

**Fifth External Program and Management Review of IITA
Implementation of Recommendations**

EPMR Recommendation	IITA Response	Implementation
<p>Recommendation 1— Prioritization Process The Panel recommends that IITA place immediate emphasis on establishing a sound methodology for prioritizing their research agenda</p>	<p>IITA welcomes this recommendation. In its new strategic plan the Institute has used a bottom-up priority setting exercise based in particular on the priorities developed under the strategic plans of the sub-regional organizations. These plans in turn were based on the strategic plans of the NARS. This collective knowledge and experience of IITA and its partners should be fully considered in any quantitative methodology used. However, the Institute fully acknowledges the potential usefulness of a sound and reliable methodology for prioritizing its research agenda and will undertake the necessary efforts for this. It will consult with its sister institutes and others to determine the best approach. The institute hopes that adequate reliable data are available to allow it to achieve trustworthy results .</p>	<p>May 2002--IITA has started implementing this recommendation. An in-house Task force on priority setting (strengthened by a Board Member) has been set up. The Task force developed an approach during the December 2001 Work Planning (WPW). For the long term the Institute has made priority setting an integral part of its research portfolio as a separate output of the new Project C. To move ahead on this topic, Social Scientists, held a meeting in Cameroon in February 2002 and recommended the hiring of a Post doctoral fellow whose main task would be to work on issues related to priority setting. May 2003—On-going. Postdoc recruited. IITA participating in CGIAR priority setting that includes SSA.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2 – From Strategy to Structure: A Work in Progress The Panel recommends immediate recruitment of a DDG-R with responsibility to guide and manage IITA’s research program, evaluate its quality and relevance, and be accountable.</p>	<p>Following the recommendation of the fourth EPMP IITA proceeded with the recruitment of a Deputy Director General. Once the new staff member was identified the Institute looked at how the research leadership could be best organized. Given the current strength and interest of the Director General, it was decided that this could best be done by having a Deputy Director General at large with extensive responsibilities for research planning and management. However, it was felt also that the Director General should maintain an active role in research planning by continuing to chair the Research Program and Executive Committee. After the retirement of the current DG the DDG’s position could be formally denominated DDG Research. At IITA the three research divisions enjoy strong scientific leadership. Even in the future the Institute should continue to benefit fully from its combined research leadership capacity. Moreover, the incoming DG should be given the opportunity to make changes as appropriate.</p>	<p>May 2002--On-going research continues in accordance with the recommendation and response given.) May 2003—On-going recruitment for DDG R4D. In the meantime the new participatory research management arrangement (RMA) which includes a Research for Development Council (RDC) and a Director R4D is taking hold. This mode of operation is new to the CGIAR. It depends more on collective wisdom. June 2003—In the light of RDC’s effectiveness after one year’s implementation and in view of the evolving program, the Administration proposed and the Board approved replacing the DDG R4D position with another Director R4D. The R4D office will now be staffed by two R4D directors who will share responsibility based on skills and preference.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3. The Panel recommends that IITA develop a concept and approach for yam ideotype breeding with the objective to render production less labor intensive in a systems approach</p>	<p>IITA agrees with the recommendation of the panel because in many yam-growing areas, the most serious constraints to productivity are the high costs of planting material and of labor for field operations like land preparation, planting, staking, weeding and harvesting. Studies in yam physiology and agronomy, currently in progress, are defining plant characteristics that would lead to increased production but reduce labor requirement in yam cultivation. For instance IITA and some NARS partners have demonstrated differential responses of yam genotypes to staking. There is also the potential for dwarfing to obviate the need for staking, as established by the selection of dwarf and semi-dwarf plant types from <i>Dioscorea rotundata</i> (white Guinea yam) populations sent by IITA to CTCRI in India in the 1970s.</p>	<p>May 2002--On-going research continues in accordance with the recommendation and response given. May 2003—On-going in projects A (on breeding per se) and E (on the crop in the WCA cropping system).</p>

