Report of the
First External Review of the Systemwide Programme on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM)

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The systemwide Programme on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM) is one of the currently 15 systemwide initiatives of the CGIAR. The purpose of these systemwide programmes in general is to catalyse research, avoid duplication of efforts, enhance complementarity and reduce transaction costs of the overall research process in international agriculture. In this sense systemwide programmes are not simply an addition to the research programmes of the individual centres, but rather are designed to produce "added value" from well planned and targeted interactions among scientists across CGIAR Centres and their ARI and NARS partners. This also applies to the SP-IPM whose focus is on pest problems of large regional and/or global nature.

Relative to the other systemwide programmes, the SP-IPM is unique as IPM concepts and principles are already widely applied in the research and development activities of most International Agricultural Research Centres (IARC) regardless of their mandates. An impact assessment study of IPM in the CGIAR-Centres including AVRDC and ICIPE found that the benefits of IPM were well recognised within these centres and by the scientific community globally (CGIAR 2000). Also, pilot IPM programmes involving CGIAR Centres have shown remarkable economic benefits with the rate of return on investments in IPM being well in line with other investments in international agricultural research. The benefits of IPM are likely underestimated since, in addition to productivity enhancement and risk reducing effects, there are large non-market benefits in the area of human health and the environment. What then is the rationale of a systemwide programme on IPM? The answer is clearly that the constraints and challenges IPM faces on a regional and global scale cannot be met by individual researchers nor by individual centres. To meet these challenges a co-ordinated effort is necessary to address two key issues: (1) the need to develop control strategies and tactics for pests (often man-induced) with a regional or global dimension; and (2) the need to create a policy environment that favours the adoption of IPM methods on a global scale.

As conclusions of its findings, the Panel offers five major recommendations:

1) The Panel recommends that in view of the global challenges from pests and pest management issues there exists a strong need and a high relevance for SP-IPM in the future. In view of the changes that the CGIAR is currently undergoing, the Panel views advancements in the internal coherence of the CGIAR research portfolio as an important pre-condition for SP-IPM to perform its role effectively. The Panel recommends that in order to be successful in the future SP-IPM should go beyond its present focus of improving co-operation among centres and should widen its scope and take a more outward-looking approach in seeking international assistance and co-operation.

2) The Panel recommends that SP-IPM should more thoroughly analyse its taskforces with regards to scope and extended problem definition in order to expand their potential global relevance. In order to carry out this task the Panel sees a strong need for an independent and strong global research network on IPM and recommends that the CGIAR make the SP-IPM a more visible part of its strategy for achieving its stated objectives.

3) The Panel recommends that in order to make full use of relevant disciplinary expertise, SP-IPM should more seriously explore the complementarity among programmes including different systemwide programmes and relevant Centres not included in the systemwide programme as well as outside research institutes be they advanced NARS or

ARIs. To fully utilise recent advances in computer modelling and GIS that offer new potentials for the transfer of site-specific research results SP-IPM should adopt these concepts as unifying part of its major research strategies.

4) The Panel recommends that socio-economic and policy research be added as a major component of SP-IPM. There are at least three broad themes that deserve to be given more attention if the SP-IPM wants to make relevant and significant contributions to international agricultural developments, namely (1) economically defined crop loss assessment, (2) policy research in response to national crop protection policies and international trade issues, i.e. IPM and globalisation, and (3) impact assessment that incorporates natural resource management aspects into social science research.

5) The SP-IPM Review Panel recommends that the status of IPM be greatly elevated within the CGIAR and to be upgraded beyond the focus of the current systemwide programme. That SP-IPM in the future should be organised as a "virtual Centre" with minimal infrastructure but maximum linkages. The Panel views this as the best way to develop a global structure that has a fair chance to overcome the problem of rising crop losses from pests and the growing level of pesticide use world-wide. The co-ordinator position should serve as a liaison and "honest broker" between the centres and other IARCs, donors, development organisations and the GIPMF on IPM issues. The co-ordinator position should be at the level of a Centre Director. Funding for the SP-IPM programme co-ordinator position should come from CGIAR core funds. The Panel recommends to establish the virtual IPM Centre either directly under TAC/SC or alternatively with any other research organisation of international status in IPM to be determined through an open bidding process and to be coupled contractually to the CGIAR.

