

APPENDIX I

PANEL COMPOSITION AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

CHAIR:

Professor Mike Gale FRS

John Innes Centre
Norwich Research Park
Colney, Norwich NR4 7UJH
U.K.
Tel: +44 1603 450599
Fax: +44 1603 450024
E-mail: mike.gale@bbsrc.ac.uk

MEMBERS:

Dr. Doris Capistrano

Deputy Representative
The Ford Foundation
55 Lodi Estate
New Delhi 110 003
India
Tel: +91 11 461 9441, 464 8401
Fax: +91 11 462 7147, 461 7738
Email: d.capistrano@fordfound.org

Dr. John Mugabe

Executive Secretary
Commission on Science and Technology
NRF, Meiring Naude Road, Brummeria
PO Box 2600, Pretoria 0001, South Africa
Tel. +27 12 481 4019 (office) 0725227018
(cellular)
Fax: +27 12 349 1179
E-mail: john@nrf.ac.za

Dr. L. (Bert) Visser

Director
Centre for Genetic Resources The
Netherlands (CGN)/Unit Statutory Tasks
DLO Foundation Wageningen University
and Research Centre
P.O. Box 16, 6700 AA Wageningen
The Netherlands
Tel: +31 317 477184
Fax: +31 317 418094
E-mail: Bert.Visser@wur.nl

Dr. Paul Zuckerman

Investment Banker
Zuckerman & Associates LLC
105 Grosvenor Road
London SW1V 3LG
Tel: +44 207 828 3464 (office)
+44 7785 247 270 (cellular)
Fax: +44 207 828 4246
E-mail: paul.zuckerman@gicap.com

CONSULTANTS:

Dr. Carlos Correa

Director, Master Program on
Science and Technology
University of Buenos Aires
Monasterio 1138, Vicente Lopez, 1638
Argentina
Tel/Fax: +5411 4791 6047
E-mail: quies@sion.com

Dr. Jorge Chang

Chairman of The Board
Compañía Azucarera Valdez
Ed. Torres del Río, Piso 8
Junín 114 & Panamá
Guayaquil, Ecuador
Tel: +593 4 297 0117/4207
Fax: +593 4 297 0012
E-mail: jchang@telconet.net
jchangg@nobis.com.ec

RESOURCE PERSONS:

iSC Secretariat

Dr. Sirkka Immonen (Panel secretary)
Senior Agricultural Research Officer
iSC Secretariat, FAO, SDRC, C626
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 570 54861
Fax: +39 06 570 53298
E-mail: sirkka.immonen@fao.org

CGIAR Secretariat

Dr. Selçuk Özgediz

Management Adviser
CGIAR Secretariat
World Bank
1776 G Street, N.W.
Washington DC 20433, USA
Tel: +1-202 473-8937
Fax: +1-202 473-8110
E-mail: s.ozgediz@cgiar.org

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Name: GALE, Michael Denis (UK)

Position: Associate Research Director, John Innes Centre, Norwich, UK.

Expertise: Genetics, molecular mapping, plant breeding and germplasm; comparative genetics, cereals, scientific administration.

Education: PhD on “Cytogenetics in the grasses”, University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, UK (1969); B.Sc. in Genetics (Hons), University of Birmingham (1965).

Experience: Current position since 1999, Director 1999, Associate Research Director (1994-98), Head of Cambridge Laboratory, Norwich (1992-94); Head, Cereals Research Department, Cambridge Laboratory at Cambridge and Norwich (1988-92); Research scientist at the Plant Breeding Institute, Cambridge (1968-88). Relevant international activities include: CNRS Review Panel, CIRAD-BIOTROP Laboratory, Montpellier; First international Rice Roundtable, China; Scientific Advisory Committee for Rockefeller Foundation’s Program on Biotechnology Breeding and Seed Systems for African Crops, Advisory Board, Max-Planck Institut Fur Chemische Okologie; member USDA Review Panel for Rice Sequencing, International Grass Genome Initiative (Co-ordinator); Plant and Animal Genome Conferences, San Diego, International Organising Committee.

CGIAR related experience includes: member of the IRRI Board of Trustees; member of the Advisory Committee to Central Advisory Services on intellectual Property for the CGIAR, ISNAR (Chair 2000-2001); Panel member of the 5th EPMR of IRRI (1998) and consultant to the 5th EPMR of IITA (2001), Chair of IRRI sub-panel of the Review on Plant Breeding Methodologies (2000); Consultant to the iSC on Genomics and abiotic stress research; advisor to the International Rice Functional Genomics Working Party, past and current research collaboration with ICRISAT, CIAT, IRRI and CIMMYT.

Has received several honours and prizes, including election to Fellow of the Royal Society and election to Foreign Fellow of the Chinese Academy of Engineering, current positions as John Innes Professor, University of East Anglia and Honorary Research Professor, Academia Sinica, China. Publications, over 200 journal articles and book chapters, mostly on general and comparative genetics, molecular marker technology and mapping in cereals. Three patents.

Name: CAPISTRANO, Ana Doris (The Philippines)

Position: Deputy Representative, The Ford Foundation (India, Nepal and Sri Lanka)

Expertise: Resource economics, management

Education: PhD, Food and Resource Economics (specialisation in natural resources and environmental economics), University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA (1990); M.S., Agricultural Economics, Rural Sociology, University of the Philippines at Los Banos (UPLB), Laguna, Philippines (1983); B.S., Business Economics, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines (1978).

Experience: 2000 – present Deputy Representative; Responsible for Ford Foundation's program on integrated natural resources management for South Asia and for assisting the Representative on all aspects of programme and administrative management; Millennium Ecosystem Assessment technical panel member and co-chair of Sub-global Assessments (2001 – present); Program Officer, India; Developing, monitoring and evaluating grant projects/programmes in participatory forest management, policy and enterprise development and providing grantees technical assistance (1997- 2000); Program Officer, Bangladesh; Responsible for environment programmes (forestry, fisheries, sustainable agriculture, environmental law), rural development and gender research; initiated and designed the Ford Foundation's Community-based Fisheries Management Programme in Bangladesh (1991-96); Post-doctoral Teaching and Research Fellow, MacArthur Foundation, Tropical Conservation and Development Programme, University of Florida (UF) Gainesville, USA (1990-91); Graduate Research Assistant (1986-90), Graduate Teaching Assistant (1986-90), Center for Latin American Studies, UF, USA; Instructor in Economics, College of Development Economics and management, UPLB, Philippines (1979-84); Study Leader, Policy Development and Socio-economic Studies, Program on Environmental science and Management, UPLB (1980-84); Co-Project Leader, Bureau of Forest Development, Integrate Social Forestry project, Laguna, Philippines (1984); Consultant, Economic and Social Impact Analysis of Agroforestry projects, Philippine Center for Economic Development; Study Leader, Upland Hydroecology programme, UPLB 1980; Research Assistant, School of Economics, University of the Philippines 1978.

Member, American Agricultural Economics Association, American Economic Association, International Association for the Study of Common Property, International Society for Ecological Economics. Experience in teaching (economics of NR conservation and trade and in micro- and macroeconomic theory), training and curriculum development; integrated ecosystems assessment conducted at different scales.

Name: Mugabe, John (Kenya)

Position: Executive Secretary of the NEPAD Commission on Science and Technology, South Africa

Expertise: Technology policy, institutional issues related to environmental management, conservation of biological diversity, biosafety, biotechnology

Education: Ph.D. (Political Economy) University of Amsterdam, Department of International Relations (1993);
1st degree, University of Nairobi, Faculty of Agriculture (1990).

Experience: Current position since 2002; Executive Director, African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS), Nairobi; responsible for programme development, outreach, resource mobilization, endowment fund development and human resource management; the office was transformed a Kenyan NGO to an intergovernmental organization with Kenya, Malawi, Malta, Ghana, Uganda, the Third World Academy of Sciences (TWAS) and ICRAF as founding members (1995-2002); Deputy Executive Director (Programmes), ACTS; Duties to develop a variety of research projects and launch a capacity development programme; lead a project to examine the institutional systems and technological abilities of African countries to manage biodiversity (1994-95); Doctoral Research Fellow at the United Nations University Institute for New Technologies, Maastricht, Netherlands (1992-93); Director and founder, Biopolicy Institute of the ACTS, Maastricht (1991-94); Programme Officer, International Diffusion of Biotechnology Programme at IFIAS, Maastricht; aim to help developing countries formulate policies to enable them to apply technology for sustainable development (1990-92); Research officer: Biotechnology for Small-scale Farmers in Kenya Project of the Free University of Amsterdam (1989-90).

Other relevant professional duties include: Fellow of the World Academy of Art and Science, South Africa's Panel on Biotechnology Policy (2001), Member, Consumers' Advisory Panel, Center for Bioethics, University of Pennsylvania; Secretary, African Regional Consultation on the Global Strategy and Action Plan on Biodiversity of UNEP, WRI, IUCN and FAO, Kenya (June 1991); Board of Directors of the African Conservation Centre, Kenya; Board of Trustees of Sustainable Agriculture Centre for Research and Development in Africa; Board of Directors of the Biofocus Foundation of the World Academy of Arts and Sciences; Board of Biotechnology and Development Monitor of the University of Amsterdam, serves on the International Curriculum Advisory Committee of the Leadership for Environment and Development, International Inc., Imperial College; Editor of ACTA Biopolicy International Series; Consultancies for UNEP, UNDP, World Bank, WRI, Swedish Agency for Research and Development Cooperation with Developing Countries and GEF. Board Member, Biofuture Foundation, Stockholm, Sweden (1991-92) He is on the STAP roster of experts. Supervise 6 graduate/post-graduate students and trained government officers on policy analysis techniques. Author in over 70 publications on CBD, access and benefit-sharing of genetic resources, IP, biotechnology, Cartagena convention and biosafety, and capacity building.

Name: VISSER, Bert (The Netherlands)

Position: Director, Centre for Genetic Resources, The Netherlands (CGN); DLO Foundation/ Wageningen University and Research Centre.