	<p>Likewise, hybridization between <i>D. rotundata</i> and <i>D. alata</i> (water yam) could lead to a valuable combination of attributes that would make the product superior to either species. This is because <i>D. alata</i> is superior to <i>D. rotundata</i> in terms of factors such as yield potential (especially under low to average soil fertility), ease of propagation (production of bulbils and reliability of sprouting), early vigor for weed suppression, and storability of tubers. Efforts will continue towards the production of viable hybrids between these two major species.</p>	
<p><u>Recommendation 4.</u> The panel recommends that IITA initiate in the framework of CORAF/WECARD, a regional scientists' forum on the development and use of genetically modified crops, which gives NARS scientists a sense of co-ownership in transgenics research and might serve as the nucleus for a future network.</p>	<p>IITA agrees with this recommendation, including the possibility of extending the initiative beyond the CORAF/WECARD region/ membership. IITA has been engaged in such activities since the 1990s. IITA organized three workshops for Nigerian scientists who were to form the core staff to implement the biosafety guidelines for the country. These workshops took place in 1993, 1994, and 1999. The 1994 workshop used the Nigerian Biosafety Guidelines, which IITA helped to draft as a working document. This year IITA is planning a workshop on biosafety for scientists and other stakeholders from some West African countries with funding provided by The Gatsby Charitable Foundation. In addition, a USAID funded workshop will be held at IITA from 28 to 31 May 2001 between Nigerian, Ghanaian and IITA biotechnologists to strengthen research collaboration among the participants and with partners in USDA and US Universities. Biosafety issues will be included in the discussion at this workshop. Moreover, the Global Biodiversity Institute (USA) and IITA conducted in March 2001 a one-month course on biodiversity, biotechnology and law for 40 participants (scientists, lawyers and policy makers) from 9 sub-Saharan African countries. The Institute is concerned about the slow progress in the implementation of biosafety guidelines in countries in SSA.</p>	<p>May 2002--Further to the actions taken, as indicated in the IITA response, IITA successfully organized a biosafety workshop in January 2002 (with funds provided by Gatsby Charitable Foundation) and resource staff from UNIDO, US Univ., USAID, USDA and ISNAR. Currently a CORAF/WECARD-IITA Visiting Scientist (Prof. Dr. Walter Alhassan, former Director General of CSIR, Ghana) works together with relevant IITA colleagues on a USAID-funded project that aims to assess the status and needs of agro-biotechnology in West and Central Africa. This 5-month project, which includes links with US Univ. partners at Michigan State Univ. and Purdue Univ., will assist CORAF/WECARD, IITA and donors to direct their investments in agro-biotechnology for agric. development in the sub region, in which assisting in developing biosafety frameworks and creating science-led public awareness about GMO and transgenic plants for food and agriculture, will be priority among non-research issues. USAID RFP for ABSP2-biosafety also offers another option for enhancing the work of IITA and partners in SSA (particularly in the domains on CORAF/WECARD and ASARECA). IITA are in the process of discussing participation in proposals that are being written for the ABSP2 RFPs.</p> <p>May 2003—New Postdoc in biotechnology will deal significantly with building biosafety capacity in SSA, particularly Nigeria, through the USAID-funded Nigerian Biotechnology Program (NBP) which is Nigeria-driven with IITA as implementing agency. Significant public awareness ongoing and a module in the NBP. Ongoing risk assessment and gene flow research in cowpea in partnership with African institutes and advanced research institutes.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 5.</u> The Panel recommends that IITA develop clear priorities for crop improvement research, structured and justified</p>	<p>IITA acknowledges this recommendation. Priorities for crop improvement research, have been established based on expressed needs of partners (NARS, SROs, NGOs, farmers and other end-users) after due consultation in several fora (network/collaborative meetings, symposia, workshops, farmer field days) as well as baseline studies for some crops in target environments, e.g. COSCA. Additional regional objectives from</p>	<p>May 2002--Following the EPMR and prior to the WPW held in December 2001 an internal Task Force on Priority setting was established and the need to strengthen formal priority setting mechanisms was brought to the attention of all IITA researchers. During this WPW protocols for priority setting were discussed and used for establishing priority outputs and activities within the new six</p>

