing farming systems in specific target areas. The CCER felt that SLP responds to the needs for inter-center collaboration and the sharing of expertise, knowledge and information.

ILRI EPMR 2006

The Panel concludes that most of ILRI's current research, including the SLP, addresses CGIAR priorities. The SLP has enabled a significant amount of inter-Center collaboration in crop-livestock systems.

MTP output/output target analysis

SLP changed its output for 2007 and 2008. The outputs for 2006 were focused on improving feed resources, improving dual purpose cultivars, feeding strategies and capacity. The outputs for 2007 were quite different; about identifying priorities; technological, policy and institutional options and informing decision-makers (no targets). The new outputs from 2008 onwards are focused on understanding drivers of change (output targets on biofuel effects), identifying feed interventions (output targets on germplasm, feed related species, conservation agriculture, pastoral and agropastoral producers), and scaling up (output targets on feed innovations and institutional capacity).

SC Conclusions:

- In difficult environments several SPs have to be addressed by an integrated systems approach where crop-livestock interface with particular emphasis on livestock feed and related resource management and policy issues continue to be important.
- SLP provides simple and flexible coordination where individual Centers lead and implement individual research projects with at least one other CGIAR Center partner. Thus, SLP serves as a platform for networking and coordination and as a platform for Centers to develop research projects that require expertise from a number of Centers
- SC supports SLP as a coordinating program of importance for the implementation of the SPs.

ASB Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins (ASB)

ASB was established in 1992 and it is hosted by **World Agroforestry Center**. From the outset ASB developed as a hybrid between a Systemwide initiative and an Ecregional Program. **CGIAR partners** in the MTP 2008-2010 are CIAT, TSBF-CIAT, CIFOR, WorldAgroforestry and IITA. **Other key partners** involve 6 NARS, 14 un-named ARIs, and others. In the logframe partners are not specified for output/output target delivery. **Program budget** in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 0.49 million.

ASB's current **goal** is: to raise productivity and income of rural households living in the tropical forest margins without increasing deforestation or undermining essential environmental services.

Objectives are:

1. To improve understanding of the tradeoffs between agricultural productivity, human well-being, deforestation and environmental services associated with different land uses at the tropical forest margins and the potential for technologies, policies, institutions and negotiation approaches to optimize those tradeoffs.
2. To synthesize results and policy implications from cross-site and cross-regional comparative analyses and make them easily available to international, regional and national policy processes shaping land use at the tropical forest margins.
3. To facilitate information exchange, collaborative projects, and capacity building among local, national and international organizations for more effective research on land use at the tropical forest margins

For developing **IPGs**, priority given to problems common across the tropical forest margins; Site-specific work uses common protocols; Synthesis teams draw together results by site, theme and across sites and themes; Engagement with international policy processes clarifies the potential for linking site-specific research to global issues. **SP alignment indicated in MTP is (%)**: 4A (70), 5B (30).

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

Logframe poorly developed. The ASB has just undergone a review and the external review panel gave the program high marks on most fronts. ICRAF is to be congratulated for its part in achieving this endorsement. The more than 10 years collective experience of ICRAF and CIFOR in NRM research through ASB should provide insights on which the directions in terms of substance and form of integrated natural resources research in the CGIAR should be. ASB partners have identified capacity building for their local and national teams as the key element of their long term strategy.

ASB External review

ASB has been highly relevant to the CGIAR's core mission and is pursuing work well aligned with the System Research Priorities. ASB has created the world's pre-eminent system for use-driven, comparative scientific investigation of human-environment interactions at the forest margin across the pan tropic domain. ASB results are treated as influential global public goods by research communities specializing in the ASB domain around the world; results have played a significant role in transforming the way that decision makers think. ASB has developed an effective and efficient governing structure that successfully integrates capabilities and concerns across CGIAR Centers, tropical regions, scales and disciplines. ASB, with help from ICRAF, has been effective in mobilizing a generally increasing level of financial resources to support its work. These resources, however, have been both inadequate in total amount and too imbalanced in allocation between global and regional tasks to enable the Program to realize its full potential. Resolving funding constraint will require constructive intervention at the level of the SC and CGIAR to improve incentive structures facing Centers across the CGIAR and potential outside collaborators as they consider the option of collaborating with System-Wide Programs such as ASB. Panel concluded that the capacity created by ASB could make a unique contribution to CGIAR and SC goals on integrated land, water and forest management at landscape level and should be sustained and strengthened. Regarding ASB future option 1 to declare victory and close the Program should be rejected. Given the uncertainties over how SPs will evolve and where the CPs are headed, Panel supports either option 2, Building on continued adaptation and learning, or 3, engage development more directly. An informed choice on ASB's future will require more clarity about objectives, priorities, and modalities in the environment in which it operates. It would also benefit from an open discussion involving not only existing ASB partners, but also other groups pushing research, conservation and development agendas on the tropical forest margin.

MTP output/output target analysis

ASB changed its outputs in 2007. Of the old ones one was research focused, while two were on supporting the network and capacity building and included several process related output targets, such as re-branding the ASB. The new outputs focus on trade-off studies, influencing policy, networking and capacity. The targets are partly internal and related to process.

SC Conclusions:

- IPG oriented, appears relevant to SPs (area 4) and has been productive in terms of research publications.
- Is undergoing changes with a new coordinator
- Where does this program stand in relation to the total agenda for forest and tree research in the CGIAR?
- Does its forest margin "boundaries" provide a landscape for SP 4 implementation?
- Links to regional instruments for out-scaling?
- Role vis a vis new Amazon initiative?
- Very small budget – is it viable?
- Time bound targets should be set either for a re-branded research program (landscape level SP4) or for emphasising the out-scaling and implementation nature.

Consortium for the Sustainable Use of Inland Valley Agroecosystems in Sub-Saharan Africa (IVC)

IVC was established in 1993 and is hosted by Africa Rice Center (**WARDA**). It has just started implementing phase III (2006-2010). **Center partners** include WARDA, IITA, ILRI, IWMI, WorldFish and IFPRI. **Other partners** include: CORAF, CIRAD, AVRDC, WUR, FAO ICT, Bonn. The IVC is comprised of 12 countries in West Africa. It operates through partners (national coordination units in member countries) and a coordinating unit managed by a Regional coordinator housed in WARDA. The partners' roles are not indicated in the MTP. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 1.8 million in the MTP and at US\$ 2.12 in the financial tables.