Expertise: Genetic resources management (plant, animal, on-farm conservation), molecular breeding, institutional development, virology, genomics

Education: Pre-doctoral studies, Agricultural University, Wageningen, 1969-76 in genetics, molecular biology, virology; PhD in human virology; State University Utrecht, The Netherlands (1982)

Experience: Since 1997: present position. Duties related to agro-biodiversity, international co-operation, IPR, national policy advice; regular member in FAO-IT and CBD delegations; national focal point for Access and Benefit Sharing of the CBD; as such responsible for establishing database for genetic resources for the Netherlands (plant, animal, microbial); Head, Dept. of National Quality Control and Standardisation, Institute for Animal Science and Health (ID-DLO) Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries. Duties included registration and advice on veterinary medicines and feed additives (1994-97); Senior Officer Institutional Development, Special Programme, Biotechnology and Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Duties included support for technical programme formulation, end-user involvement (Kenya and Zimbabwe in particular, in collaboration with government, NARS, farmer groups and NGOs), biosafety (Eastern and Southern Africa), IPRs; Additional activities in Colombia and India (1992-94); Project Leader, Molecular Breeding, Research Institute Ital, Centre for Plant Breeding and Reproduction Research (CPRO-DLO), Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries (1986-92; 1990 – 92 Section Head, Gene Expression); Postdoc, Research Foundation Ital in molecular microbiology (1982-86).

Member of the Steering Committee of the European Cooperative Programme on Crop Genetic Resources Networks (ECP/GR); member of the Programme Coordinating Committee of the global, multi-donor Community Biodiversity Development and Conservation programme; coordinating an on-farm genetic resources management project in Southeast Asia, PEDIGREA; carried out desk studies for FAO on bilateral costs of exchange of genetic resources, on GURTs, on PGR networks, and on a FFF guideline for on-farm management of genetic resources; since 1995 science editor of the Biotechnology Monitor.; member of the Expert Panel on the sMTA for the International Treaty on PGRFA. Author of 26 peer reviewed articles and 30 other publications.

Name : Zuckerman, Paul S. (UK)

Position: Chairman & CEO, Zuckerman & Associates LLC

Expertise: Finance, Agricultural Economics

Education: B.A. & M.A., Economics, Trinity College, Cambridge University, 1964-67
Higher National Diploma, Agricultural Economics, Trinity College, Cambridge University, 1967-68
Ph.D., Agricultural Economics, Reading University, 1970-74

Experience: Current position since 1999; Managing Director, Investment Banking, Caspian Securities, Ltd. (1995-98); Executive Director, S G Warburg & Co Ltd, London; Vice Chairman, S G Warburg International; Chairman S G Warburg Latin America (1981-95); Senior Economist, World Bank (1974-80); Research Associate, IITA (1970-72); Training Associate, Ford Foundation (1968-70).

Other relevant duties include: Founding Chairman, UK/Brazil Joint Business Council (1995-98); Director, Five Arrows Chile Investment Trust Ltd (1996-2000); Director, UTI Public Sector Fund Ltd (1997-2000); Deputy Chairman, ICAP plc (1998-present); Director, Dabur Oncology Ltd (1999-present); Director, BuyIndiaOnline.com Inc (1999-2001); Chairman, Quantum Softech Ltd, India (2000-01); Director, Merrill Lynch European Equity Hedge Fund Limited (2001-present); Director, Ispat Mexicana plc. and various other boards. Member of IITA EPMR.

Name : Chang, Jorge F. (Ecuador)

Position: Chairman of The Board (CEO), Compañía Azucarera Valdez S. A.

Expertise: Production of banana and other tropical crops, management of research and development, agro-industry, NGO management and institutional development.

Education: MPA (Development Policy, Agribusiness and Management), Harvard University (1994); Ph D in Agronomy, Iowa State University (1981); MS in Agronomy, Iowa State University (1976), BS in Agronomy, Cornell University (1971); Escuela Agrícola Panamericana (Zamorano), Honduras (1971).

Experience: Current position since 2002; responsible for policy and guidelines for management, strategic planning of large sugar cane operations. Executive director, Foundation for Agricultural Development (1987-2001); responsible for overall technical, administrative and financial performance of the leading NGO in agricultural sector of Ecuador; Executive Secretary, Agricultural Science and Technology Commission (1985-87), responsible for coordination of a group of eminent international scientists to advise the Minister of Agriculture. Head, Agronomy Department, Escuela Agrícola Panamericana (Zamorano), Honduras (1983-85); Head of Research and Development, Dow Chemical International (1981-83), responsibilities on agrochemical marketing and sales strategies in Ecuador, Perú and Bolivia. Research and Production Superintendent, Standard Fruit Co., Costa Rica, Colombia and Ecuador (1973-74, 1976-79).

Other assignments have included consultancies in Latin America and Caribbean countries to the World Bank, USAID, IDB, FAO, IICA, NRIL and insurance companies on technology generation and transfer, foundations management, project design and evaluation, institutional building, disaster loss appraisals, banana and plantain operations; President of FAVARETO S. A., a family corporation for production and export of bananas and plantains in Ecuador. Former President of EMSERIMBA Cía. Ltda., EMSEILLI Cía. Ltda, and Agrigunga Cía. Ltda. Numerous memberships include networks, and Boards related to trading, industry, NGOs and foundations. Published on development of agro-industries, banana and fruit production and marketing and agricultural development.

Name : Correa, Carlos María (Argentina)

Position: University of Buenos Aires: Director of the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Industrial Property and Economics, and Director of the Post-graduate Courses on Intellectual Property, Law Faculty; Director of the Master Program on Science and Technology Policy and Management, Center of Advanced Studies,

Expertise: Political economy, international trade, patent law and intellectual property genetic resources policy issues

Education: Ph.D. in Law; Degree in Economy, University of Buenos Aires (1972)

Expertise: Director of the UNDP/UNIDO Regional Program on Informatics and Microelectronics for Latin America and the Caribbean (1991-1995); Undersecretary of State for Informatics and Development of the Argentine national government (1984-1989); Advisor, Secretariat of Science and Technology (1989); Coordinator of the Inter-Ministerial Group on Intellectual Property of the Argentine Government (1987-1989); Lawyer and private consultant, specialized in intellectual property, investment and negotiation of international transfer of technology agreements (1976-1984); Legal Advisor, Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Industrial (Registro Nacional de Transferencia de Tecnología) (1972-1976).

He is a senior researcher of the University of Buenos Aires and a co-director of the university's research programme on legal, socio-economic and agronomic aspects of the diffusion of transgenic plant varieties in the Argentine agriculture and teaches courses on International trade and WTO, Political economy of science and technology, Economics of intellectual property, Patent law and WTO multilateral trade. He is doing consultancies to organizations such as UNCTAD, FAO, WHO, UNDP, CBD, DFID and several regional organizations on themes such as the International Treaty negotiations, intellectual property, plant variety protection, international trade, transfer of technology, public health and electronic commerce for international. Current memberships include: Latin American Trade Network;; Scientific Resource Group on Globalization of the World Health Organization, International Economics Law Association, Association on Teaching and Research on Intellectual Property and the of the "Steering Committee" of the project "Genetic Resources Policy Issues", SIDA/SAREC. He has been involved in evaluation of research projects and recently chaired the review of the CGIAR's Genetic Resources Policy Committee. He is a reviewer of several journals. Recent publications, some 50 titles, include books, book chapters and articles.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE
FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAMME AND MANAGEMENT REVIEWS
OF CGIAR CENTRES**

BACKGROUND

Context

1. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) is an informal association of over 50 members that supports a network of 16 international research centres in agriculture, forestry and fisheries. The CGIAR aims, through its support to the Centres, to contribute to promoting sustainable agriculture for food security in developing countries. Because the Centres constitute the core of the CGIAR, the effectiveness of each Centre is crucial to the continued success of the CGIAR (as a System).
2. Each Centre is an autonomous institution operating within the mandate assigned to it by the CGIAR, and is governed by a legally constituted Board that has full fiduciary responsibility for managing the Centre. To ensure accountability in an essentially decentralized system, each Centre is expected to be responsive to the CGIAR, which provides financial support for its work.
3. The CGIAR has established a tradition of External Programme and Management Reviews (EPMRs) to provide a mechanism of transparency and accountability to the Members and other stakeholders of the CGIAR System. EPMRs are the joint responsibility of TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat, and are conducted for each Centre approximately every five years. As each Centre is autonomous, EPMRs provide a measure of central oversight and serve as an essential component of the CGIAR's accountability system.

Integrated System of Reviews of Each Centre

4. Besides the EPMRs, Centre Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs) are undertaken at each Centre. These CCERs are commissioned by the Centre Boards to periodically assess the quality and effectiveness of particular aspects of a Centre's work. The terms of reference (TORs) for each CCER are determined by the Centre, based on broad principles endorsed by the CGIAR at ICW95 (ref. document entitled *Improving the Quality and Consistency of CGIAR's External Centre Reviews*, dated October 24, 1995).

5. EPMRs complement the CCERs by providing a CGIAR-commissioned and comprehensive external assessment of the Centre's programme and management, especially its future directions and the quality and relevance of its research. The TORs for the EPMRs (which update the "standard TORs" endorsed by the CGIAR at MTM95) are provided below. Guidelines for undertaking the reviews are issued separately.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Objectives and Scope

6. EPMRs seek to inform CGIAR members that their investment is sound, or recommend measures to make it so. Members of the CGIAR and other stakeholders can be informed whether the Centre is doing its work effectively and efficiently. EPMRs are both retrospective and prospective; and help ensure the Centres' excellence, relevance and continued viability, and the CGIAR System's coherence. Each review is expected to be strategic in orientation and as comprehensive as the situation warrants.
7. The broad objectives of EPMRs are to: a) provide CGIAR members with an independent and rigorous assessment of the institutional health and contribution of a Centre they are supporting; and b) to provide the Centre and its collaborators with assessment information that complements or validates their own evaluation efforts, including the CCERs.
8. The EPMR panel is specifically charged to assess the following:
 - a. The Centre's mission, strategy and priorities in the context of the CGIAR's priorities and strategies;
 - b. The quality and relevance of the science undertaken, including the effectiveness and potential impact of the Centre's completed and ongoing research;
 - c. The effectiveness and efficiency of management, including the mechanisms and processes for ensuring quality; and
 - d. The accomplishments and impact of the Centre's research and related activities.
9. The topics expected to be covered by the EPMRs are listed below.

TOPICS TO BE COVERED

A. Mission, Strategy and Priorities

- The continuing appropriateness of the Centre's mission in light of important changes in the Centre and its external environment since the previous external review.

- The policies, strategies, and priorities of the Centre, their coherence with the CGIAR's goals (of poverty alleviation, natural resources management, and sustainable food security), and relevance to beneficiaries, especially rural women.
- The appropriateness of the roles of relevant partners in the formulation and implementation of the Centre's strategy and priorities, considering alternative sources of supply and the benefits of partnerships with others.