<p>on the basis of relevance to the target environments and users, the Institute's comparative advantage, and the prospects for achieving impact.</p>	<p>SROs were included based on the market and end-user demands such as high protein, micronutrients, nutritional qualities and other post-harvest characteristics. The relative distribution of the Institute's research capacity over each of the six mandate crops is largely a reflection of the economic importance of these crops in sub-Saharan Africa. With emerging needs of the ecoregional and agro-ecozone orientation of research at IITA, prioritization will be further refined, particularly for selection of the most appropriate biotech approaches for crop improvement in sub-Saharan Africa.</p>	<p>projects. Additionally, and using GIS and breeders' perspectives in agro-ecozones and traits for each crop, a committee was set-up to start rationalizing breeding sites, particularly in Nigeria. IITA is also examining the quality of data held at IFPRI for use in more substantive analytical work on regional status, which would lead to better priority setting.</p> <p>May 2003--IFPRI, IITA and ILRI working together in setting priority tools through USAID-funded IEHA. Also RDC and project C dealing with this matter periodically. An important issue on priority setting is the quality of database and other information on which setting priorities rely. The joint IFPRI/ILRI/IITA work within the IEHA framework tries to address this important point. Likewise, IITA has been engaged in setting priorities at the national or regional level within Nigeria through a special project on policy. For example, the APAN (Assessment of Nigerian Agricultural Policy) or NDDC (Niger Delta Development Commission) strategy. For more information see update on recommendation 1.</p>
<p>Recommendation 6. The Panel is concerned that productivity in PHMD appears to be declining. The Panel recommends that IITA assess the research output of all IRS and NRS to help maintain PHMD's worldwide reputation in biological control and IPM.</p>	<p>IITA is also concerned about a gradual decline in scientific output as measured by the number of peer-reviewed journal articles produced by the Plant Health Management Division. To some extent, the decline in the number of peer-reviewed publications per scientist is explained by the fact that departing principal staff had a long career of scientific publishing, often on laboratory or process studies. The institute is also concerned that the success in biological control of cassava green mite has been largely undocumented and shall take appropriate action. The shift towards long-term field and impact studies inherent in maturing projects and recommended by the previous EPMP naturally led to a reduced frequency of publications. IITA recognizes that some scientists who are involved in special projects concerning implementation over several countries have not published in peer-reviewed journals. Their impact has been in writing training manuals or monographs, or in giving training courses or bench training to national staff. Notwithstanding this commendable effort, we are urging them to present the process and impact of technology transfer in appropriate journals and to integrate the corresponding literature on farmers' participatory research and similar topics.</p>	<p>May 2002--With further declining staffing levels and all remaining staff desperately writing up proposals, it is not easy to reverse the trend described by the EPMP. Since last April, PHMD has produced a series of manuscripts (approximately 80) for peer-reviewed journals. Some have appeared, some are in press, and some have been submitted. Many titles were produced by departing staff, as described by the EPMP; but others were written by established scientists. Two new core scientists have not yet had any possibility to publish results from their new assignments. The criticism concerning the cassava green mite project is addressed by a host of publications coming out from recently completed PhD studies.</p> <p>May 2003--PHMD and other research divisions were integrated into a single R4D management unit on 10th June 2002. New scientists have been recruited and publications are in the pipeline. Meanwhile a book by existing and former staff on Biological Control in IPM Systems in Africa (Neuenschwander, P.C. Borgemeister and J. Langewald (eds), CABI Publishing, Wallingford is in press.</p>
<p>Recommendation 7. The panel recommends that RCMD develop a clear business plan for each of its project components; identifying clear outputs by expected time lines that</p>	<p>IITA accepts the tenor of this recommendation but notes that detailed log frames with outputs, milestones and means of verification are available for projects 11 – 14, as is the case for all the projects carried out by the Institute. These are reviewed annually and upgraded in preparation for work planning week at IITA. The Institute acknowledges that peer reviewed publications detailing the methods and concepts on the benchmark approach have been somewhat lacking in the past; however, just such a publication is proposed for presentation at the next CGIAR</p>	<p>May 2002 --IITA and RCMD have taken account of the comments of the EPMP and those of the BOT noted below in the design of the revised project portfolio, particularly those projects aimed to address priority research for development needs in the major agro-ecologies served by IITA. "Trustees saw very little interest among donors for funding research and considered how a research institute such as IITA might position itself to attract funds that were primarily intended for</p>