REVIEW OF THE CGIAR SYSTEM-WIDE PROGRAMME ON INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT (SP-IPM): A JOINT RESPONSE FROM IITA AND THE SP-IPM STEERING COMMITTEE

GENERAL COMMENTS

We have read and circulated the SP-IPM review report and consulted with members of the Inter Centre Working Group (ICWG/Steering Committee) of the SP-IPM to prepare this response. The response represents the common view of the convening Centre, IITA, and the ICWG. We express our appreciation to the reviewers for highlighting the good progress made by the programme, providing advisory comments on IPM science and its application, and suggesting an operational and governance mechanism of the programme. The SP-IPM will build upon the encouraging words by the reviewers to address the key issues raised in the report. Many of the details of the report are clearly reflective of the scientific backgrounds, interests and particular experiences of the two reviewers, the future growth of the SP-IPM will certainly benefit from their experiences. The operational shortcomings noted in the report are probably best viewed in framework of the proven ability of the SP-IPM to reorganize itself. The recommendations are stimulating and challenging, albeit with some factual errors, and will guide the discussions on the best way to up-grade the programme and sustain a quality and cost-effective delivery system.

Certainly, many of the reviewers' suggestions on the future of SP-IPM go well beyond SP-IPM alone and, we look forward to feed back from the iSC on some of these issues. For example, we view the proposed concept of an "IPM virtual Centre" as alternative to the Challenge Programme approach, for which SP-IPM partners had recently submitted a concept note and pre-proposal for consideration. It is also important to stress that the body of the report acknowledges that the SP-IPM was established by the CGIAR as a mechanism to coordinate its own IPM research and outreach activities in partnership with other IARCs, ARIs, specialized global IPM implementation agencies, and sub-regional/national agricultural development programmes. The CGIAR provides the resources, has the institutional and technical capacity, proven ability, and appropriate linkages to coordinate collaborative partnerships required to meet the challenges in a far more effective, comprehensive and committed manner than would a "virtual Centre". It also makes excellent and cost saving sense to work within the institutional settings offered by memoranda of understanding between the Centres and governments/inter-governmental bodies than to initiate a "virtual Centre" at extra time and budgetary costs.

The reviewers wrongly believe that IITA profiteered through research gains on the SP-IPM and cite examples to partly justify their conviction that IITA has compromised its neutrality as a convening Centre of the programme. This conclusion is partly based on factual errors in the report. IITA remains an active partner in SP-IPM and has profited mainly by openly sharing information and technical resources to improve the quality of the programme and timely delivery of products and services. Similarly, other partners have profited by working together to achieve the SP-IPM goal through better collaboration.

In terms of upgrading the programme, we agree with the reviewers that the coordinator's position be paid by CGIAR funds and not from the special donor contributions as is presently the case.

We also advocate a professional reward system that fully recognizes valuable contribution of task force leaders/members/scientists.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Annexes 1 - 4 accompany the following responses to specific recommendations in order to correct some factual errors in the report about the structure of the SP-IPM task forces, projects and pilot site initiatives.

Recommendation 1

The Panel recommends that in view of the global challenges from pests and pest management issues there exists a strong need and a high relevance for SP-IPM in the future. In view of the changes that the CGIAR is currently undergoing, the Panel views advancements in the internal coherence of the CGIAR research portfolio as an important pre-condition for SP-IPM to perform its role effectively. The Panel recommends that in order to be successful in the future SP-IPM should go beyond its present focus of improving co-operation among Centres and should widen its scope and take a more outward-looking approach in seeking international assistance and co-operation.

Response

We fully agree with the panel that the overriding challenge for the SP-IPM partners is to continue to develop pest control strategies/tactics and to undertake consultative activities to influence the policy environment that favours IPM adoption. The SP-IPM would, however, not want to globalise the challenges at the expense of marginalizing the location-specific nature of IPM, especially as experienced by resource-limited farming communities and national organisations.