IVC's **Goal** is to improve the livelihood of rural communities through the adoption and use of sustainable technologies fulfilling the production potential of the inland valleys in SSA; Its **Purpose** is to develop appropriate technologies helping farmers to profitably increase productivity of inland valleys, while conserving the environment and biodiversity. **Research and activities** include: 1) increasing inland valley productivity, 2) mitigating negative impacts affecting ecosystem services, 3) benefits from past achievements and transfer of technologies, including local innovations, and 4) systematic stakeholder capacity building. Development of **IPGs**: is through producing decision-making tools, policy recommendations, databases, agricultural technologies, manuals, training modules and fact sheets and scientific publications. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% allocation) is: 4A (24), 5D (18), 4D (16) 4B (15), 4C (10), 3C (10), 3A (4), 2A, 2B, 3B (1)

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

IVC promise synthesized results which would underpin rice-based and overall agricultural productivity in the inland valleys of West Africa. However the output targets for the plan period are rather more modest and include workshops and steering committee meetings. Projections (Phase III) for the IVC take additional activities beyond the comparative advantage of the Center in rice-related matters. It may be appropriate to review the future utility of the IVC and the role it plays vis a vis WARDA's core research.

MTP 2007-2009

With regards to the IVC, the SC considers that this ecoregional program remains an essential vehicle for the discovery and development of appropriate technology for the Africa's inland valleys. However, it is important to know what strategic involvement WARDA has in the IVC's activities and the SC suggests that the EPMP next year look into this matter.

MTP 2008-2010

WARDA's involvement in SLP and IVC seem appropriate

WARDA EPMP 2007

The EPMP gives a very positive account on IVC. The IVC is a flagship SWEF coordinated by WARDA with many partners in WCA and in the North that provides the NRM research so vital to the lowland agro-ecology development, which has great rice intensification potential, and for which adapted NERICA varieties are now available. The Panel assesses IVC as a crucial SWEF in WARDA's research program, particularly for NRM in the lowlands. There have been some recent financing problems in IVC and the Panel hopes that these will be resolved satisfactorily. IVC offers a way to putting inland valleys into productive use for food security and poverty alleviation in SSA. The IVC has conducted soil and water management research in the countries in which it operates, biophysical and socio-economic characterization, has established a GIS unit at WARDA, and has developed the West African Inland Valley Information System (WAIVIS) that has facilitated access of NRM information to WARDA scientists, participating countries and is also used by IWMI and FAO. IVC has contributed to the establishment of a soil laboratory in Cotonou, to the development of screening tools for iron toxicity and has developed the Participatory Learning Action Research (PLAR) methodology with WARDA's social science team. IVC has made a concerted effort in the development of soil and water management options (leveling, bunding, etc) that are now available to NARES and farmers. This work is being consolidated and expanded to include diversification into rice-vegetable cropping systems. More recently IVC has facilitated the formulation of country level research projects by NARS in region. The Panel thinks that all of the country-specific projects are only coordinated by IVC, and are not core WARDA projects and these achievements are commendable. IVC is recognized as the regional NRM platform and has stimulated the financing of large inland valley development projects in Ghana (by AfDB) and in Togo (by UNDP). IVC benefited from long-term funding from The Netherlands (DGIS: 1993-2006), now stopped and being renegotiated. Funding for 2007 is ensured from the World Bank and new funding opportunities are being explored. The existence of the IVC devoted to an ecoregional approach for the inland valleys shows to the Panel that WARDA is putting strong and justified emphasis on this ecosystem.

MTP output/output target analysis

IVC revised outputs in 2007. The 2006 outputs and output targets were focused on facilitation with not much specific research content. The new outputs are on productivity increases, ecosystem services, up-scaling and capacity. The output targets are rather downstream, some targets on weed research, information systems and focus participatory learning and action research (PLAR) modules.

SC Conclusions:

- IVC is recognized as the regional NRM platform – and its activities are facilitation, not NRM research
- Yet these inland valley system remain an important land system for African agriculture and fisheries.
- Given the very favourable review by EPMP team – seems that IVC has contributed to many positive developments at WARDA related to research facilities- and this ongoing need for research as the IVC basin level, the SC recommends that an NRM research be built on the original concepts of the IVC. This NRM platform would need to get the right balance among research on the SP and the need for capacity strengthening particularly in Africa.
- The IVC could explore other regional entities for the coordination as a sub-regional platform for facilitation.

African Highlands Initiative (AHI)

AHI was established in 1995. It is a **regional research program of ASARECA** hosted by **WorldAgroforestry Center**. In the MTP Center partners are not indicated. Three Centers (?) are involved in program in governance. Other partners are research and development actors from NARIs and extension departments, as well as NGOs and local government partners. Partners' role is not indicated in the MTP. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 1.1 million.

AHI's **Goal** is to enhance local stakeholder capabilities to sustainably manage their agricultural systems so as to improve their economic opportunities and well being. Its **Purpose** is to have integrated natural resource management (INRM) innovations, strategies, and policies utilized in Eastern and Central Africa highlands. **Research and activities** include: Social, action-based learning approaches for collaborative development and testing of new approaches for INRM in partnership with national partners and communities. Development of **IPGs** is through Systems intensification and diversification, Participatory integrated watershed management, Collective action in natural resource management, Policy and institutional innovations, Process for institutional change, process of scaling up INRM practices methods and approaches. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% allocation) is: 5C (30), 4D (20), 5A (15), 5D (10), 2A, 2C, 3A, 4A, 4C (5)

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

There is an indication in the MTP that the AHI has had little or no impact over the ten years of its existence due to the methodology and approaches used. Therefore, the SC recommends that: (i) this program be discontinued; and (ii) that the forthcoming 3rd ICRAF EPMR assess the lessons from the AHI research approach, the implications to ICRAF's research and the possibilities of succeeding as an ASARECA network. In addition, given the similarity between what the AHI program set out to achieve and what the SSA CP is planning to accomplish, the SC hopes that the SSA CP can take on board the lessons to be learned from this program in terms of what works and what does not work and why. Logframe poorly developed

MTP 2007-2009

SC considered AHI non-SP activity. The EPMR recommended a review of AHI to determine the Center's appropriate role. There is still little to be gleaned on progress with this program from the MTP but the Center is conducting both internal and partner reviews of the program in the current year. In its repose AHI emphasised that ASARECA has its own expectations for the program.