<p>are substantiated by peer-reviewed publications; and particularly with respect to the concepts and methodologies of the benchmark approach.</p>	<p>INRM annual conference at CIAT in August 2001 and will be subsequently published in a suitable peer reviewed journal. More emphasis will be placed on this aspect of publication in the future. In addition, further efforts to associate project outputs with peer reviewed publications will continue the trend established after 1999 following the CCER which led to the establishment of the current projects 11-14.</p>	<p>agricultural development. They saw the agroecological zones as a powerful tool to attract donors interested in the lower end of the research to development continuum. IITA had to be able to convince donors that through its partners working in development, IITA's technologies were flowing through to the end users. It was therefore critical that the benchmarks became operational in terms of technological development to be used as platforms to demonstrate IITA's position in the development continuum" May 2003-- The MTP 2003-2005 includes agro-ecozone projects (D, E, F) in which clear business plans with objectives, outputs and milestones for each are provided. Publications on the bench mark approach are becoming available, including a monograph in IITA Impact Series.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8: The panel recommends that RCMD lead a concerted effort to fully understand the driving forces, extent, rates, and types of cropping system intensification in the major AEZs of West and Central Africa (wet and dry savannas and humid forest), using innovative approaches and appropriate partnerships.</p>	<p>IITA accepts that understanding the major driving forces behind cropping system intensification allows not only prediction of problems that will occur during the intensification process, but also insight into potential solutions. These concepts were developed in the early 1990s and published in the mid 1990s by Smith, Weber and Manyong and incorporated into the theory underpinning the size of benchmark areas, i.e. large enough to contain gradients in intensification as well as different driving forces such as population and market access. IITA concurs with the need to analyze the data that have been collected in 5 EPHTA benchmark areas and will therefore step up the analytical effort, particularly with regard to how the driving forces are impacting on the adoption of IITA technologies.</p>	<p>May 2002--Data collected in the humid forest in Cameroon, degraded forest in Eastern Nigeria, derived savanna in Benin and the northern Guinea savanna benchmark sites in Nigeria have been analyzed and will soon be submitted for publication in referred journals. Research activities, particularly with regard to how the driving forces behind cropping system intensification are impacting on the adoption of IITA technologies are being implemented in the new systems project in the dry and moist savanna and in the humid forest. One of the outputs of these projects is the identification of key drivers of intensification to formulate, target and priorities researchable issues to respond to stakeholders' needs. Activities on this output are being implemented in 2002. May 2003—Ongoing in Projects E and F</p>
<p>Recommendation 9: The panel recommends that research capacity in the social sciences at IITA be strengthened, through two actions: appointing an eminent agricultural economist to provide leadership and cohesion to the socio-economic research activities; and ensuring representation of a senior economist on the RPEC</p>	<p>An additional social scientist IRS position added to RCMD project 14 team would be welcomed by IITA particularly a scientist with experience in policy, agricultural economics and other issues. However, IITA needs to treat this recommendation pragmatically, as the availability of such senior candidates with the willingness to be based in West Africa is very limited. In addition, IITA is pleased to note the recent stronger leadership and cohesion in social sciences resulting from the re-organization of Project 14, and its complementary alignment with projects 11-13 since the 1999 CCER. Representation of a senior social scientist on the RPEC is in theory desirable but would be dependent on the outcome of current IITA restructuring at senior management level.</p>	<p>May 2002—Reorganization of the former 14 into 6 projects brings stronger leadership and cohesion in social sciences. Impact, Policy and Systems Analysis is one of the projects and this cuts across all IITA projects. IITA social scientists met in February 2002 and (i) examined the state-of-the-art and shared experiences in social science research at IITA, (ii) developed strategies to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and relevance of social science research to IITA's clients and (iii) fostered better interaction with other researchers within IITA. Ongoing RMA discussions include consideration for increased social science capacity at IITA. May 2003—An economist was elected by his IRS R4D peers to the Research Development Council (RDC). Young social scientists are under recruitment through postdoctoral fellowships and APO/JPO appointments which will enhance capacity of the Institute through project C as their housing as well as in others.</p>