The SP-IPM, at its inception in 1996, realized that the CG Centres couldn't do the job in isolation. At the time of the review, the programme already had a relatively impressive spread of partners. The ICWG list (Annex 1), for example, includes 10 CG Centres, 3 other IARCs, the FAO Global IPM Facility, the Pesticide Action Network (PAN, representing NGOs), the Global Crop Protection Federation (a private crop protection industry), and the re-emerging IPM Forum (for information dissemination). Many of these groups are also key partners to plan and execute joint activities in collaboration with at least 30 national programmes (research, extension services and NGOs) and associated farming communities in the developing world. The need to broaden partnership is further met by the programme's de-facto membership on the Governing Board of the International Association for the Plant Protection Sciences (IAPPS), the independent umbrella organization established at the 14th International Plant Protection Congress (IPPC, in Jerusalem, July 1999) to address important work on international plant protection problems/questions, and plan the IPPCs. Based on need, special projects of the SP-IPM attract a wide range of ARIs, e.g., the primary partners on the whitefly project include 10 ARIs from Australia, Denmark, Germany, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The mechanism to attract and collaborate with other key players exists.

The SP-IPM will build on these kinds of collaborative linkages and networking to further increase its visibility outside CG research circles, and encourage activities to gradually break down "exclusivity" walls that may surround some individual partners.

Recommendation 2

The Panel recommends that SP-IPM should more thoroughly analyse its taskforces with regards to scope and extended problem definition in order to expand their potential global relevance. In order to carry out this task the Panel sees a strong need for an independent and strong global research network on IPM and recommends that the CGIAR make the SP-IPM a more visible part of its strategy for achieving its stated objectives.

Response

We are in full agreement with the panel on the need to re-organize our task forces (Annex 2), especially to move the task forces away from fund seeking for special projects (as their major activities) to more proactive assistance to decision-making processes by national and inter-governmental on plant protection issues of common/growing concern. Some of the SP-IPM shortcomings cited by the reviewers can be traced to the failure to attract funds for crucial task forces covering cornerstone IPM topics, not linked with direct requests by our clients for solving specific pest problems. In an atmosphere of very weak core SP-IPM funding level, these task forces easily "disappear". The long-term value of the programme would probably lie in the capacity of re-structured task forces to provide credible and objectively verifiable information on candidate problems/issues such as crop loss and IPM impact assessment methods, insecticidal transgenic crops, beneficial micro organisms, alien invasive species, novel IPM research and extension methodologies, PQ protocol, and national institutional environments to integrate IPM in mainstream agriculture. Additionally, the task forces would encourage sub-regional collaborative research for technology development, and minimize "more of the same" research to reduce farmers' dependence on unsustainable plant protection options.

The SP-IPM will re-organize the multi-institutional task forces to include national programmes, universities, and international specialist organizations and other similar key stakeholders with keen interest in IPM. The SP-IPM is obviously well placed to play the role of a "…strong global research network on IPM…", and we fully endorse the reviewers recommendation for the CGIAR to "…make the SP-IPM a more visible part of its strategy for achieving its stated objectives", and thereby further strengthen the foundation for leaving a legacy of ideas, processes and results.

Recommendation 3

The Panel recommends that in order to make full use of relevant disciplinary expertise, SP-IPM should more seriously explore the complementarity among programmes including different systemwide programmes and relevant Centres not included in the systemwide programme as well as outside research institutes be they advanced NARS or ARIs. To fully utilise recent advances in computer modelling and GIS that offer new potentials for the transfer of site-specific research results SP-IPM should adopt these concepts as unifying part of its major research strategies.