B. Quality and Relevance

- The quality and relevance of the science practised at the Centre.
- The effectiveness of the Centre's processes for planning, priority setting, quality management (e.g., CCERs, peer reviews and other quality and relevance assurance mechanisms), and impact assessment.

C. Effectiveness and Efficiency of Management

- The performance of the Centre's Board in governing the Centre, the effectiveness of leadership throughout the Centre, and the suitability of the organization's culture to its mission.
- The adequacy of the Centre's organizational structure and the mechanisms in place to manage, coordinate and ensure the excellence of the research programmes and related activities.
- The adequacy of resources (financial, human, physical and information) available and the effectiveness and efficiency of their management.
- The effectiveness of the Centre's relationships with relevant research partners and other stakeholders of the CGIAR System.

D. Accomplishments and Impact

- Recent achievements of the Centre in research and other areas.
- The effectiveness of the Centre's programmes in terms of their impact and contribution to the achievement of the mission and goals of the CGIAR.

ITINERARY OF THE EPMR PANEL

Mike Gale and Paul Zuckerman attended IPGRI's Board meeting held at IPGRI's Sub-regional office in New Delhi, India, 30 September – 3 October. Subsequently Paul Zuckerman joined the Board on a field visit to Bangalore and Mangalore. In Bangalore the group visited an NGO, the Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment, the Indian Institute of Horticulture, the Foundation of Local and Traditional Health with activities on medicinal plants, the University of Agriculture and Indian coordinated projects on Small Millets. In Mangalore the Board visited the International Coconut Genebank and the Central Plantation Crops Research Institute in Kasaragod.

Several field visits were organized before the Initial Phase capitalizing on the Panel members' non-review related travel in the relevant regions. Mike Gale paid a short visit to IPGRI's office in Beijing 19 September, while in China. He also had an opportunity to visit IPGRI's regional office in Kuala Lumpur 45 October and meet with IPGRI staff and partners. While in Malaysia he visited the Malaysian Agricultural Research and Development Institute, the Universiti Kabangsaan Malaysia and the Forest Research Institute of Malaysia.

Mike Gale and John Mugabe visited the IPGRI office and partner institutions in Nairobi, Kenya, 28-30 October. There they visited the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, the Kenya Forestry Research Institute, the National Museums of Kenya and the University of Nairobi. Mike Gale continued to visit Uganda 31 October – 2 November to see regional activities and collaboration. From the INIBAP office in Kampala he visited the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa and the Ugandan National Agricultural Research Organisation. He also enjoyed a field trip to the Busheni Banana and Plantain Farmers Association.

The whole Panel, including the two consultants, stayed at the IPGRI headquarters in Maccarese, Rome, from 25 - 29 November 2002 for the Initial Phase of the Review. The Panel's visit coincided with the meetings of IPGRI's Programme Planning and Review Committee (PPRC) and the Management Committee. The Panel attended selected PPRC sessions including presentations given by senior research and management staff on issues of financial and research management and on specific activities within IPGRI's eight strategic choice areas. In addition, IPGRI organized poster sessions on the specific projects. The Panel held sessions with several senior staff members, including the Regional Directors, to be briefed on all aspects of IPGRI's programmes. During the week discussions were also held with relevant FAO staff.

Between the Initial and Main Phases field visits were France and Belgium, Morocco and Tunisia, Mexico and Costa Rica, Kenya and Uganda and Nepal. A list of contacts, including institutions visited and persons met or consulted by phone is provided in Appendix IV.

Immediately following the Initial Phase, Jorge Chang paid a visit to the INIBAP Transit Centre in KUL, Leuven, Belgium, 2-4 December, accompanied by Bert Visser, and to INIBAP headquarters in Montpellier, France, 4-7 December, accompanied by Mike Gale.

Bert Visser visited CWANA Regional Programme sites and partners in Morocco and Tunisia. In Morocco, 17-19 January, he visited an *In Situ* Project site in Er Rich and a date palm site in Aoufouss, both near Errachidia. He also had discussions with national stakeholders in Marrakech. In Tunisia, 20-24 January, meetings were held with a number of representatives of the Tunisian government, NGOs and farmers in Tunis and in Tozeur, one of the project sites.

Doris Capistrano visited Nepal 29-31 January. In Katmandu she met with representatives of the National Agro-biodiversity Committee and the Nepal Agricultural Research Council. She visited the NARC Agriculture Botany Division and the Biotechnology Laboratory and met with the IPGRI collaborative project teams. She visited LI-BIRD and Kaski-ecosite in Pokhara, and the NARC Agricultural Research Station in Lumle.

Mike Gale and Carlos Correa attended part of the Steering Committee Meeting of the SGRP that was held at CIMMYT, Mexico 3-7 February. Carlos Correa attended the field day on 6 February that included interaction with the Mexican biodiversity institution, CONABIO. Mike Gale moved to Merida, Yucatan, 6-9 February, to visit the Global *In situ* Project. There he had discussions at CINVESTAV-IPN in Unidad Mérida, the host institution to IPGRI activities, Instituto Tecnológico de Mérida and Instituto Tecnológico Agropecuario No. 2. He also visited the Yaxcaba community.

Mike Gale and Jorge Chang visited Costa Rica, 9-13 February. They had meetings at CATIE with the institute staff and with INIBAP staff. They visited Corporación Bananera Nacional (CORBANA) and the University of Costa Rica field station in Guapiles. They also had meetings at IICA and at the University of Costa Rica in San Jose.

Paul Zuckerman paid a visit to INIBAP's office in CATIE, Costa Rica, 17-18 February, to the INIBAP Kampala office 24 March, and the Nairobi office to discuss issues of governance and management.

The Panel reassembled at IPGRI headquarters from 3 to 21 March 2002, for the Main Phase of the review. The Panel had a chance to have individual discussions with project leaders and staff for further information and clarifications. Panel members were also in contact with some IPGRI staff and stakeholders by telephone.

The chapters of the report were shared with the MEC and the relevant senior staff at the Panel Draft stage for factual corrections. On 23 March Mike Gale presented the report to the Board Chair and Board members in the presence of IPGRI's Senior management.

PEOPLE CONTACTED BY THE PANEL

ARGENTINA

Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (INTA)
Andrea Clausen, Researcher, Genetic Resources

BELGIUM

Catholic University Leuven - Laboratory of Tropical Crop Improvement
Rony Swennen, Professor

BRAZIL

Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuaria (EMBRAPA)
Manoel Souza, Researcher
Clara Goedert, Researcher

COLOMBIA

International Centre for Tropical Agriculture - CIAT
Daniel Debouck, Head, Genetic Resources Unit

COSTA RICA

Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA)
Enrique Alarcon, Technology and Innovation Specialist
Luis Gmo Gonzales, Technology and Innovation

Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Esenañza (CATIE)
Pedro Ferreira Rossi, Director General
Carlos Navarro, Genetic Diversity Project Director
John Beer, Director, Agriculture & Agroforestry Department
Andreas Ebert, Scientist
William Vazquez, Scientist
Carlos Astorga, Coordinator, Genetic Resources
Edgar Viquez, Scientist

Corporación Bananera Nacional (CORBANA)
Jorge A.Sandoval, Director of Research

University of Costa Rica
Eric Mora, Scientist
Jorge Mora Urpi, Geneticist

Oscar J. Rocha, Ecologist
Nevio Bonilla Morales, Researcher INTA

FRANCE

Recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD)

Frédéric Bakry, Deputy director of banana, plantain and
pineapple programme
Philippe Petithuguenin, Head of Cocoa Programme
Marie-Line Caruana, Scientific Coordinator Midec
Jacky Ganry, Deputy Director for Research
Thierry Lescot, Agronomist, Fruit & Horticultural Crops

INDIA

Central Plantation Crops Research Institute

Velamoor Rajagopal, Director

University of Agricultural Sciences

K.N. Ganeshaiia h, Professor. Department of Genetics and
Plant Breeding
R.Uma Shaankar,, Department of Crop Physiology

National Academy of Agricultural Sciences

K.L. Chadha, Vice President
K. Pradhan, Vice chancellor

Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Enviornment

R. Ganesan, Fellow

University of Agriculture, Department of Horticulture

B.S. Sreeramu, Associate Professor

Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR)

H. Hameed Khan, Project Coordinator (Palms)

ITALY

Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)

N. Murthi Anishetty, Senior Officer, Plant Genetic Resources
Christel Palmberg-Lerche, Chief, Forest Resources
Development Service
Jose T. Esquinas-Alcazar, Secretary, Commission on Genetic
Resources for Food and Agriculture
Mahmoud Solh, Director, Plant Production and Protection
Division, Agriculture Department
Dietrich E. Leihner, Director, Research, Extension & Training
Division
Clive Stannard, Senior Liaison Officer, Agriculture
Department
Arturo J. Martinez, Chief, Seed and Plant Genetic Resources

Service

PricewaterhouseCoopers SpA

Robert Ware, Partner

KENYA

University of Nairobi

Henry Kamau, Scientist, Documentation, Information and Training

Daniel Mukunya, Dean and Principal

Kenneth .M. Mavuti, Professor

Levi S.M. Akundabweni, Professor

National Museums of Kenya

George H.O. Abungu, Director General

Patrick Maundu, Head of Kenya Resource Centre for Indigenous Knowledge

Kenyan Agricultural Research Institute- KARI

Romano Kiome, Director General

Ephraim Mukisira, Deputy Director General

Joseph A.W. Ochieng, Assistant Director Crops

Zackary Muthamia, Head of Genebank

Evans Mutegi, Scientist, Genebank

Desterio Nyamongo, Scientist, Genebank

Kenya Forestry Research Institute – KEFRI

Paul K. Konuche, Director

Bernard N. Kigomo, Deputy Director

Ebby Chagalla, Research Scientist

MALAYSIA

Malaysian Agricultural Research and Development Institute (MARDI)

Saharan Haji Anang, Director General

Ahmad Zamzam Mohamed, Deputy Director General

Mohamed Sena wi, Director, Biodiversity Centre

Salma Idris, Taxonomist

Abdul Shukor, Scientist, Medicinal Plants

University Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM)

Mohamad Said Said, Department of Agriculture and Horticulture

M. Noor Normah, Cryopreservation

Mahani Mansor Clyde, Professor

Mohamad Osman, Doctor

Forest Research Institute Malaysia (FRIM)