<p>Recommendation 10: The panel recommends greater emphasis on the development of geo-spatial analysis capabilities within IITA coordinated with other ongoing programmes in the CGIAR System and with appropriate ARIs.</p>	<p>IITA fully endorses an increased emphasis on geo-spatial analysis capabilities and has been retooling capacity since late 2000. IITA will upgrade the current core post-doc GIS specialist position to that of full international staff level. IITA has joined the CGIAR Consortium for Spatial Information in 2001 and is developing closer GIS links with WARDA and ICRISAT in West Africa in particular. It also has further plans to cement it's continued linkage with ARIs, in particular Yale University Centre for Earth Observation (for remote sensing) and Mud Springs Geographers Inc., the Regional Center for Training in GIS and Remote Sensing (RECTAS) in west Africa at Ife, Nigeria and with the United States Geological Survey (for GIS data). GIS work is expanding at village and benchmark level through existing CGIAR Alternatives to Slash and Burn Agriculture Consortium partners. IITA will also seek other ARI partnerships where appropriate in the future.</p>	<p>May 2002--IITA intends to upgrade the current core post-doc GIS specialist position to that of full international staff level in October 2002. Data exchange within the CGIAR Consortium for Spatial Information is going on and closer GIS links with WARDA and ICRISAT in particular have been established. Through CSI a research proposal on poverty mapping for Nigeria has been accepted in principal and initial activities have been implemented. Linkages continue with ARIs, in particular with Yale University Centre for Earth Observation, Mudsprings Geographers Inc., the Regional Center for Training in GIS and Remote Sensing (RECTAS). The Yale-IITA CERA project is in its final year. Remote sensing, GIS and modeling work continues to be expanding at village and benchmark level through the CGIAR's Alternatives to Slash and Burn programmed.</p> <p>May 2003—GIS included in new Geo-Spatial lab, which includes biometrics, Research Database Management System(RDBMS) weather stations and modeling. A Senior IRS leads this lab since April 2003.</p>
<p>Research Support Recommendation 11. The Panel recommends that the Center develop a specific strategy on information dissemination and training, particularly emphasizing mid-career scientist development for researchers from national programs, even at the expense of some postgraduate training.</p>	<p>The institute accepts this recommendation while noting that over the last five years it has implemented a deliberate policy of outsourcing to relevant NARS the organization of most group training courses.</p>	<p>May 2002--Some reorganization of information services and training is currently taking place. The new Head of Communications and Information Services now reports directly to the Director General's Office while the responsibility for initiating training now lies within the research divisions with logistical support from a training office. Greater emphasis is currently placed on individual degree and non-degree training. Most group training continues to be outsourced to NARS and conducted in collaboration with the many networks. Information dissemination vehicles have been deliberately broadened in order to address key specific audiences, e.g. the striga video for donors and the pictorial series of anti-Striga interventions for farmers. Mid-career training has been a current feature of the Rural Sector Enhancement Program (RUSEP) project, e.g. courses for Ministry/ADP colleagues in Nigeria on Market Information Systems. This recommendation is also being proposed in more long-term CG center integration discussion.</p> <p>May 2003—On going . Examples are hands-on training of NARS in biotechnology labs. This kind of capacity building embedded into special projects and therefore former training unit now included under newly created Contracts & Grants Office.</p>