Response

We agree that the combination of simulation modeling and GIS techniques offers hitherto little explored opportunities to integrate local results, thus allowing researchers to see the big picture and to communicate this to a wider audience. Partnerships between CGIAR Centres and ARIs already exist and should be strengthened to tackle specific problems that escape a solution through traditional, agronomy-type studies. We would, however, like to express caution on over expectations from modeling in IPM, as it can be difficult to attribute a practical success due to modeling. While we consider GIS techniques extremely useful, their exploitation would need more investment in extension and farmer training to guarantee monitoring and assessment of pest incidence and severity. This would generate the 'ground truthing' information, without which maps generated from satellite images are of limited use for other communities. This will also be in line with the Agenda 21 objective to "put IPM practices within the reach of farmers". The task force on farmer participatory research can explore communication media and systems, additional to existing models on participatory learning in IPM, to promote the efforts to reach a large number of farmers simultaneously.

Recommendation 4

The Panel recommends that socio-economic and policy research be added as a major component of SP-IPM. There are at least three broad themes that deserve to be given more attention if the SP-IPM wants to make relevant and significant contributions to international agricultural developments, namely (1) economically defined crop loss assessment, (2) policy research in response to national crop protection policies and international trade issues, i.e. IPM and globalisation and (3) impact assessment that incorporates natural resource management aspects into social science research.

Response

We agree with the panel's recommendation to engage in IPM policy and social research. The SP-IPM is exploring collaborative linkages with the IAPPS to undertake consultative dialogue with national governments and multi-stakeholder groups to develop/revise national plant protection plans with appropriate strategies and legislative policies to secure high and stable yields and increase user compliance of the protocols. The SP-IPM expects that the activities will emphasize the "do good" aspects of IPM, and not simply re-focus attention on the "do no harm/pesticide control" aspects. The programme also expects to conduct the activities within the framework of agricultural development policies (where these exist) to create excellent opportunities for a holistic research approach on social and policy issues in food security demands. Some concerns to address would include a regulatory framework for the production, marketing, distribution and use of inorganic pesticides, biopesticides and insecticidal transgenic crops, institutional capacity and sustainability for research and education to evaluate pest problems, generate alternatives to unsustainable products/practices and enhance farm-level decision making. The World Bank Operational Policy 4.09 (cited by the reviewers; an internal bank document for project appraisal, monitoring and evaluation; under review) forms a background to build upon. In this regard, the key collaborative partners in Sub-Sahara Africa, for example, will include, the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (Yaoundé, Cameroon), the FAO Regional Plant Protection Office (Accra, Ghana), and international IPM development organizations).

Recommendation 5

The SP-IPM Review Panel recommends that the status of IPM be greatly elevated within the CGIAR and to be upgraded beyond the focus of the current systemwide

programme. That SP-IPM in the future should be organised as a "virtual Centre" with minimal infrastructure but maximum linkages. The Panel views this as the best way to develop a global structure that has a fair chance to overcome the problem of rising crop losses from pests and the growing level of pesticide use world-wide. The co-ordinator position should serve as a liaison and "honest broker" between the Centres and other IARCs, donors, development organisations and the GIPMF on IPM issues. The co-ordinator position should be at the level of a Centre Director. Funding for the SP-IPM programme co-ordinator position should come from CGIAR core funds. The Panel recommends to establish the virtual IPM Centre either directly under TAC/SC or alternatively with any other research organisation of international status in IPM to be determined through an open bidding process and to be coupled contractually to the CGIAR.

Response

We agree that the status of the SP-IPM needs to be elevated within the CGIAR, but not with the rest of recommendation #5 for a number of reasons:

a) The SP-IPM currently has impressive membership and professional linkages; the CG/IARCs and other international partners have memoranda of understanding with national governments and inter-governmental bodies. It makes far better sense to work within these institutional settings, at no cost to the SP-IPM, than to initiate a “virtual Centre” that may have to rediscover this wheel, and at extra time and budgetary costs.

b) The SP-IPM was established by the CGIAR as a mechanism to coordinate its own IPM research and outreach activities within the framework of its mission. The body of the reviewers report does not dispute the fact that the CGIAR provides the resources, has the institutional and technical capacity, proven ability, and appropriate linkages to coordinate collaborative partnerships required to meet these kinds of challenges. It is doubtful that an independent/“virtual Centre”, removed from the centres and from the daily challenge by local, rural and political problems, would be able to contribute effectively to the CGIAR mission to alleviate poverty. What the SP-IPM does is to harness plurality of IPM interests to serve its clients.