Abdul Razak Mohd Ali, Director General

Daniel Baskaran Krishnapillay, Director, Forest Plantation

and Medicinal Plant Division

MEXICO

Centro de Investigación de Estudios Avanzados de IPN (CINVESTAV)

Luis Manuel Aria Reyes, National Coordinator for the *In situ*
Conservation Project
Alejandro Flores-Nava, Director

Instituto Tecnológico Agropecuario, SEP

Luis Latournerie Moreno, Professor

Yaxcaba

Jose Dias, Commisario, Yaxcaba project
Luis Burgous, Field Staff Leader, Yaxcaba project

MOROCCO

Institut agronomique et vétérinaire Hassan II

Ahmed Birouk, Project Coordinator

NEPAL

Local Initiatives for Biodiversity, Research and Development (LI-BIRD)

Anil Subedi, Executive Director
Ram Rana, Socioeconomist, Program Officer
Deepa Singh, Technical Officer
Resham Gautam, Home garden project Program Officer of
Kalpana Gurung, Administrative officer
Abhiskar Subedi, Plant taxonomist
Krishna Prasad Baral, Public Awareness Officer
Sanjay Gyawali, Plant breeder, Participatory plant breeding
Bharat Bhandari, Plant breeder

Nepal Agriculture Research Council

MP Upadhaya, National Project Coordinator
RP Shah, Director, Crop and Horticulture research
RP Sapkota, Executive Director
MP Upadhyay, National Project Coordinator, *In Situ*
Conservation project
K. Budhathoki, Chief, Horticulture Research Division
RP Upreti, Neglected and Underutilized Species Project,
Technical Coordinator
Bimal K. Baniya, Chief, Agriculture Botany Division

Agriculture Research Station, Lumle

Dip N. Sah, Senior Scientist and Head of Outreach Research
Division

Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation

Keshav Kanel, Deputy Director General

Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives

Asheshwar Jha, Joint Secretary

TUNISIA

Association Tunisienne des Urbanistes

Abdelkader Baouendi, President

Observatoire National de l'Agriculture

Ali Ouled Ali, Director General

UGANDA

National Agricultural Research Organization

Joseph K. Mukibi, Director General

G.W. Otim-Nape, Deputy Director General

John Mulumba Wasswa, Curator, Entebbe Botanical Gardens

Mathias K. Magunda, Acting Director, Kawanda Agricultural Research Station

Wilberforce Tushemeirwe, Head of *Musa* Programme

Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA)

Adiel Mbabu, Secretary

Bushenyi Banana and Plantains Farmer's Association

Robert Rwabubare, Director

John Ndamira, Executive Secretary

Paul Kwangala Bindishanga, Treasurer

E. Rwabwiso, Local Government Production Coordinator

LIST OF DOCUMENTS PROVIDED TO THE PANEL

A. Documents Provided by the iSC and CGIAR Secretariats

To All Panel Members:

1. Guidelines and TOR for EPMRs
2. Food Secure World for All: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR
3. Report of the Fourth External Programme and Management Review of the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)
4. Report of the First External Programme and Management Review of the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
5. Documents regarding the most recent TAC strategic studies involving the Centre:
 - (a) Plant Breeding Methodologies INIBAP Sub-report 2000.
 - (b) SGRP Review 1998
6. The TAC Commentaries on IPGRI's 1998-2000, 1999-2001, 2000-2002, 2001-2003, 2002-2004 MTPs
7. Summary of Proceedings of CGIAR meeting(s) conducted over the previous year
8. 2001 CGIAR Annual Report
9. 2002 CGIAR Brochure and Directory
10. ExCo1, ExCo2 and ExCo3 Summary Records
11. CGIAR AGM01 End of Meeting Report
12. Report of the Review of the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee, August 2002

Supplementary documents, to relevant Panel Members (including the Chair):

13. Reference Guides for CGIAR International Agricultural Research Centres and their Boards of Trustees, August 1997. (Only to panel Chair and management specialists)
14. CGIAR Board of Trustees Directory (October 2000)
15. CGIAR financial guidelines and manuals
16. Committees and Units of the CGIAR: Roles, Responsibilities, and Procedures
17. IPGRI Board of Trustees

B. IPGRI Documents to EPMR Team

To All Panel Members and/or available at the Centre for reference:

Centre Commissioned External Review Reports

- (18) Asia, Pacific and Oceania Programme Review, September 1997, (M.P. Upadhyay, Randy A. Hautea)

- (19) Documentation, Information and Training Programme Review, March 1998, (Keith Richmond, Morten Hulden, Theresa Sengooba)
- (20) Forest Genetic Resources Programme Review, September 1998, (Kamalijit S. Bawa, Marcio de Miranda Santos)
- (21) Europe Programme Review, September 1998, (Eva Thorn, Michel Arbez, Ivan Nielsen)
- (22) Review of IPGRI's work on Policy and Human aspects of genetic resources, (Projects C13 and C20), March 1999, (Robert E. Rhoades, Carlos Maria Correa, Benchaphun Shinawatra)
- (23) Review of the Americas Programme, (Project C01) and Project C09, September 1999, (Raymond Schnell, Marleni Ramirez, Malcolm Hazelman)
- (24) Review of the INIBAP Programme - IPGRI's work in banana and plantain (Projects C16, C17, C18, C19), March 2000, (Dolores A. Ramirez, Claude Fauquet, J.K. Mukiibi, Michel de Nuce de Lamothe)
- (25) Review of IPGRI's Programme in the CWANA Region, (Project C05), September 2000, (Moncef Harrabi, Amin Abdullah Al Hemiari, Paridun Ibragimov, Rene Salazar)
- (26) Review of IPGRI's work on Methodologies and Strategies, Projects C10, C11, C12), March 2001, (Seyfu Ketema, Tan Swee Lian, Daniela Soleri, Masahiro Nakagahra)
- (27) Review of IPGRI's Programme in Sub-Saharan Africa (project C04), September 2001, (Daniel Mukunya, Abebe Demissie)
- (28) Review of IPGRI's work on Documentation, Information Training and Public Awareness (Projects C06, C14 and C15), March 2002, (Frank Karel III, Pamela Q.J. André, Carmen Siri, Ivan Nielsen)
- (29) Review of IPGRI's Programme in Asia, the Pacific and Oceania (Project C02), September 2002, (Beatriz del Rosario, Qu Dongyu, Theresa Sengooba)
- (30) IPGRI Resource Management, May 2002, (Joan H. Joshi, Gordon B. MacNeil)

Other Documents

Strategy documents or presentations:

- (31) Key Issues, Opportunities and Challenges facing IPGRI, 2002
- (32) Significant programme achievements since 1996, 2002
- (33) Scientific trends and new directions (Powerpoint presentation), 2002

- (34) Eight Powerpoint presentations summarizing IPGRI's response to its strategic choice areas, 2002
- (35) IPGRI Logframe and project logframes, 2002
- (36) Diversity for Development: The new strategy for the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute, 1999
- (37) Project Framework Documents, 2002
- (38) IPGRI's Evaluation and Impact Assessment Strategy and Action Plan 2000-2004, 2000
- (39) IPGRI Plant Genetic Resources Documentation Strategy, 2003
- (40) IPGRI Communications Policy and Strategy (including IPGRI's Media Strategy, 2003
- (41) Dietary diversity: a challenge linking human health with plant genetic resources, 2002
- (42) IPGRI's Genetic Resources Policy Strategy, 2002
- (43) IPGRI-SSA Strategic Plan and Programme Orientation, 2002
- (44) IPGRI-APO in the new millennium, 2002
- (45) Neglected and underutilized plant species: IPGRI's strategy, 2002
- (46) Resource mobilization strategy, 2001
- (47) Strategic framework for IPGRI training and capacity development, 2001
- (48) Publications sales and marketing policy, 2001
- (49) Molecular Genetics and Plant Genetic Resources: A Strategic Action Plan for IPGRI, 2000
- (50) The Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants: IPGRI's Contribution, 2000
- (51) IPGRI's Ethical Principles, 1999
- (52) Public awareness strategy, 1998

Internal and External Reviews:

- (53) Implementation of IPGRI's 4th EPMR: Assessment of the EPMR recommendations by IPGRI management and Board of Trustees, 2002

- (54) Internally Commissioned Review of IPGRI People Management Practices, 2001

Working Papers related to Indicators:

- (55) Report of the FAO/IPGRI Workshop on Genetic Diversity, Genetic Erosion and Genetic Vulnerability, Rome, 11-14 September 2002, 2002
- (56) Report to the 9th meeting of the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture on Indicators and reporting format for monitoring the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for the conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, Rome, 14-18, 2002, 2002

Internal Audit Reports:

- (57) Management of Letters of Agreement, 2001
- (58) INIBAP, 2001
- (59) Americas, 2001
- (60) Asia, Pacific and Oceania, 2001
- (61) Sub-Saharan Africa, 2001
- (62) Management of Liquid Assets, 2001
- (63) Travel Process, 2001

Case Studies:

- (64) Evaluating Capacity Development of the Plant Genetic Resources Centre in Bunso Ghana. Presented to the International Conference on Impacts of Agricultural Research and Development, February, 2002. San José, Costa Rica, 2002
- (65) An analysis of IPGRI's influence on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (R. Sauvé, J. Watts, J.). *In: Agricultural Systems*, forthcoming edition. Horton, D. and Mackay, R. (eds.), Learning for the future: Innovative approaches for evaluating agricultural research, 2003.
- (66) One plus one equals three: maximizing participation in plant genetic resources networks (J. Watts). Plant Genetic Resources Newsletter, No. 130, 2002, 2002
- (67) Towards sustainable national plant genetic resources programmes – policy, planning and coordination issues: Proceedings of the Workshop held from May 10-18, 2000 in Zschortau, Germany (J.M.M Engels, R. Vodouhe and M. Grum, eds.). IPGRI, Rome, Italy, 2001

- (68) Evaluating IPGRI's Fellowship Programmes: An Analysis of the Vavilov-Frankel Fellowship Programme and the Italian-funded Research Fellowships 1993 through 1998. Unpublished IPGRI internal report, 2001
- (69) Adoption of Crop Descriptors in IPGRI. *In* A Synthesis of Findings concerning CGIAR Case Studies on the Adoption of Technological Innovations. (L. Sechrest, M. Stewart and T. Stickle, eds.) CGIAR Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group Secretariat, Rome, Italy, 1999
- (70) The International Musa Testing Programme IPGRI/ INIBAP. *In* A Synthesis of Findings concerning CGIAR Case Studies on the Adoption of Technological Innovations (L. Sechrest, M. Stewart and T. Stickle, eds.) CGIAR Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group Secretariat, Rome, Italy, 1999

Rapid Assessments of Impact and Effectiveness:

- (71) Nature and effectiveness of partnerships across several IPGRI projects. Paper prepared for IPGRI External Programme and Management Review. IPGRI, Rome, Italy, 2002
- (72) IPGRI's *Modus Operandi*: Leveraging resources to achieve common goals. Paper prepared for IPGRI External Programme and Management Review. IPGRI, Rome, Italy, 2002
- (73) IPGRI's *Modus Operandi*: Evaluation of the Letters of Agreement Database for the years 1996-2001. Paper prepared for IPGRI External Programme and Management Review. IPGRI, Rome, Italy, 2002
- (74) Report of an assessment of IPGRI's Publications Output. Paper prepared for IPGRI External Programme and Management Review. IPGRI, Rome, Italy, 2002
- (75) Evaluation of the Impact of IPGRI's Publications. Paper prepared for IPGRI External Programme and Management Review. IPGRI, Rome, Italy, 2002

ASSESSMENT OF IPGRI'S RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 4th EPMR

The 4th External Programme and Management Review of IPGRI in 1997 made 16 recommendations. IPGRI's original response to these recommendations and the Centre's current view are presented in this Appendix, which in addition provides the Review Panel's assessment of the status of implementation of the recommendations.