<p>Recommendation 12. The Panel recommends that IITA act now to fully implement its new IPR policy, namely:</p>	<p>IITA accepts the recommendation to fully implement the new Board approved (May 2001) IPR policy and to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue to check that it has freedom to operate in its present operations, • make any necessary modifications to its Research Database Management System (RDBMS), with advice from the CGIAR Central 	<p>May 2002-- After the EPMR, and BOT meeting of May 2001, IITA issued electronically and in printed form the BOT-approved IPR policy. During WPW in December 2001, a special session was dedicated to discuss this policy with all IITA researchers and managers (plus some research support staff). IITA participated in a CGIAR meeting to discuss the FAO-sponsored</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that it has freedom to operate (FTO) in its present operations • Put in place an infrastructure to ensure that all future IP issues be monitored and databased. • Ensure that IITA’s IP policies effectively cover its designated germplasm, breeding products, publications, databases, trademarks and proprietary technologies. <p>Periodically review the IPR policy in the light of evolving international regulations and conventions.</p>	<p>Advisory Service (CAS), to ensure that information on IITA generated intellectual property is properly stored</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that the IITA policies do effectively cover all of IITA's intellectual properties, • keep under periodic review the IPR Policy in light of changes in IITA's operating environment. 	<p>International Treaty (IT) on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The implications of this IT on IITA IPR policy will be discussed as a separate agenda item in the next meeting of the BOT of IITA.</p> <p>May 2003—Director R4D follows up with relevant IITA and CGIAR colleagues (through SWP such as SGRP or CAS) on IPR issues. IPR policy booklet updated as 2nd edition to include changes (Interim MTA for Gene Bank accessions held under agreement with FAO) ensuing from new international treaty. Subject was also included in the Executive Committee of the IITA Board with technical backstopping from IITA for this agenda item.</p>
<p>Private Sector Recommendation 13. The panel recommends that IITA work more closely with IFDC, IFPRI and other international partners to achieve a better understanding of constraints to adoption and performance of its improved varieties, with particular consideration given to agricultural input sector of Nigeria and other countries</p>	<p>IITA is already working closely with IFDC as co-members of the CGIAR Systems –wide Initiative on Soil Water and Nutrient Management (coordinated by CIAT), as part of the “Best Bets” group working in the dry savannas of Nigeria, Niger and Mali funded by the Systems -wide Livestock Program (coordinated by ILRI) and in the specific case of seed and inputs has recently collaborated with IFDC and WARDA in preparing a review of the constraints in the agricultural input sector in Nigeria “Agricultural Input Markets in Nigeria: An Assessment and a Strategy for Development”. 2000, IFDC, Muscle Shoals, Alabama. This has led to a major funding proposal to USAID “Management of Agricultural Inputs” project in which IFDC and IITA are the major partners and IITA has responsibility for the outputs concerning the seed industry</p>	<p>May 2002--The IFDC/IITA project, “Developing Agricultural Input Markets in Nigeria” is now in progress with IITA’s specific task being an analysis of the formal and informal seed sectors. The IITA/Winrock/FMA&RD RUSEP project is midway through its preparatory participatory phase and a following 5-year phase is likely to be forthcoming. Adoption of IITA improved maize, soybean, cowpea and cassava is one of the key demands of Nigerian stakeholders to spark rural development. A core -funded study has been initiated to quantify the uptake of IITA improved soybean, cowpea and maize varieties in the NGS in Nigeria using a new georeferenced assessment technique.</p> <p>Informal discussions have been initiated with IFPRI with the intention of exploring how the two Centers can work more closely in SSA, with particular emphasis on greater commercialization of food crops through collaboration with the private sector. See also recommendation No. 5.</p> <p>May 2003—Ongoing through special projects such as RUSEP and soon to start IEHA may include in its agenda.</p>

<p>Board of Trustees Recommendation 14. The Panel recommends that the Board carry out a programme of Board reform that includes, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • returning to two meetings a year of the full Board • reducing the number of members on the Board of Trustees, including the number of host country members • defining the term of office of the Board Chair 	<p>The Board was pleased to read – page 76—“In 2000 the 13 members elected at large provided an appropriate representation of gender, north/south and discipline dimensions,” and page 77, “The Board gives the impression of being willing to carry out its responsibilities and at one level functions at its meeting in an active, engaged manner.”