MTP 2008-2010

AHI does not appear global in reach and planning.

ICRAF EPMR 2006:

Panel believes that hosting function might be better located within ASARECA and necessitates an external review analogous to the recent review of ASB. It is difficult to identify the research element in the midst of the efforts to stimulate cooperation among partners and stakeholders. The strong focus on human dimensions in AHI research has raised the question of whether ICRAF's role is research for scaling-up or the actual scaling-up, i.e. extension functions. AHI staff state the role of the program in the R&D continuum as conducting research on development for the development of innovative INRM methods that could subsequently be used as research for development (as public goods for application within the development domain). Determining impacts is problematic because of the long-term nature of INRM research, coupled with the difficulties in monitoring and quantifying adoption, diffusion and continuity of agroforestry technologies by the rural poor across the African Highlands. However, early impact assessment provides evidence of impact in diverse biophysical and social domains although these have not yet been published. The AHI has made significant advances in the development and application of INRM approaches and strategies, strengthening capacities and creating a more enabling institutional and policy environment at local community; district decision makers and development actors; research community; and development community levels. AHI may have progressed rather more usefully than implied in ICRAF MTPs; achievements primarily methodological although some socio-economic, environmental and institutional impacts are claimed by AHI from the application of the methodologies. Evidence for these impacts is limited. However, the current progress and outputs appear valid and promising. AHI needs to be reviewed. Three options then arise: (i) strengthen and continue AHI with a framework that provides more visible IPGs that can be linked to impacts in the region; (ii) merge AHI program elements of ICRAF with the regional ECA program, building upon existing strengths and synergies; (iii) reduce ICRAF's involvement, particularly as manager, leaving it solely as a partner in research and as a member of the Program Advisory Committee, say by handing it over to ASARECA.

MTP output/output target analysis

AHI outputs changed in MTP 2007-9. The old outputs focused on development and use of participatory INRM methods, support to decisions makers and capacity strengthening. The current outputs include pilot implementation and institutional change in support of INRM. The output targets are quite vague. Most are lessons, out-scaling, district level facilitation, institutional capacity strengthening, knowledge management, lessons on institutional change and mainstreaming. There is no clear research agenda and these types of outputs and products would seem more appropriate for regional program than for a CGIAR program.

SC Conclusions:

- This program has moved away from the original concept of the ecoregional programs and has focused mainly on one tactic for NRM i.e. that of institutional change and in promoting adoption of INRM methodologies.
- AHI has focus on extension and local activities; and the IPG nature of the activities is not clear.
- AHI is an ASARECA project and the active involvement of other Centers than ICRAF is not shown in either the Program Web site or in the MTP.
- The Program has run for 12 years; there has been adequate time to prove the concept and its outcomes and impacts documented so far should be published.
- The program currently seems an inadequate forum for facilitating the framework planning of NRM research in the CGIAR for which the existing task force would seem better positioned.
- Conducting an external review (as recommended by the ICRAF EPMR) in order to determine the program's value as a SWEF does not seem currently justified (the Program has had two external reviews: 1995 and 2000). However, an external review for providing direction to the program as an ASARECA project is a different matter on which the SC will not comment.
- The SC sees no compelling reasons why this program should continue as a CGIAR SWEF for implementation of SPs.
- WorldAgforestry may wish to redefine the scientific basis of the work of this program and its partners under priority 4D.
- The ongoing program may be appropriately continued by ASARECA

Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion (CONDESAN)

CONDESAN is hosted by CIP and was established in 1993. It is a consortium and an ecoregional partnership of close to 60 organisations that is involved in a variety of research and development activities in the Andes of Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia. In CIP MTP 2008-2010, CIP is specified as the only Center partner. In the logframe only CIP, CPWF and GMP identified as responsible for output/output target delivery. **Program budget** in 2008 is 2.2 million (decreasing trend noted in MTP).

CONDESAN's **Objective** is: To learn and promote opportunities for increasing the welfare and social inclusion of Andean poor population based primarily in their management of the Andean diversity. Integrated water management practices and innovation in agricultural systems need to be up-scaled. CONDESAN concentrates its efforts on second level activities (synthesis, comparative analyses, support to multi stakeholder platforms, etc.). CONDESAN's **Research and activities** include: (a) the integrated management of water resources and (b) the development of innovations in agricultural systems that value the Andean diversity. **The IPGs** produced by CONDESAN are largely of a regional nature and generated by comparing and synthesizing information, methodologies and results at an ecoregional level. **SP alignment indicated in MTP is (%):** 4A (53), 5A (8), development (39)

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

CONDESAN has a strong development focus and would more appropriately be presented as a regional network for delivery of research results, rather than project charged with new cutting edge research, and its development focus is justified.

MTP 2007-2009

SC was doubtful of CONDESAN producing IPGs. The integration of Project 7 (CONDESAN) with Project 8 (Global Mountain Program) should be improved as a strategy to contribute to IPGs.

CONDESAN is region specific and therefore the IPGs produced under the Project will be of regional relevance. Integrated water management and improving the livelihood of the target regions are the two main areas of

concern which are to be addressed through this project. Stronger links with IWMI and ILRI would greatly complement the research efforts in the project. Following the EPMR recommendations the use of CONDESAN's benchmark watershed sites as the basis for regional projects has increased, and this also brings opportunities to strengthen CIP's collaborative research in themes that range from biodiversity conservation in the Andes, to development of methodologies to measure poverty dynamics and for instance to adaptation of the participatory Farmer Field Schools research methodology.

MTP 2008-2010

CIP should devolve its role in the CONDESAN which is unrelated to CIP's core research.