Recommendation No. 1:

The Panel recommends that GRST undertake a systematic programme of appropriate diversity surveys in crops or groups of crops by country and region as a base line activity.

IPGRI's initial response

IPGRI agrees with the Panel that GRST should undertake a systematic programme of baseline genetic diversity surveys. We interpret this recommendation to mean that IPGRI should design such a programme and develop and promote suitable protocols for implementation by national programmes and through networks.

IPGRI's current view

The generation of effective baseline information requires contributions from many organizations with different interests in gathering and using the data. IPGRI sees its own contribution as strengthening and supporting partners, providing tools, methodologies and skills, and conducting research on specific crops.

Work on *in situ* conservation has provided substantial amounts of baseline data on diversity itself and on socioeconomic factors influencing the amount and distribution of diversity in production systems. National partners are providing important new information on the diversity of specific crops in different countries (e.g. barley in Morocco, Ethiopia and Nepal; rice in Nepal and Vietnam) and on ways in which diversity is partitioned among varieties and managed by communities. The work is also developing approaches for monitoring changes in the distribution of diversity and genetic erosion. IPGRI is concerned with the use of biotechnology and information tools such as DNA markers and Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and has, e.g., worked with CIP and CIAT to develop GIS software for diversity analysis (see; <http://www.cipotato.org/diva/>) and <http://www.ipgri.cgiar.org/regions/Americas/programmes/gissoftware.htm>).

IPGRI's work on specific commodities includes the generation of baseline data using traditional and new techniques. The coconut network COGENT is developing databases and catalogues from surveys of farmers' varieties. COGENT has also developed a microsatellite kit for developing countries and trained partners in its use; it is currently being used to characterize farmers' varieties in 54 communities in 15 countries. The INIBAP programme has supported diversity surveys and collecting missions for *Musa* in China, Vietnam, Indonesia and East Africa, and surveys in the Middle East and Malaysia. The *Musa* Germplasm Information System (MGIS) contains information from most major germplasm collections around the world and provides an important tool for monitoring and analyzing diversity. Research on cacao has generated a large amount of evaluation data (e.g. on resistance to *Phytophthora*), to be stored in the International Cocoa Germplasm Database. Research is planned to use molecular markers and resistance testing to compare ca. 1000 accessions from populations in farmers' fields with accessions used in breeding.

Other relevant activities include: (i) organization of an expert workshop with CIAT and FAO on molecular characterization to address the establishment of worldwide baseline diversity surveys in crops; (ii) collaborative research and capacity-building on molecular techniques; (iii) technology transfer between crops (e.g. from rice to bamboo) to capitalize on existing knowledge; (iv) a pan-American project involving the REDARFIT (Andean) network to develop baseline data for *Capsicum*; (v) a watching brief on ongoing research on specific crops to ensure that they continue to include adequate diversity surveys.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The assembly of baseline data from which to measure rates of erosion is still important. This now exists for many staple crops but is still needed for most marginal and regional crops. IPGRI should establish 'gold-standard' GR methodology, and this is a difficult task in an area where the science is advancing so rapidly. The work should continue and the surveys already undertaken should be applied in the field to understand their relevance in rate of change studies.

Recommendation No. 2:

The Panel recommends that projects directed at developing and testing methodologies in genetic resources should be more than case studies, and should be linked directly to priority problems of actual conservation management in national and/or international programmes.

IPGRI's initial response

This recommendation stresses the importance of solving actual problems rather than just increasing academic knowledge through the use of case studies. Such an approach is indeed central to IPGRI's research programme. While agreeing with the Panel, IPGRI must strike a balance between solving immediate problems and more strategic research which aims to underpin future "problem solving" research.

IPGRI's current view

In developing and testing conservation methodologies, IPGRI follows a well-established procedure to decide on priority problems, species to be used, and partners, as follows:

- a) Identification of priority problems is done through needs assessment at the local and/or regional level. Country visits, network meetings, and participatory preparation of research agendas allow IPGRI to be very strategic in the choice of research targets.
- b) The choice of species uses criteria such as the applicability of the knowledge generated to a wider range of species, the prior existence of research results needed for the study, economic importance of the species, and the opportunity to collaborate with experienced partners, whenever possible in developing countries.
- c) Research on methodology development includes strategic as well as adaptive elements, where possible involving partners who actually face the problems(s).
- d) To reach as many partners as possible at local to global levels IPGRI's strategies include the development of information products that provide options to support well-informed decision making. These include Technical Bulletins (e.g., *A protocol to determine seed storage behaviour; Molecular tools in PGR conservation: a guide to the technologies*), decision guides (e.g., *Regeneration of accessions in seed collection: a decision guide; Guidelines for the management of field and in vitro collections*) and guidelines for on-farm management of diversity.
- e) IPGRI seeks to strengthen partners' research capacity through research partnerships, training, and production and dissemination of training modules. The choice of training activities is based on needs expressed in national stakeholder meetings, sub-regional and regional fora and networks. Recent examples are training on legal and policy issues, community-based participation in agrobiodiversity management, data analysis, and management skills for coordinating national programme frameworks.
- f) An illustrative example of IPGRI's approach of developing and testing methodologies on an actual priority problem relates to *Musa*. Since cryopreservation is the method of choice for long-term conservation of such vegetatively propagated crops, INIBAP has supported research to develop simple, robust cryopreservation techniques. Three complementary techniques have been developed, a combination of which allows all the different genome types of *Musa* to be successfully cryopreserved. In recent years, INIBAP has moved from research towards routine application of the technology for long-term conservation of one of the developing world's most important crops. Moreover, the technical and strategic learning achieved will have wider impact for other problem crops presenting conservation problems.

Another example is research carried out by IPGRI's on-farm conservation project with local and country components that are providing strategic learning for application at the global level.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The *Musa* example is apposite, however exclusive focus on *Musa* should be avoided. More potentially generic examples should continue to be developed. The Panel notes that a complementary approach including *in situ* studies for the study of metadata has recently been mooted.

Recommendation No. 3:

The Panel recommends that IPGRI strengthens its documentation unit and establishes, with SGRP, a Documentation Advisory/Support Group comprised of documentation specialists from various advanced institutions. The terms of reference for this Group should be to: provide programmatic guidance to IPGRI; advise on standardisation of codes, formats and data sets; facilitate documentation in support of surveys, GIS and farmers' data; assist in facilitating training opportunities; and incorporate the latest developments in information technology in the advice given.

IPGRI's initial response

IPGRI will explore mechanisms for strengthening its staffing in documentation, as recommended, taking into account also the skills and responsibilities of regionally-located staff. Although the precise nature of the Documentation Advisory Support Group recommended by the Panel requires clarification, the concept of a participatory mechanism to assist in the identification of documentation needs and constraints, and to develop and implement solutions, is received with interest and will be explored together with SGRP. It is further noted that implementing this recommendation will incur added costs.

IPGRI's current view

IPGRI takes a decentralized approach to PGR documentation work, with not only Headquarters staff devoted to it, but also several staff in regionally located offices including those of INIBAP. It is also relevant to note that at the time of the last EPMR, PGR documentation staff in the DIT Group had recently transferred responsibility for the management of Headquarters computer services to a separate unit within Finance and Administration. This has subsequently freed up time of scientific staff and brought additional information and communications technology skills into IPGRI.

IPGRI's PGR documentation staff represent a strong research and development presence in the plant genetic resources community. The decentralized approach is complemented and lent coherence by the collaborative development of a PGR documentation strategy led by a focal point, plus opportunities for strategic work created through project restructuring. Collaborative work involving Headquarters and regional locations is addressing genebank information management systems, bridging the digital divide, low-cost open source software evaluation and use, and development of training materials on e.g. data management and analysis, and information and communication technologies skills for constructing and accessing networked systems.

The SINGER project of the SGRP plays a key role in collaborative development of GIS (with the Americas Group) and software tools (with the SSA Group), and in training in software tool development (with the Europe Group). Links between SINGER and other PGR documentation staff and activities are strong, and have increased in SINGER Phase II, the planning of which involved inputs from other CGIAR Centres and external experts.

External inputs have also been provided to IPGRI through a meeting held in 1999, when invited experts helped analyse IPGRI's information and PGR documentation work and plan for the future. An Information Action Plan thus developed identified 60 priority activities, of which at least 20 address PGR documentation issues revealed by needs assessment among partners. Most priority activities are currently being implemented. A follow up strategic meeting in 2003 will again involve experts from international, regional and national partner organizations.

Feedback on user needs and thematic trends is also obtained from GFAR, from workshops and training courses, from crop and thematic networks, from regional meetings to promote the implementation of the Global Plan of Action, and from partners in ongoing collaborative activities, e.g. FAO, USDA, and participants in EU bioinformatics projects. Within the SGRP, external inputs come from the SINGER Listserver, SINGER review meetings (such as held in November 1998) that provide critical feedback from the CGIAR Centres, and ongoing communications among CGIAR Centre SINGER Focal Points.