</p> <p>In 1997, the Board conducted a self-assessment using the forms recommended by the CG Secretariat. As a result of this exercise in 1998, the bylaws and board policies and procedures were amended and a Trustees conflict of interest policy was adopted. The Board also decided to assess Board and DG performance in written form every other year. A draft of a Board policy manual specifying governance style, Board/DG linkages and executive limitations was prepared as a result of 2000 Board of Trustees meeting to be discussed and approved at the May meeting in 2001 as proposed at the Executive Committee in February 2001. Further improvements may be introduced after the establishment agreement has been revised and the future of the CGIAR is more clearly defined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board of Trustees had already agreed to meet for a second time in 2001 at the end of November. The Panel’s recommendation confirms the need for this and is accepted by the Board. It will contribute to inclusiveness in the Board • The Board recognized that a smaller Board would further enhance inclusiveness and help to mitigate the costs of reverting to two Board meetings a year. It agrees that in the context of a smaller Board, a reduction in the number of host-country members would have to be considered. Against the reduction is the complexity of IITA’s mandate, the disciplinary diversity of its staff and the variety of its activities along the research continuum. There is no guarantee that absentees would reduce and this might penalize the ability of a smaller Board to have a properly rounded discussion on some issues. • The term of office of the Board Chair is specified in the By-Laws and Policies and Rules of Procedures of the IITA Board of Trustees, which state, “the Chair and Vice-Chair may not serve for more than three consecutive years.” Extension of the term of the current Chair was a decision taken in the light of the timing of the 5th EPMR and the Search for a new Director General. The Board considered it important for the existing Chair to see such critical Board processes to a successful conclusion. 	<p>May 2002--The Board subsequently decided that in view of the budget situation and staff layoffs to maintain one full meeting a year and 2 Executive Committee meetings with the results being shared with all members of the Board in the form of minutes.</p> <p>May/June 2003—At its June 2003 meeting the Board decided and took steps to reduce the number of board members from 17 to 15/14 over time.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing the time taken at Board meetings for formal execution of its responsibilities • establishing, documenting and committing to ‘best practice’ procedures for the Board and its committees • providing a budget for the Board Chair, and • commissioning a CCER on Board governance approximately one year after the new DG has taken up his or her appointment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board is unclear on the exact meaning of this recommendation. The text of the report and the consultant’s larger report see greater formality in several aspects of the evaluation and performance monitoring (paragraphs 5.1.4 and 5.1.6). It is unclear whether this could or should reduce the time taken at meetings. Clarification is requested. • As mentioned in the preamble, revision of the Board policy manual, revision of practices is in progress. The Board accepts the recommendation. • The Board was unable to find a reference to this recommendation in the text of this report. Nor does it appear in the extended report by the Consultant, either as a recommendation or in the text. In the past the Board has encountered no difficulties in ensuring the funding of specific initiatives, hence it does not see a justification for providing a special budget for the Board Chair in the future. • The Board notes that this recommendation is not consistent with the Panel’s advice (though not a recommendation) in paragraph 3.1.23. i.e., “The Panel also considers that the CCERs should be conducted within two years of the next 5 year review.” 	<p>May 2002-- The 2002 Board took the decision to distinguish between information provision and substantive, strategic issues requiring debate. The former now provides a passive set and only issues arising are brought up for discussion</p> <p>May 2003—A new BOT policy manual to supplement the existing policy and procedures manual committing to best practices was written and adopted by the Board.</p> <p>May 2003—An annual budget for the Board, which includes Board Chair expenses has been allocated and is monitored at each meeting of the Board.</p> <p>May 2003—Action will be taken after the exercise by the Science Council on the future CCERs and their relationship to External Reviews has been concluded.</p>
<p>Human Resources Recommendation 15. The Panel recommends that a single manager oversees the human resource function, reporting to the Director of CSD, and secondly, that there is a greater degree of flexibility in its NRS scientist policies to ensure consistency between the</p>	<p>IITA does not see the benefit of one single manager overseeing the human resource function and cannot find significant arguments for it in the Panel’s report. The two positions require very different skills and experience that are adequately met under the current arrangements. In recent years, the Institute has actively tried to reduce the International Staff in research support, administrative and service functions and replace them by well-qualified national staff. Such staff can only be attracted and maintained by paying salaries comparable to those in the industrial sector around us. The Institute is not in the strict sense employing NRS scientists; these are all classified as research associates. These staff members are encouraged to pursue MSc or Ph.D research. Once they have obtained a Ph.D they are eligible to apply for international positions at IITA or seek employment in their national</p>	<p>May 2002-- The Institute has continued to reduce the number of IRS in administration and service functions. The trend continues with national and regional recruitment of experts to replace them. This program is also linked to internal training.</p> <p>May/June 2003—Human resources for international and national staff has combined and new Human Resources Manager recruited.</p>