CIP EPMR

CONDESAN can be considered as an OUTPUT of CIP; an "institutional output" that put together a powerful platform to address the problems of natural resources management in the Andes. Because the scaling up of the accumulated knowledge – partly from CIP's outputs, but mainly from research of CONDESAN's other partners – was considered to have had limited results, while having great potential, CONDESAN recently decided that the benchmark-sites approach had to be abandoned. With this new approach the 2002 EPMR recommendation fell apart. The new Road Map has not yet materialized into concrete research. Regarding publications, which have been many, the outputs, including CIP's, to which these publications relate, are not evident, and there is not enough clarity about what the expected audience is. In the Panel's opinion, CIP has very little to contribute to the main pillars of the new CONDESAN Road Map. CIP claims that all the 2002 EPMR recommendations with respect to CONDESAN have been fulfilled. But this Panel sees no evidence that between 2002 and 2006 CONDESAN's work has increased its contribution to CIP's mainstream research and output mobilization initiatives, not even to CIP's NRM research or Papa Andina's output mobilization. CONDESAN's work has not been done in any significant relation with CIP's research or with the mobilization of CIP's outputs. What the Panel sees instead is that CIP has used the CONDESAN mechanism to a very limited extent, and that as a result, both CONDESAN and CIP have lost an opportunity for relevant research outputs and a more effective output mobilization for the Center. Thus, financial considerations notwithstanding, the Panel strongly questions the benefits for CIP as CONDESAN's convening Center. In addition, the Panel sees that this SWEP has little or no capacity to undertake research on the selected Road Map areas. Perhaps the "exit" for CONDESAN in this respect will be to contract-out this research with alternative suppliers. However, the Panel would like to point out that CONDESAN is indeed very valuable as a platform and partnership concerned with natural resources management in the Andes, and should play an important role in the future vis-à-vis the work of NARS and regional organizations. Panel recommended that: (1) CIP disengages from convening CONDESAN; (2) the Board of CONDESAN, the Head of the Coordination Unit, and CIP, in coordination with the Alliance, discusses and agree on the exit strategy, and define a working plan for a three-year transition period; and (3) this working plan addresses the financial repercussions for CONDESAN and CIP.

MTP output/output target analysis

Outputs and Output Targets listed in the log frame apply to those CONDESAN Initiatives where the funding is channelled through CIP as the hosting center. The initiatives are:

- Andean Paramo Project (GEF) and complementary Trans-boundary Paramo Project (Moore Foundation)
- Coordination of the Andean System of Basins of the Challenge Program on Water and Food (convened by IWMI)
- InfoAndina, Information and Communications for the Sustainable Development in the Andes (SDC + own budget)
- Lemelson Recognition and Mentoring Program LRAMP – Peru (Lemelson Foundation)

Others are contributing to CONDESAN but with money not channelled by CIP, and therefore not in the MTP. Complementary CONDESAN activities with other CGIAR partners involve CIAT, CPWF and GCP.

Outputs were partly revised in 2006; MTPs 2007-2009 and 2008-2010 have two outputs: on improving integrated water resource management with shift to out- and up-scaling and on institutional innovations, forms of organization and mechanisms for cooperation, training and dialogue.

SC Conclusions:

- CONDESAN has provided a NRM platform for the region. This platform was viewed by the 2002 EPMR of CIP to have great potential using the "bench mark" approach to water shed management. Unfortunately the 2007 EPMR found that that potential has not been realised.
- It is unlikely that CONDESAN can be redirected to form a NRM vehicle for the implementation of the SP 4C on integrated water management. The network serves primarily its own regional and local partners rather than the CGIAR.

- SC notes ExCo accepted CIP's response to the EPMR recommendation which is to continue host CONDESAN as a service to the CGIAR and the Andean research and development community and make future decisions of the SWEPS subject to a discussion within the CGIAR. SC also notes that at ExCo the need for an exit strategy on CONDESAN was expressed.
- The SC recommends that CONDESAN continue its activities as a sub regional Network but ceases to operate as a mechanism for implementing the CGIAR research agenda, i.e. a CGIAR systemwide initiative with accountability to the CGIAR.
- Partnership with the CGIAR should be continued (There are other examples of Networks that are partners with the CGIAR; for example Global Diversity Trust, SARRNET, AFRN and ASARECA)

Desert Margins Program (DMP)

DMP was established in 1997 and is hosted by ICRISAT. The **Center partners** include ICRAF, ICRISAT, IFDC, ILRI and TSBF-CIAT. **Other partners** listed in the MTP include: CEH, CIRAD, IRD + 9 African countries. ICRISAT is the Executing Agency while the GEF Implementing Agency is the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) with support by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Partners' role is not specified in the MTP logframe, with the exception of ILRI. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 2.11 million.

DMP's **Objective** is to arrest land degradation in SSA's desert margins through demonstration and capacity building activities. ICRISAT as a research partner is developing technological packages such as the Sahelian Eco-farm (SEF) and the African Market Gardens (AMG), thus playing a primary role in research. The DMP supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) recognizes two important **public goods**, namely domestic benefits, i.e. benefits realized at the local level or country level and global benefits or benefits of a global nature for which **IPGs** are a component. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% allocation) is: 1B, 4A (100%), 4D, 5A.

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

The specific biodiversity outputs are limited to documentation of what is there, what should be there and how can further loss be prevented or reversed. These would be IPGs, but it seems that ICRISAT plays largely the facilitating role, although it has responsibility for the deliverables in Project 8, the Desert Margin project (DMP). DMP appears to have a small research agenda with a large activity in capacity building, and scaling up of such activities as micro credit, the Sahelian Eco farm and the African market gardens initiatives.

MTP 2007-2009

DMP among other Projects includes activities/outputs at a local level that are justified as a "proof of concept" research. In particular, the DMP (Project 8) now entering a third phase largely consists of scaling out activities, which appear to be development rather than research. The SC would not consider this within the SP research agenda. (ICRISAT's response: Yet, ICRISAT is willing to concur that some of the activities in its Desert Margins Program System-wide/Ecoregional program are development- oriented as it is natural for a consortium involving NARS from nine countries. Nevertheless, what activities ICRISAT undertakes itself *per se*, other than administrative coordination, we classify as research within priority 4A and 4D.]