Provision of expert advice is a two-way process. IPGRI's PGR documentation activities (including leadership of SINGER) are widely recognized as promoting agreed taxonomy, data standards and exchange protocols. In addition, SINGER is being called on to advise, support and link to information systems of others such as AVRDC, the European Crop Genetic Resources Network (EURISCO), and international crop networks on barley, wheat and sweet potato led by ICARDA, CIMMYT and CIP respectively.

In view of the proactive approach of IPGRI's PGR documentation staff, the close interactions between SINGER and other activities, and the many mechanisms that can and do provide the acknowledged benefits of an external perspective, IPGRI does not agree with the need for a Documentation Advisory/Support Group of external experts.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The Panel agrees that DIT has evolved considerably since the time of the last EPMR and that initiatives such as the Information Action Plan may have reduced the immediate need for a Documentation Advisory/Support Group of external experts. Nevertheless information management technologies are evolving extremely rapidly. A continual zero-based evaluation of IPGRI's DIT needs in Rome, Montpellier and the regions to inform the most appropriate location for skills and services remains necessary.

Recommendation No. 4:

The Panel recommends the appointment of a training specialist officer in DIT responsible for all aspects of PGR training

IPGRI's initial response

The recommendation to appoint a Training Officer echoes earlier recommendations (e.g. by the DIT CCER). IPGRI agrees, and recruitment of a full-time Training Officer is already planned but is currently on hold pending sufficient funds becoming available.

IPGRI's current view

Following an analysis carried out in 1999 by the (then) newly-appointed Director of Documentation, Information and Training (in consultation with other members of the Management Committee) on the training and capacity-building activities currently being carried out by IPGRI or in conjunction with other organizations, the decision was made to recruit a full-time Training Officer. The Training Officer was recruited in late 2000 and reported for duty in March 2001. After an extended induction period in Headquarters with visits to all regions, the Training Officer was established in his duty station in the SSA Regional Office in Nairobi. From this location he serves as the institutional focal point for training and is coordinator of the Global Training and Capacity Building project.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The successful appointment has been made. No doubt Management will evaluate the relative merits of locating 'experts' in the Regions or at HQ.

Recommendation No. 5:

The Panel recommends that IPGRI, and hence the CGIAR, should reconsider its facilitation role for COGENT unless greater emphasis is placed upon improvement of coconut productivity for smallholders.

IPGRI's initial response

The Board is somewhat surprised at the Panel's analysis of COGENT and the resulting recommendation to reconsider IPGRI's facilitating role in the network. There also appear to be some misconceptions about the situation regarding coconut genetic resources and the biology of the crop. We wish to point out that 95% of the world coconut production is from small farms, and that the COGENT Steering Committee members are deeply concerned with solving the problems faced by small-scale producers. We thus regard COGENT as a very relevant activity for IPGRI and the CGIAR. The Board, however, does accept the recommendation of the Panel concerning the importance of targeting smallholders but stresses that this is already the case and is exemplified in a proposal, recently submitted to a donor, to strengthen on-farm coconut research.

IPGRI's current view

IPGRI agrees with the importance of targeting smallholders and has built this into COGENT's work from the outset. Examples from current projects illustrate the approach taken:

An IFAD-funded project on *Sustainable use of coconut genetic resources to enhance incomes and nutrition of smallholders in the Asia-Pacific region* addresses the needs of coconut smallholders in 14 Asia-Pacific countries through farmer participatory research, and through identification of high-value products and suitable farmers' varieties. The results of this project are being deployed along with promotion of on-farm conservation of coconut diversity in 24 communities in eight countries through an Asian Development Bank-funded project on *Poverty reduction in coconut growing communities*. A Common Fund for Commodities-funded project on *Utilization and conservation of coconut genetic resources to promote sustainable coconut production* is evaluating promising hybrids and varieties under smallholder conditions in Africa (in Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Tanzania) and Latin America (in Brazil, Jamaica and Mexico).

Following the success of COGENT in promoting the conservation and use of coconut genetic resources, an expanded programme entitled *Global Coconut Research for Development Programme (PROCORD)* has been launched under the aegis of GFAR. Through PROCORD, COGENT, the Bureau for the Development of Research on Perennial Tropical Oil Crops (BUROTROP) and the Asian and Pacific Coconut Community (APCC) will collaborate to address priority research on coconut genetic resources, socioeconomics, policy, agronomy, coconut-based farming system, crop protection, processing and marketing, with a clear emphasis on the improvement of the livelihoods of the poor.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The Panel is reassured that the present COGENT programme is addressing both role of genetic resources and the sustainable improvement of livelihoods of the poor.

Recommendation No. 6:

The Panel recommends that IPGRI define more precisely the role and responsibilities of the Regional Groups in their interaction with the headquarters-based Thematic Groups in order to contribute to more efficient and effective operation of the Regional Groups and to more closely integrate Rome-based and regional activities.

IPGRI's initial response

We agree with the Panel on the need for close interaction and integration between Regional and Thematic Groups and the need to more precisely define the roles and responsibilities of Regional Groups. Mechanisms to help ensure such interaction are contained in the recently revised Project Management Framework. We recognize the need for careful monitoring of its implementation

IPGRI's current view

In 1997, IPGRI carried out an exercise with help from Professor Bernard Tinker of Oxford University, to enhance collaboration between Thematic and Regional Groups. As a result, IPGRI consolidated its work into a 20 Projects (“C-series”) making activities more Project- than Group-focused. Logical framework training workshops helped clarify roles and responsibilities and promote cooperation. The transition in 2002-2003 to the D-series of the Project Portfolio will reinforced a project focus. Each Project Team is multidisciplinary and the majority include members from both Regional and Thematic Groups. Mechanisms used to promote and maintain close interaction include regular Project Team planning meetings, bringing together staff across Group boundaries, e-mail discussion groups/communities of practice, and more region-to-region collaborative linkages.

In the information area for example, different communication structures have been established to encourage cross-fertilization of ideas, sharing of information and joint planning. An Information Meeting in 1999 brought together regional and thematic information, documentation and training staff for a strategic planning exercise. A similar event will take place in 2003. An IPGRI-INFO listserv has been established to share information of mutual interest across Regional and Thematic Groups, and specialized listservs have been set up for documentation, knowledge management and other topics. A community of practice of regional and thematic staff involved in training and capacity-building was recently established for joint strategy development and planning.

Revision of the composition of the Programme Planning and Review Committee (PPRC) and the Management Committee (MC) has helped reinforce the complementarity of the institutional and ambassadorial responsibilities of Regional Directors and the institute-wide thematic responsibilities of the Thematic Directors. It has also created a PPRC team that is de-linked from administrative home Group identities.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The new PPRC has indeed helped, although continued work is required for PPRC to attain maximum efficiency. Further transparency, coherence and consistency with overall Institute directions will be achieved by the development of Strategic Plans for all Regional Offices.

Recommendation No. 7:

The Panel recommends that IPGRI shifts its strategic priorities and support for PGR conservation and use towards Objective 2 (regional collaboration) while its Objective 1 (national programme support) would also be achieved through this regional dimensions

IPGRI's initial response

IPGRI sees long-term value in the recommendation to shift resources to the Institute's Objective 2 (promoting international collaboration), with Objective 1 (the strengthening of national programmes) being addressed primarily through regional approaches. However, we view this with

some reservation as national programmes are the necessary building blocks of any regional or international effort. In line with the Global Plan of Action, IPGRI aims to support national programmes so that they can both more effectively benefit from, and contribute to, regional and international efforts. As national programmes become stronger, IPGRI's Objective 2 will gradually evolve to take precedence over Objective 1.

IPGRI's current view

IPGRI's revised strategy, *Diversity for Development*, reaffirms the importance of working at both the national and regional levels and underlines the importance of directing attention to less-endowed countries. IPGRI's policy is to take advantage of regional networks to help stronger countries support weaker ones, at the same time helping build regional cohesion and leveraging resources within regions. IPGRI's capacity building strategy includes strengthening management skills for developing functional national programmes. A training module covering planning, priority setting and monitoring, multi-stakeholder analysis, coordination and public awareness is currently under development. National programmes remain the basic units of plant genetic resources conservation and use initiatives. IPGRI must remain flexible to work with them bilaterally as well as through sub-regional and regional networks. Collaboration with FAO to define milestones and indicators relating to national programme development in the context of follow-up to the Global Plan of Action supports a strategic approach to interventions at the national level. Donor trends towards bilateral funding, as well as developing countries themselves becoming donors, bring a *de facto* national focus. IPGRI recognizes this reality at the same time as looking for opportunities to generate a regional impact. An illustrative example is the INIBAP banana biotechnology project in Uganda supported by Ugandan funding but with a projected regional impact. In another example, the approach of the Global Environment Facility is country driven but IPGRI's recognized comparative advantage as a GEF project executing agency is due in part to its ability to "regionalize" and "internationalise" the impact of the donor's investments.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

We agree that the importance of the regional activities is reflected in IPGRI's present *modus operandi*. Many activities are carried out through regional networks and it is important that IPGRI ensures that adequate funds are made available to sustain key networks. The Panel notes that within Regions particularly needy NARS are often targeted specifically.

Recommendation No. 8:

The Panel recommends that the draft regional strategies be further clarified so that IPGRI's priorities are clearly articulated such that, when faced with an opportunity to work in a region, the proposal can be measured against the agreed strategy, and ranked in order of importance and its claim on resources

IPGRI's initial response

IPGRI agrees that its regional strategies require further elaboration. This will be done in consultation with key partners.

IPGRI's current view

IPGRI agrees with the importance of careful elaboration and active use of regional strategies for prioritizing its work. Regional strategies have been developed and are refined as part of an on-going process. They are also the basis for the development of logframes for regional projects in the D-series of the IPGRI Project Portfolio, with the institutional logframe being used as a basic framework.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The Panel still requires confirmation that strategies have been adequately developed for all regions and strongly encourages regions which have not done so to complete its exercise.

Recommendation No. 9:

The Panel recommends that:

1. INIBAP be fully integrated into IPGRI as an identifiable Programme;
2. The INIBAP Support Group endorse this recommendation and exercise its right to terminate the MoU between the Support Group, INIBAP, and IPGRI [dated 22 May 1994 under the provisions of Article VII (Final Provisions), Section 2] forthwith;
3. The Support Group remain as an advisory Group to the INIBAP programme within IPGRI; and
4. IPGRI should seek to conclude any necessary agreements with the Government of France to protect the privileges and immunities of the institution and its staff.