<p>administrative and research staff and among the CGIAR Centres operating at one station.</p>	<p>institutions. IITA does not wish to employ two categories of scientists; this is contrary to its recruitment policies, and can lead to significant staff dissatisfaction.</p>	
<p>Finance Recommendation 16. In sum the Panel recommends that the following steps be taken with regard to financial management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • putting in place an effective internal audit function • a comprehensive framework for the installation of the Oracle-based MIS/FIS be put in place • consideration be given to engaging on overseas development officer • adoption of an overhead charge policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps have already been taken to maintain an effective internal audit function. • A steering committee for the installation of the Oracle MIS/FIS has been established; additional resources, financial and human, have also been made available to the project. • The Institute will look into possibilities of how the activities to be undertaken by an Overseas Development Officer can best be fulfilled and in particular in a cost-effective manner. • The Institute in principle charges the overhead percentage calculated on the basis of the latest CGIAR methodology. There are a number of situations where, for a variety of reasons donors do not accept this full percentage, and it is the DG's responsibility to negotiate the best rate, keeping in mind the interest of the research program of IITA. 	<p>May 2002--The Institute, with BOT approval, is currently experimenting with outsourcing the management of the internal audit function with the implementation being carried out by NRS. The effectiveness of this way of handling the internal audit function will be carefully monitored</p> <p>May/June 2003—The Audit Committee of the Board has recommended increasing the number of staff in the unit. Recruitment has commenced.</p> <p>May 2002--With assistance from a team of external consultants, the Oracle MIS/FIS has now been installed and is operational. It is now managed by in-house staff.</p> <p>May 2003—Contracts & Grants Office (C&GO) created in 2002. Two IRS, one in Ibadan and other overseas (through a retainer fee) working in this unit within R4D office. Also large special projects include overseas non-IITA staff who assists through partnerships on resource mobilization (e.g. Sustainable Tree Crops Program). Furthermore mega projects include in budgets the costs of project managers who will assist in resource mobilization and administration of project so researchers can spend more time on their research for development agenda.</p> <p>May 2002—The Institute continues to recover overhead charges calculated on the basis of the agreed to CGIAR methodology. The application of this rate to both pass-through funds and to sister CGIAR centers is currently under debate at the CGIAR level.</p> <p>May 2003—in 2002, overhead recovery went up showing actions taken to ensure full cost recovery on all projects.</p>

<p>Recommendation 17. The Panel recommends that the status and importance of the position of the Head of the External Liaison Office be upgraded, but not to DDG level.</p>	<p>After very careful analysis of the best way to strengthen the relationships with NARS, the Institute decided that this could be done more effectively by integrating the relevant activities to be undertaken into each of the projects. As a result the responsibilities of the External Liaison Office became more focused. It is evident from the Panel's own discussion of IITA's partnership and linkages that this change has been very beneficial. Consequently, the Institute sees the present model as more than adequate to meet its needs.</p>	<p>May 2002-- In a downsizing operation that took place at the end of 2001, the External Liaison Office was closed. All the responsibilities for linkages with NARS partners are now performed from the scientific divisions who are now also responsible for the administration as well as scientific content and the implementation of restricted core projects.</p> <p>May 2003—Under the new IITA organogram the functions of the External Liaison Office are under the Research for Development Office and the two Directors R4D will, together with the Director General are responsible for relationships with NARS, other stakeholders and partners in research for development as well as with public and private investors.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------