MTP output/output target analysis

In the MTP the total budget for Phase 1-3 is given as 33.5 million with GEF funding of 15.9 million. Phase II will come to an end in 2009.

The outputs (revised in 2007) are about biodiversity loss, ecosystem dynamics and agrodiversity management. There are very few output targets, mostly on training and with very limited research content.

SC Conclusions:

- The proposed OASIS Challenge Program might subsume DMP but it wouldn't be good to develop it as an umbrella of on-going development-oriented initiatives
- The full-proposal is due early 2008 when it will be evaluated for its relevance to SP research and quality of the research content.
- DMP is in essence a GEF project with a lifeline designed for 2002-08.
- Currently the DMP does not have clear research features, and the SC considers its activities outside the SPs.
- The IPG nature of the program is not clear and in terms of outputs and output targets the activities are limited.
- ICRISAT agrees about the development nature of the consortium that has largely national partners.

- It seems that the CGIAR's contribution is not much beyond administration and the program therefore does not qualify as a systemwide research program.
- The SC recommends that the Program ceases to be a SWEP irrespective of what happens to OASIS and is brought to closure at the end of the current GEF funding period.

Global Mountain Program (GMP)

GMP was established in 1997 and it is hosted by CIP. Center partners other than CIP include: In Africa: ILRI, IWMI, ICRAF, IFPRI, Bioversity, SIUPA, AHI. In LAC: CONDESAN. MTP identifies 7 Centers as partners for Output 2. Other global partners include: Mountain forum, Mountain partnerships, FAO's SARD-M project. GMP collaborates with AHI, CONDESAN and ICIMOD among others. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 0.294 million (decreasing trend noted in MTP).

GMP goals are: Increased food and economic security that improve the well being of mountain people; Improved upper watershed management that enhance rural livelihoods and environmental services; Conservation, understanding and use of the wealth of mountain biodiversity for the benefit of mountain people; Better mountain policies developed through informed and participatory policymaking; Sustainable agriculture as stated in chapter 13 of Agenda 21. Its **objectives** are: in the next three years to improve the contribution of the CGIAR to the Millennium Development Goals through: a) bringing together a plan with the Mountain forum to better support information for mountain groups, an analysis of the CGIAR 'offer' in mountains and development better mechanisms to harness the CGIAR research strengths to support sustainable mountain development; b) better understanding and connection of processes that affect sustainable mountain development, especially the role urban-rural linkages through collection and analysis of baseline information on peoples livelihood issues and options. **Research and activities** include: Rural-urban linkages; Information and support; Mountain policy, Global change; Improving information pathways and research content for sustainable agriculture and development for mountain people through: a) development of a methodology with indigenous communities to study information/communication bottlenecks b) collecting, analyzing and packaging the CGIAR products for mountains; Strengthening Rural Urban Linkages and livelihood options in mountains. Development of **IPGs** is not elaborated in the MTP. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% alignment) is: 4A (70), 5D (18), stand-alone training (12).

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries:

MTP 2006-2008

In terms of clarity the Global Mountain Program is the weakest in CIP's logframe.

MTP 2007-2009

The integration of Project 7 (CONDESAN) with Project 8 (Global Mountain Program) should be improved as a strategy to contribute to IPGs. The Global Mountain program's research on strengthening rural-urban linkages, finding livelihood options in mountainous regions, and designing national policies for their sustainable development are also likely to generate IPGs. The program's output targets are not defined in sufficient detail and do not appear in the partner Centers' MTPs either.

MTP 2008-2010

CIP should devolve its role in the Global Mountain Program which is unrelated to CIP's core research.

CIP EPMR 2007

In CIP's previous constrained-project approach, this SWEP was within the Integrated NRM in Mountain Agroecosystems Project, as one of its six subprojects. The GMP was an umbrella organization that brought together ICIMOD, CIP (CONDESAN) and ICRAF's (AHI) mountain efforts in three continents and was funded by SDC & IDRC. In 1999, GMP moved to the NRM Program and became an integral part of the then vision and activities of the NRM program. The 2002 EPMR did not evaluate the GMP separately because the GMP was the NRM Program. The GMP contributed to the NRM Program with SDC funding. In 2004, CIP's reorganization enabled GMP's identity as one of its Partnership Program. The program was reoriented in 2005 to support MDGs and CG System Priorities in Mountains. The principal funding institution is CIDA.

The Panel found no evidence of any significant contribution to CIP's research outputs In CIP's previous "project" research structure, this program was originally part of the Center's "Integrated Natural Resource Management in Mountain Agro-ecosystem project". When in 2004 the NRM Division was created, CONDESAN and GMP were pulled out from CIP's research projects. The GMP's mission is basically about linking research with development,

and searching for information and models that planners and policy makers can use to promote development in mountain ecosystems. Its work was planned to be done mainly by gathering technologies produced by CGIAR Centers, acting as an umbrella organization for that purpose, and then making them available to mountain peoples. A benchmark site was proposed (developed) for the rural/urban linkage area.

But because these technologies are often not adapted to mountain environments, and plans for their testing have not yet been clearly outlined, adoption of GMP's technology "offers" has been low. Furthermore, policy frameworks developed by GMP for sustainable mountain development have not been effective in influencing governments. Science Council comments on CIP's 2007–2009 MTP stated that the GMP's output targets were not defined in sufficient detail and did not appear in those of partner Centers' either. And GMP's financial prospects do not appear to be healthy either. Funding for the program is expected to decline from US\$0.4 in 2006 to a planned level of less than US\$ 0.3 in the coming years. The level of contribution of the GMP to CIP's research outputs is small, and so is its value to mobilize the Center's main outputs.

Because, since its creation in 1997, the GMP has concentrated on addressing policies, understanding processes, and analyzing technology "offers" from CGIAR for mountain people, the Program makes a negligible contribution to CIP's core research outputs. Therefore, the Panel recommends that: (1) CIP disengages as the convening Center for the GM; (2) the Board of the GMP and CIP, in coordination with the Alliance, discuss and agree on an exit strategy and a working plan for a transition period; and (3) this working plan address the financial repercussions for the GMP and CIP. The Panel's assessment of GMP's future plans reveals an over-all lack of clarity and lack of research activities.