IPGRI's initial response

IPGRI concurs with the Panel's four sub-recommendations regarding the full integration of INIBAP within IPGRI. We will explore with the INIBAP Support Group its future role in relation to both the INIBAP programme and proposed *Musa* Improvement Programme (MIP).

IPGRI's current view

All the possible steps for the implementation of the recommendation have been taken.

- 1) The successful integration of INIBAP as an identifiable Programme of IPGRI has allowed the Programme to develop substantially. 2) The budget of INIBAP has grown from US\$2.7 million in 1995 to US\$6.2 million in 2002.

3) The IPGRI Board, INIBAP Board and the INIBAP Support Group have passed the necessary resolutions that will lead to the dissolution of INIBAP as a legal entity.

4) The INIBAP support Group has accepted to take on the responsibility of being the Support Group of *PROMUSA*.

Because of legal difficulties, IPGRI has not yet managed to sign a Headquarters Agreement with the Government of France. INIBAP therefore still has to continue to exist as a legal entity until a HQ agreement is signed in the name of IPGRI.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The Panel agrees that the IPGRI have complied with the letter of this Recommendation. INIBAP is established as the INIBAP Programme of IPGRI. The Support Group has been subsumed in IPGRI's Board. The MoU between INIBAP and IPGRI has not been terminated because of its links to the INIBAP Headquarters Agreement with the French Republic, which, for technical reasons, has still not been transferred to IPGRI. The Panel is of the opinion that further integration is desirable.

Recommendation No. 10:

The Panel recommends that INIBAP/IPGRI and IITA carry out a joint strategic planning activity at the earliest possible date for defining the IITA-INIBAP input into the *Musa* Improvement Programme and to agree upon a revised MOU.

IPGRI's initial response

We agree with the recommendation to carry out joint strategic planning with IITA, not only in the context of the *Musa* Improvement Programme but also in the regional networks in Africa. IITA has already contributed to the development of the draft proposal for MIP and will participate in the March 1997 meeting to launch the programme.

IPGRI's current view

Following the signature of a new MoU with IITA in 1998, regular planning meetings have been held between INIBAP and IITA staff. In 2001, this led to the decision to create a *Future Harvest Musa Programme for Africa* to be jointly implemented by IITA and INIBAP. In 2002, a very positive relationship has also been established with the new management team of IITA. Currently two projects are being implemented jointly by IITA and INIBAP and a first joint staff member has been appointment in November 2002

5th EPMR Panel's observations

Improvements in the relationship have indeed been achieved. There is room, nevertheless, for still further harmonisation of effort in SSA.

Recommendation No. 11:

The Panel recommends that IPGRI engage with the ICWG-GR in exploring measures to ensure that Centre representatives have authority to speak for their institute on strategic decisions and joint plans of action and, further, to appoint one or more external advisers to assist it to focus on long-term Systemwide Programmes and strategies.

IPGRI's initial response

The Panel notes the difficulties created by having the Inter-Centre Working Group on Genetic Resources (ICWG-GR) composed of individuals from different levels within their Centres. However, we believe that the problems this creates are not insurmountable and that goodwill among the members, a strong sense of ownership of the programme and a personal desire to participate effectively in it are ultimately more important than their level of decision-making authority within their own institute. Nevertheless we agree with the recommendation that IPGRI should explore possibilities for ensuring that all members of the ICWG-GR are empowered to make appropriate decisions, when needed, on behalf of their Centres. The recommendation to appoint one or more external advisers to the SGRP will also be explored with the ICWG-GR.

IPGRI's current view

The issues of authoritative decision-making and strategic focus were addressed by the 1998 EPMR of the SGRP. Recommendations on these topics have been discussed within the ICWG-GR, among Centre Directors, TAC and CGIAR members. It has been agreed that the IPGRI Board of Trustees provide the governance to the SGRP.

At the 1999 annual meeting of the ICWG-GR, five Centre representatives were Deputy Directors General, and since 1999, there have always been at least two Centres represented at this level. Moreover, the SGRP's activities in addressing Systemwide policy, procedures and funding needs for operating the genebanks have fully involved the highest level of Centre and System management. For example, the workshop on the new Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in February 2002 was attended by six Directors General, the TAC Chair, and representatives of the CGIAR Secretariat and Genetic Resources Policy Committee. The campaign for the Global Conservation Trust received full System endorsement at MTM 2001 and has Centre Director General and System Office representation on the Campaign Strategy Group.

The purpose and domain of the SGRP vis à vis Centres' own genetic resources programmes, has been clarified, with the agreement that the SGRP focus on systemwide areas and on achieving internal system cohesion. In April 1999, at an extraordinary meeting of the ICWG-GR, participants developed a logframe for SGRP to clarify its strategy, direction and mode of operation. Any problems of authority and focus have been alleviated through these developments

5th EPMR Panel's observations

At the 2003 SGRP meeting in Mexico The Panel Chair observed both the use of an external advisor by SGRP Support and very significant strategic decisions being taken harmoniously by all Centre representatives.

Recommendation No. 12:

The Panel recommends that IPGRI initiate a consultation process among the Boards and Directors General of the CGIAR Centres with the objective of reassessing the System's genetic resources conservation responsibilities in the post-UNCED environment and to readdress structural options for better programmatic integration of the entire CGIAR efforts.

IPGRI's initial response

IPGRI agrees that there are still opportunities for the CGIAR to further increase the coherence of its genetic resources work to more fully realize its potential contribution to the global system in the post UNCED era. However, we believe that this issue would best be addressed by the proposed TAC external review of SGRP rather than by IPGRI initiating a separate and possibly overlapping effort.

IPGRI's current view

The conservation responsibilities of the CGIAR Centres and coherence of the System's work on genetic resources in contribution to the global conservation effort were predominant concerns for the 1998 SGRP EPMR, and the subject of many of its recommendations. In response, the SGRP's future direction became more clearly focused on conservation, with highest priority being given to ensuring that obligations regarding the in-trust collections be met.

The CGIAR, under IPGRI's lead, was actively involved in providing technical advice and inputs to the renegotiation of the International Undertaking (now Treaty) on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The implications of the Treaty for the CGIAR's in-trust plant collections were examined by the Centres at a workshop in February 2002, and a proposed draft for new in-trust agreements is pending a response from the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

In 2001, the Centres launched a campaign to create the Global Conservation Trust to secure funding for the in-trust collection and other key collections of crop genetic resources around the world. This is aimed at putting in place a rational global system of *ex situ* conservation as called for under the Global Plan of Action and the International Treaty.

It is also relevant to note that genetic resources now feature more prominently in Centre programmes and other inter-Centre initiatives such as the Integrated Natural Resources Management (INRM) Task Force. The SGRP has played a role in putting genetic resources management into the INRM framework, thereby promoting an ecosystem approach to *in situ* conservation.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The Panel agrees that this Recommendation has been superseded. IPGRI-mediated progress with the International Treaty and the Global Conservation Trust are both significant.

Recommendation No. 13 :

With respect to the Board of Trustees, Panel recommends that the Executive Committee consist of five positions: the Board Chairperson, the Director-General (*ex-officio*), two members who have been tasked with multi-year leadership responsibility for the Audit & Operations and Programme oversight functions, respectively, and the FAO Representative (as required by the terms of the MoU on Programme Cooperation with FAO)

IPGRI's initial response

The full Board of IPGRI is involved and operates on a year-round basis rather than confining its activities primarily to its Board meetings which take place twice per year. Because of its commitment to full Board involvement and transparency in its processes, an Executive Committee decision has been required only once in the past two years. Although the Board will continue this mode of operation, the leaders of any Task Groups assigned to Programme and Audit/Operations functions at future Board meetings will be added to the membership of the Executive Committee as recommended.

IPGRI's current view

The Executive committee of the Board now has a composition as detailed in this Recommendation (Board Chair, DG, FAO Representative, Leaders of POTG (Programme Oversight Task Group) and FITG (Financial Issues Task Group - which has taken over from the Audit and Operations Committee). The continuity of key Board functions is ensured through (i) selection of Task Group members and nomination of the Board Vice-Chair to provide balance over time; (ii) drawing of the Chairs of the Board Task Groups from within the existing membership of the respective Task Groups; (iii) follow-up activities by the Board Secretary. The monitoring of the implementation of Board decisions is facilitated through detailed minuting of Board meetings, the review and approval of the Board minutes of the preceding meeting at each Board meeting, the review and approval by the Board of an Action List of items for follow up from each Board meeting, and the monitoring by the Board Secretary of the Action List. The Board is currently exploring the need for a standing Audit Committee to complement the work of the Finance Task Group

5th EPMR Panel's observations

Satisfied.

Recommendation No. 14:

The Panel recommends that an *ad hoc* Committee of Board members and staff be formed to translate the broad statement of the *Diversity for Development* document, and other, more recent draft strategy papers, into a set of operational statements that will guide the resource allocation and priority-setting decisions that must underpin the implementation of the MTP (1998-2000), and PPRC programme deliberations. The work of the *ad hoc* Committee could be completed by end-1997, and its report presented by Management to the full Board for its review and approval.

Recommendation No. 15

The Panel recommends that Management strengthen its programme planning and review process to articulate further the linkages between the institutional, thematic, and regional strategy documents, and the programme priorities that guide the implementation of the MTP (1998-2000), and the associated budgetary allocation processes.

IPGRI's initial response to Recommendations 14 and 15

IPGRI agrees with these two related recommendations regarding the need to further articulate the linkages between the institutional, thematic and regional strategies, and to develop operational statements to guide resource allocation. The recommendation that this be carried out jointly by staff, management and Board is also received positively. This will be done in the context of the planned revision of IPGRI's long-term institutional strategy, "Diversity for Development".

IPGRI's current view of Recommendations 14 and 15:

As indicated in the initial response to the recommendation, the entire institutional strategy has been reviewed by both staff and Board, this process identifying eight strategic choices around which to develop IPGRI work with contributions from the three IPGRI Programmes and from Regional and Thematic Groups. The new institutional strategy was translated into the MTP for 2001-2003, with Board involvement particularly at BOT 14 in September 1999.

At subsequent Board meetings, in addition to the continuing series of CCERs (which have been given a more strategic function to complement technical reviews of projects by the PPRC), there have been special sessions in which strategic issues were addressed, e.g. At BOT 17 in March where the Board participated in three workshops on: Funding strategies; Programme issues; Policy developments.

IPGRI has institutionalized the practice of using the logical framework tool ("logframes") to develop objective-oriented programme planning, monitoring and evaluation. Logframes were developed for the C-series projects and for the Institute as a whole, to link to the CGIAR logframe. The common component in all of the logframes, providing a unifying sense is the set of outputs for each, categorized according to the five principal CGIAR outputs. Currently, logframes are being developed for the D-series projects.