MTP output/output target analysis

GMP reports having continued its expansion of activities with the World Agroforestry Center, African Highlands Initiative (AHI) and Urban Harvest for supporting the Africa node of the Mountain Forum and an Addis Ababa, Ethiopia based project on rural-urban linkages in mountain environments.

GMP has changed its outputs for 2006 and 2007. In all years it has planned making CGIAR's mountain related product and experiences available. Output targets seem to represent products from other SWEPS or Centers. Focus has shifted to rural-urban linkages and in 2010 focus is on peri-urban agriculture.

SC Conclusions:

- One of CIP's partnership programs that has only since 2004 been defined as a Systemwide Program.
- The SC notes that ExCo has agreed with CIP's partial agreement with the EPMR recommendation for CIP to disengage as a convening Center.
- The involvement of other Centers/programs comes through GCP compiling other SWEPS' and Centers' products, which seems weak justification for having a separate program.
- The synergy around relevant mountain-specific issues is not clear
- The agenda is fragmented both geographically (strongest focus on Andean regions through CONDESAN, and a bit in Ethiopia due to AHI) and thematically
- GMP's history links it to CIP's research agenda, but its SWEP features seem historically weak.
- Very low funding and not very good funding prospects
- Focus is not clearly on SP research or activities
- These aspects and the very negative assessment of CIP's 6th EPMR lead to the SC recommendation that the GMP should not continue as a SWEP of the CGIAR. Research issues relevant for mountain agroecologies and livelihoods should be built into the relevant FPs.

Systemwide Farmer Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA)

PRGA was established in 1997 and is hosted by CIAT. **Center partners** include: CIAT, CIMMYT, ICARDA, IRRI and CPWF. **Other partners** indicated in the MTP include: WOCAN. Partners' roles in delivery of results are not defined in the MTP. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 0.7 million.

PRGA's **Goal** is to improve the ability of the CGIAR System and other collaborating institutions to develop technology which alleviates poverty, improves food security, and protects the environment with greater equity. Its **Purpose** is to assess and develop methodologies and organizational innovations for gender-sensitive participatory research, and operationalize their use in plant breeding, and crop and natural-resources management. **Objective** is to improve the competencies of the CG System and collaborating institutions to mainstream the use of gender-sensitive participatory approaches in plant breeding and natural-resources

research. **Research and activities:** (Phase III) New Developments in Participatory Plant Breeding, Institutional Innovations in Africa's Seed and Seedling Revolution, Re-framing Effective Action for Research and Development. Development of **IPGs** is through methodologies, relevance of results in similar socio-economic and ecological situations. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% allocation) is: 5C (70), 5D (10), development (8), stand-alone training (12)

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2006-2008

Relationships and synergy of multi-partner programs with CIAT projects not clear.

MTP 2007-2009

The integration of PRGA with Center programs is not clear. The project on participatory research approaches seems to be focused more on institutional development than on undertaking research on institutional development. Last year the SC mentioned the importance of undertaking research on participatory methods within the commodity programs in order to provide substance to the process research. It is not clear that such a change has been made. The SC anticipates that the ongoing external evaluation of the PRGA will address issues of relevance and direction. The PRGA logframes still contain much process information (in outputs and output targets), and although explicit about capacity strengthening, the only references to research in the logframe relate to developing impact assessment methods.

PRGA external review 2007

The PRGA has made formidable contributions in research and advocacy to the growth of participatory plant breeding. Participatory plant breeding is of sufficient importance to the CGIAR and its partners that work in this area by itself warrants maintained funding to the PRGA for a prospective Phase III from 2008-2112. We also found that the PRGA has also acquitted itself well in impact assessment. Over a relatively short span of six years a diverse body of interesting and relevant work is accumulating. Arguably, the Program's record in impact assessment is as good as any other systemwide or ecoregional program and may even rival the level of achievement in some of the Centers. The review also confirms two of the most important findings of the 2000 internally commissioned external review: research in NRM lacks focus and the integration of gender analysis into participatory research is inconsistent. Important work has been done on gender mainstreaming in NARS in Africa, Asia, and Latin American during Phase II, but there has been little testing and fine tuning of gender models and typologies that were developed during Phase I. Activity in both research and advocacy in participatory natural resource management has declined significantly over time since the start of the second phase of the Program in 2003.

CIAT EPMR 2007

It was suggested [in the Agroenterprice CCER], and the EPMR Panel agrees, that PRGA has had a major impact on how the CGIAR system deals with gender and status inequities. While a number of innovative research strategies have been developed in PRGA and the impact assessment work of the program was found to be of good quality, there has not been systematic data collection and analysis, and no academic breakthroughs on participatory research.

[Provides summary of the external review follow-up]

PRGA has accepted and is implementing the External Review recommendations that the PRGA continue its strong work on participatory plant breeding and impact assessment while making a greater effort to mainstream gender analysis in the CGIAR. Both CIAT and the PRGA accept the Review recommendations of a closer relationship between the systemwide program and the convening Center. The Panel considers PPB as the most important part of the PRGA systemwide program and that it is integrated into CIAT's commodity improvement programs. Further, the Panel agrees with the overall SC position on the systemwide program.

MTP output/output target analysis

The outputs changed in 2007. Much of the focus has been on internal processes output targets reflecting activities and outcomes, not research deliverables; a little on impact documentation. The current plan reflects pause in activities and focus is increasingly in internal processes. A very odd output target for 2010 is about: exploration of the impact of women scientists on the CG research agenda.

SC Conclusions:

- The PRGA does not clearly contribute to SPs, not even to 5C which it considers its primary focus
- The SWEP has been successful in the PPB research. SC has recommended that this part of the program be phased out over three years with efforts on publishing PPB related impact evidence.
- The SWEP has not been successful in NTM research. This component should be discontinued

- The SWEP has not addressed gender related research. This should be addressed through a new initiative (i.e. time-bound program or task force with clear research targets with clear time-bound objective of mainstreaming gender issues into the Centers' research and priority setting)
- Following the PRGA review the decision on its future is pending.
- SC concludes that the PRGA should continue until end of 2009 with activities limited only to compiling and assessing the existing ex-post impact evidence and conducting a comprehensive ex-post IA of the successful PPB cases. The activities on NRM and GA within the PRGA should be discontinued.

Systemwide Initiative on HIV/AIDS (SWIHA)

SWIHA was established in 2000 and it is hosted by Africa Rice Center (**WARDA**). Center partners include: WARDA, IITA, ICRISAT; CIAT-TSBF, IFPRI, Bioversity International, IWMI, ICRAF and WorldFish. SWIHA collaborates with the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program. Other partners include: CABI, COL, ACEWH, Dalhousie University, CTA and UN Aids Inter-Country team for WCA. The partners' roles are not indicated in the MTP logframe. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 0.826 million.

SWIHA's **Goal** is to provide policymakers and agricultural communities with ways to mitigate the negative effects of HIV/AIDS on agriculture, rural livelihoods and food security. Its **objectives** are:

1. To understand and communicate the bi-directional links between HIV/AIDS and agricultural production systems, natural resource use, food and nutritional security to a wide range of decision makers;
2. Set up efforts in information sharing and capacity development for sub-regional response in the context of HIV/AIDS and food security;
3. Identify and disseminate innovative gender-sensitive policies, technologies and methodologies from CGIAR centers to vulnerable groups and communities in the region at risk to the impact of HIV/AIDS;
4. Ensuring that CGIAR Centers have best workplace practices for their workforces, which can serve as role models for national systems;
5. Involving the CGIAR Centers in efforts aimed at mitigating and preventing the spread of AIDS, including support to relevant research agendas, selection and improvement of practices that improve human nutrition and health.

Research themes are not clear in MTP; outputs include coordinating stakeholder action, diversifying and improving livelihoods and developing information and communication models.

For development of **IPGs** multi-location and multi-country studies are given priority; IPGs: innovation/knowledge about the linkages between HIV/AIDS and agriculture; (b) training manual and modules to be used by health and development workers; (c) strategies for improving health and for mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in agriculture and rural development; (d) HIV/AIDS communication strategies; and (e) policy recommendations/documents. **SP alignment** indicated in MTP (% allocation) is: 4A (7), 4B (17), 4C (17), 4D (17), 5A (18), 5B (8), 5C (8), 5D (8)

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries

MTP 2007-2009

Many of the HIV/AIDS activities in the SWIHA MTP do not relate to research or to a specific SP. The SC supports WARDA's involvement as a partner in this program, provided that WARDA's research role is better defined to fit with the SPs and focuses on agricultural productivity impacts that health-related issues have on rice-based systems. The SC doubts that WARDA has a comparative advantage in designing nutritional strategy or providing guidance of how to live with AIDS.

MTP 2008-2010

As discussed in the recently completed 6th EPMP, WARDA's comparative advantage in SWIHA is not obvious

WARDA EPMP 2007

Recommendation: Because the System-Wide Initiative on HIV/AIDS (SWIHA) is not expected to contribute to WARDA's core research outputs, the Panel recommends that WARDA transfer its convening role to a partner more suited to leading the SWIHA initiative.

The Meta-Review of CGIAR SWEPs in 2007 noted that there is no evidence of value added to SWIHA through inter-Center collaboration to maximize CGIAR Centers' comparative advantage. IFPRI operates a HIV/AIDS program outside the purview of SWIHA.

MTP output/output target analysis

SWIHA did not submit any outputs or output targets for 2006. The outputs are on coordinating stakeholder action, diversifying and improving livelihoods and developing information and communication models. Output targets are not associated with the SP research despite claimed alignment. The outputs, which are not on research, focus mostly on HIV directly: attitudes (positive living), impact, nutrition and diets, coordination, and little on agriculture on HIV context.

SC Conclusions:

- HIV *per se* is not a research priority within the SPs
- The program does not contribute to coordinating SP research
- The program plans are only vaguely or indirectly related to agriculture
- CGIAR has not comparative advantage in research on nutrition and diets or questions related directly to HIV
- The SC notes that WARDA agreed in principle to the EPMR recommendation for WARDA to transfer its convening role to a more suitable partner.
- SC recommends that SWIHA ceases to be a SWEF; it may be devolved to others

Strategic Initiative on Urban and Periurban Agriculture (Urban Harvest, UH)

UH was established in 1999 and it is hosted by CIP. CIAT, ICRAF, ILRI and IWMI are listed as Center partners contributing to MTP outputs. Other partners include AVRDC, CIRAD and national partners. Program budget in 2008 is estimated at US\$ 1.151 million.

UH's **Goal** is to stimulate the contribution of agriculture within and around cities to increasing urban food and nutrition security, alleviate poverty whilst contributing to the sustainability of urban livelihoods and the urban environment.

Its **Objectives** are:

- (a) Establish the conditions for the institutional and policy recognition of urban and peri-urban agriculture as a productive and essential component of sustainable cities.
- (b) Reduce poverty and increase food and nutrition security of urban and peri-urban populations through local agricultural production and processing.
- (c) Reduce the negative environmental and health impacts of urban agriculture whilst enhancing its positive potential for urban ecosystem maintenance.

Research and activities include Stakeholder & Policy Dialogue; Livelihoods & Markets, Urban Ecosystem Health. The development of **IPGs** is through: Testing and validation of strategies, frameworks and methods in multiple sites, after they have been developed initially in a single or sometimes in two sites; comparative, "meta" evaluations of similar output targets from sites in different regions. In its MTP CIP acknowledges SC's view that the program activities do not fall within the SPs, but sees following alignment: 3A, 3B, 4A, 4D. 100% of budget is reported as new research.

Comments:

SC MTP commentaries:

MTP 2007-2009

The SC does not recognize the Urban Harvest systemwide program as part of the SPs. Thus, the continuation of the program should be considered part of the 20%. The SC will continue to monitor the development of this program (and the IWMI program on Urban Waste Water) to determine whether research on urban agriculture may eventually qualify to be a SP. The Urban Harvest program plan is improved with an adequate IPG research agenda, and it seems that sufficient and appropriate networks and individual R&D Centers have been identified to implement it.