IPGRI has also recently been reviewing its programme planning, execution and follow up with a view to maximizing the impact of the institute's work on development. The Sustainable Livelihoods (SL) framework as promoted by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) appears to be a particularly promising approach for adoption by IPGRI; discussions are ongoing with DFID regarding the provision of support for staff development and pilot projects to experiment with the SL framework.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The environment that IPGRI is operating in CBD, TRIPS and post WSSD is very different from that at the time of the last EPMR. A further update of 'Diversity for Development' would be desirable. The Panel agree that the development of 'eight strategic choices' is relevant to these Recommendations.

Recommendation No. 16:

The Panel recommends that IPGRI develop a mode of subcontracting a part of its research programme through the issuance of calls for proposals for designated research topics, and after a peer review, select the most suitable proposals for funding.

IPGRI's initial response

IPGRI is somewhat concerned at the Panels depiction of the institute as taking an opportunistic approach to its relationships with partners. Partnerships have in many cases developed over a large number of years and IPGRI's staff have very extensive webs of contacts. In contracting out research, IPGRI not only seeks to maximise the quality of the research conducted, but also uses such contracts as a means of developing the research capacity of partner organizations and to help promote their participation in the international arena. Thus we have strong reservations about the recommendation to issue calls for proposals and are concerned that IPGRI not be seen by its partners as a funding agency. Nevertheless we will explore that part of the recommendation that calls for a greater use of peer reviews for evaluating project plans.

IPGRI's current view

IPGRI has found a mechanism that is useful and appropriate for subcontracting work and introducing peer review alongside participatory planning, through workshops in which national programme scientists, other stakeholders such as NGOs and farmer representatives, and independent technical experts collectively evaluate and assess project plans. In addition, some opportunities have been taken for peer review of proposals (e.g., in CWANA), the SSA Group has incorporate a limited use of competitive bidding in its collaborations with national programmes, and the Vavilov-Frankel and Abdou-Salam Ouédraogo Fellowships are awarded through a competitive process. Also, the recently initiated Genetic Resource Policy Initiative (GRPI) will call for project proposal submissions from partners. At the end of GRPI Phase 1, during which a Southern Country Demand Analysis will be carried out, a process will be initiated for national partners to generate proposals for GRPI

Phase 2. This will be a competitive grants system, but very much embedded within the GRPI project. It will seek to build the capacities of the partners who will be making the proposals, involving them at an early stage in the project, participating in priority-setting and the development of multi-stakeholder teams to generate proposals for follow up actions. Efforts will be made to maximize partner participation in follow-up research and incorporate as many as possible of partners project ideas into funded work.

Regarding to TAC's comments encouraging an emphasis on an ecological approach to genetic research, IPGRI affirms its interest in this area, as reflected in its revised strategy and notes that in 2000 IPGRI appointed an ecologist to head the APO Regional Group. It is also pertinent to note that IPGRI is placing greater emphasis on agricultural biodiversity as a whole. Just as ICLARM is now known as the World Fish Centre, perhaps IPGRI should become the World Agrobiodiversity Centre.

IPGRI agrees with TAC on the complementarity of outsourced and in-house research and notes that the Institute (i) encourages staff involvement in research where opportune; (ii) has a steady recruitment of young staff as Associate Experts and Interns that generate a significant amount of original research; and (iii) hosts seconded staff and Honorary Fellows who are able to devote a significant amount of time to original research.

5th EPMR Panel's observations

The Panel is more comfortable with IPGRI's current view than with IPGRI's initial response. It is clear that some projects are still initiated through personal linkages between Centre staff and NARS scientists. While many of these projects are successful, the move towards outsourcing and peer review should be strengthened.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACIAR	Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADG	Assistant Director General
AGM	Annual General Meeting
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
AMS	IPGRI Regional Office for the Americas
APAARI	Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions
APAFRI	Asia Pacific Association of Forestry Research Institutions
APCC	Asian and Pacific Coconut Community
APFORGEN	Asia Pacific Forest Genetic Resources Programme
APO	Asia, Pacific and Oceania
ARI	Advanced Research Institute
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
ASPNET	Asia and Pacific Regional Network of INIBAP
ATREE	Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment
AVRDC	Asian Vegetable Research and Development Centre
BAC	Bacterial artificial chromosome
BAPNET	Banana Asia Pacific Network
BARNESA	Banana Research Network for East and Southern Africa
BoT	Board of Trustees
BRIS	Bureau of Research and Information Systems
BUROTROP	Bureau for the Development of Research on Perennial Tropical Oil Crops
CAPGERNET	Caribbean Plant Genetic Resources Network
CARBAP	Centre Africain de Recherches sur Bananiers et Plantains
CARE	Co-operative Assistance on Relief Everywhere
CATIE	Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza
CBC	Committee of Board Chairs
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community Based Organizations
CCER	Centre Commissioned External Review
CD-ROM	compact disc, read-only memory
CFC	Common Fund for Commodities
CGIAR	Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CIMMYT	Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo
CINVESTAV	Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN
CIP	International Potato Centre
CIRAD	Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique
CIRAD-FLHOR	CIRAD Fruit and Horticultural Crops Department

COGENT	International Coconut Genetic Resources Network
CONDESAN	Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion
COP	Conference of Parties
CORAF	Conférence de Responsables de Recherche Agronomique Africains
CORBANA	Corporación Bananera Nacional
COSUDE	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
CP	Challenge Programme
CWANA	Central West Asia and North Africa Region
DDGP	Deputy Director General for Programmes
DFA	Director of Finance and Administration
DFID	Department for International Development
DFSC	Danida Forest Seed Centre
DG	Director General
DIT	Documentation, Information and Training
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
EAPGREN	Eastern Africa Plant Genetic Resources Network
ECP/GR	European Cooperative Programme on Crop Genetic Resources
EPMR	External Programme and Management Review
EST	Expressed sequence tag
EU	European Union
EUFORGEN	European Forest Genetic Resources Programme
EURISCO	European Internet Search Catalogue
EXCO	Executive Committee
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FGR	Forest Genetic Resources
FGRP	Forest Genetic Resources Programme
FHIA	Fundación Hondureña de Investigación Agrícola
FITG	Financial Issues Task Group
FONTAGRO	Fondo Regional de Tecnología Agropecuaria
FRIM	Forest Research Institute Malaysia
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
GCT	Global Conservation Trust
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GM	Genetic Modification
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
GNP	Gross National Product
GPA	Global Plan of Action
GRENEWECA	Genetic Resources Network for Western and Central Africa
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
GRPI	Genetic Resources Policy Initiative
GRST	Genetic Resources Science and Technology
HQ	Headquarters
HRM	Human Resource Management
IA	Impact assessment
IARI	Indian Agricultural Research Institute
IBPGR	International Board for Plant Genetic Resources
ICARDA	International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas

ICLARM	International Centre for Living Aquatic Resources Management
ICRAF	International Centre for Research in Agroforestry
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
ICWG-GR	Inter-Centre Working Group on Genetic Resources
IDLO	International Development Law Organization
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IGG/OOF	Inter-Governmental Commodity Group/other official flows
IICA	Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IMTP	International <i>Musa</i> Testing Programme
INFOMUSA	International Magazine on Banana and Plantain
INIA	Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agraria
INIBAP	International Network for the Improvement of Banana and Plantain
INRM	Integrated Natural Resources Management
IPGRI	International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
IRS	International Recruited Staff
iSC	interim Science Council
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research
ISO	International Standard
ITC	INIBAP Transit Centre
ITPGRFA	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
IVDN	Integrated Voice Data Network
KARI	Kenyan Agricultural Research Institute
KEFRI	Kenya Forestry Research Institute
KEPHIS	Plant Quarantine Station Muguga
KUL	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
LIBIRD	Local Initiatives for Biodiversity, Research and Development
LoA	Letter of Agreement
LRP	Locally Recruited Professional Staff
LRS	Locally Recruited Staff
MARDI	Malaysian Agricultural Research and Development Institute
MC	Management Committee
MEC	Management Executive Committee
MGIS	<i>Musa</i> Germplasm Information System
MIP	<i>Musa</i> Improvement Programme
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTP	Medium Term Plan
MUSACO	Réseau <i>Musa</i> pour l'Afrique Centrale et Occidentale
MUSADOC	CD-ROM with <i>Musa</i> information
MUSALAC	Plantain and Banana Research and Development Network for Latin America and the Caribbean
MUSALIT	Banana and plantain bibliographic reference database
NARS	National Agriculture Research System

NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NORGEN	Plant Genetic Resources Network for North America, Canada, Mexico and the USA
NTG	Nominations Task Group
NUS	Neglected and Under-utilized Species
OAS	Organization of America States
OAU	Organization of African Unity
pcGRIN	Gamecock Residential Information Network (stand-alone version)
PGR	Plant Genetic Resources
PGRFA	Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
POTG	Programme Oversight Task Group
PPB	Participatory Plant Breeding
PPRC	Programme Planning and Review Committee
PR	Public Relations
PROINPA	Foundation for the Research and the Promotion of Andean Products
PROCISUR	Programa Cooperativo para el Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario del Cono Sur
PROCORD	Global Coconut Research for Development Programme
PROMUSA	A Global Programme for <i>Musa</i> Improvement
PRONAMACH	Programa Nacional de Manejo de Cuencas Hidricas
QTL	Quantitative Trait Loci
REDARFIT	Red Andina de Recursos Fitogenéticos
REMERFI	Red Mesoamericana de Recursos Fitogenéticos
RILET	Research Institute for Legumes and Root Crops
SACCAR	Southern African Centre for Cooperation in Agricultural Research and Training
SAFORGEN	Sub Saharan Africa Forest Genetic Resources Programme
SBSTTA	CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
SGRP	Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SINGER	Systemwide Information Network for Genetic Resources
SL	Sustainable Livelihoods
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
ToR	Term of Reference
TRIPS	Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
TROPIGEN	Red Amazónica de Recursos Fitogenéticos
UKM	University Kebangsaan Malaysia
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UPLB	University of the Philippines Los Baños
USAID	US Agency for International Development
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VVOB	Vlaamse Vereniging voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking en Technische Bijstand (Flemish Association for Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance)
WARDA	West Africa Rice Development Association

WCA	West and Central Africa
WECARD	West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
WFP	World Food Programme
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organization