CIP EPMR 2007

The Panel has not found evidence of sound research on the UP themes.

In the Panel's opinion there are at least two important considerations regarding UH and its convening by CIP. The first one, also discussed in Chapter 2, is in regard to the whole idea of allocating CG System resources to the "slum dwellers" MDG target, regardless of whether the associated research could be of an IPG nature. The second consideration is whether in fact research conducted so far by the Urban Harvest program is yielding significant IPGs related to CIP's core business, and whether CIP has a comparative advantage in undertaking such research.

Since most of the poor people of the world still lives in rural areas, and the accomplishment of CGIAR goals is still far down the road, due to the formidable challenges ahead and to limited financial resources to solve the

world's agricultural problems, logic dictates the need to concentrate CGIAR activities in the rural sector of developing countries. The Panel's analysis of achievements/outputs and publications from the Urban Harvest program, reveals that most of the knowledge and information generated, despite its value for urban planners and organizations concerned with urban livelihoods, is of specific importance for particular socioeconomic situations in particular sites. The proposed "meta" evaluation of similar output targets from sites in different regions has yet to be seen. The Panel has no doubt that some lessons and methodologies produced by Urban Harvest may be of an IPG nature, but more as a by-product. In their field visits (Hanoi and Kampala) the members of the Panel found no evidence of concrete work by UH. Furthermore, the Panel believes that the initiative on "Sustainable and healthy horticulture in and around cities", proposed in the Center's Strategic Plan, is outside CIP's comparative advantage and this involvement would certainly drain CIP's scarce human and financial resources diffusing its research agenda even further. The Panel believes that today there is the need for a sustainable global food chain and world's natural resources are under survival stress. The CGIAR is still the best instrument to propel resolving the world's agricultural problems, and its Centers best equipped to provide needed agricultural technologies. Because the research challenges to improve the livelihood of poor potato and sweetpotato farmers are still of great importance for CIP, working to alleviate the poverty of poor urban dwellers distracts CIP's resources away from the rural poor. Furthermore, the Urban Harvest Program is neither complementing CIP's main outputs nor addressing the CGIAR System Priorities, as expected from SWEPS. Therefore, the Panel recommends that: (1) CIP disengages from being the convening Center for the Urban Harvest SWEP; (2) CIP set the terms of disengagement in coordination with the Alliance; and that CIP assure donors to this Program that CIP will carry on its responsibilities until the completion of current project activities.

MTP output/output target analysis

MTP 2008-2010: During the year "CIP on behalf of Urban Harvest was awarded several new projects that create new output targets. These include major projects that sponsor research in Nakuru, Kenya and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia."

The outputs have been slightly revised in 2007 and 2008 and focus on documenting UPA impacts, increasing productivity and marketing, safety and sustainability of urban agriculture and urban nutrient sources, and policies and institutions. The output targets represent a large spread of different activities.

SC Conclusions:

- The UH program is not included in the SPs in order to maintain focus on those systems with the largest potential impact.
- The SC notes that ExCo has agreed with CIP only partially accepting the EPMR Panel's recommendation that CIP disengages from being the convening Center for the program.
- CIP acknowledges SC's position that UH is not SP-research.
- The budget seems little for the large number of very different activities where other Centers than CIP mostly do not have a clear role.
- The Center (and its donors of this program) may choose to continue the program outside the SP (80% agenda). However the SC would question whether such activities, detached from the core business of CIP, would detract from their focus on that business.
- SC recommends that UH is not continued as a CGIAR Systemwide initiative accountable for implementing CGIAR research. The decision for its continuance outside the SP is that for the Center and its donors.

SWEPS that have been recently terminated

The Systemwide Initiative on Water Management (SWIM-2)

SWIM-2 was established in 2001 out of the former SWIM programme with its strong technical focus on water use efficiency. It was hosted by IWMI and was closed at the end of 2006. Summarizing from the Meta-Review annex: SWIM-2 adopted IWMI's IWRM philosophy as concepts of INRM were evolving in the system, but went further than the CGIAR at the time with its added focus on the environment. Like ASB, SWIM-2 developed a global perspective while concentrating its research in the IWMI reference basins selected as representative of key agroecological and socioeconomic zones in developing regions of Africa, Asia and Central & South America. Its reference basin approach also has parallels with the basin stratification approach adopted by RWC, albeit the domains of the latter are regional rather than global in scope. The Comprehensive Assessment within SWIM-2 was established as a SWEP with an initial 5-year design life 2002-2006. It has demonstrated conclusively that the utility of the INRM/IWRM model in the context of a SWEP approach was effective for tackling the complex problem of water in agriculture in a broad global developmental context, and in doing so validates the SWEP

model for addressing complex issues requiring contributions from many disciplines and research and policy organizations.

The Systemwide Initiative on Malaria and Agriculture (SIMA)

SIMA was established in 2003 and was hosted by IWMI. It was closed at the end of 2006. Summarizing from the Meta-Review annex: SIMA adopted an “agroecosystem”/INRM approach working in transdisciplinary participatory mode alongside more conventional multidisciplinary approaches; both were found to be effective but raised different issues in application. SIMA developed its research, capacity building and knowledge base on a holistic ecosystems approach linking health, agricultural and social sciences, and institutional entities in transdisciplinary mode, and adopting a participatory research approach involving targeted rural communities and gender issues. This model was developed under the aegis of the convening center IWMI, then active in development of the IWRM and INRM models. SIMA might be credited with providing an early successful test of the INRM model. SIMA was designed to run from 2002-06. It has been able to demonstrate that application of its ecosystem/INRM model within the framework of the SWEP organization was effective for addressing the complex issues of malaria in agriculture, requiring contributions from many disciplines and sectors to address the crosscutting issues involved. While SIMA’s outputs are significant, in particular in documenting the complexity of the system and providing a knowledge base for policy makers, much remains to be done. Proponents plan to continue SIMA as a regional programme outside of CGIAR post 2006.