c) The reviewers believe that IITA profiteered through research gains on the Africa cassava mosaic disease (ACMD), Striga (parasitic weed) and stemborers, and cite these examples to partly justify the conviction that IITA has compromised its neutrality as a convening Centre of the programme and is now unsuitable to host the programme. However, the facts are very much to the contrary. The prior and on-going ACMD work by IITA in Africa added significant value to the SP-IPM global project on whiteflies and whitefly transmitted viruses (Annex 3) in many ways, e.g., existing NARS networks, IITA core research activities in East/Central Africa, funded special projects with trained national field staff. On Striga, the parasitic plant task force never got funded, but IITA went ahead and did much of the work with its own core scientist, in the spirit of the task force. Presently, the SP-IPM lead Centre for Striga/parasitic flowering plants is ICRISAT and not IITA. The only ongoing work on Striga/parasitic flowering plants is limited to the SP-IPM pilot sites initiatives with ICIPE (Western Kenya), IITA, (Northern Nigeria) and ICRISAT (Mali and Burkina Faso) and ICARDA (Egypt and Morocco). The SP-IPM Coordinator plays a facilitation role in this initiative (which is not a task force). Furthermore, the only SP-IPM stemborer work is at the ICIPE pilot site. The reviewers erroneously equate the pilot sites initiative with the task force on parasitic flowering plants. The pilot sites were funded under a different mechanism

specifically to promote the adoption of 'best bet IPM options' in cereal/legume intercrops with entry points Striga and/or stemborers, in Africa (Annex 4). The evolving pilot site initiative tries to pick up some good ideas from several sources to achieve stronger organizational partnerships, a more inter-disciplinary approach, including social sciences input, participatory methods and impact analysis. In fact, we believe that this pilot site initiative could be a better way forward for the SP-IPM than the existing task forces. We hope to expand/duplicate this concept around other pest problems and with other centres, collaborators, and countries (see also response to recommendation 2). In fact, the stimulating interplay between core activities of the centres and their SP-IPM contributions and collaborative activities is the basis of SP-IPM.

d) The ICWG of the SP-IPM had recently had two opportunities to discuss the management structure, but on both occasions the members did not express any strong desire to move the convening Centre from the CGIAR, and for that matter from IITA. ICIPE had raised the need to rotate the Secretariat and offered to host the Secretariat, but the issue has received no echo from the general membership. A recent suggestion concerns the need to discuss programme management structure, especially should the SP-IPM evolve into a Challenge programme. The ICWG will certainly re-visit the broader issue of SP-IPM management structure at its next annual general meeting in April 2002.

e) The key management issue relates largely to how closely the Programme Leader and Coordinating Secretary interact with each other and with the ICWG to promote activities by task forces, projects and special initiatives. The report indicates that the task of organizing and developing SP-IPM had been unevenly shared between the then Programme Leader and Coordinator/Secretary, with the latter taking on much of the duties. Our current description of a Coordinator is "a facilitator, advocate, consensus builder and day-to-day organizer", these elements of coordination focus mainly on people (building partnerships), things (provision of technical and material resources), processes (facilitation, programmatic issues) and money (budgeting and disbursement). The Programme Leader takes on the other roles of technical linkage with task forces to advise on scientific content, fund raising/donor relations, and CGIAR relations. This is practically the “small team” advocated by the reviewers for the management of the virtual IPM Centre. In short, we think that the presently practised consultative interactions and sharing of roles between the Programme Leader and Coordinator and amongst partners is a better way forward for SP-IPM implementation than new structures, new locations etc.

f) The administrative position of the coordinator of the SP-IPM is the highest position possible in the organigram of the convening Centre, IITA, namely ‘Project Coordinator’. The position is not 'deep within the hierarchy', this phrase, as stated in the report, gives an erroneous impression that the coordinator lacks the freedom to act. In terms of upgrading the programme, we agree with the reviewers that the coordinator’s position be paid by CGIAR funds and not from the special donor contributions as obtains presently. We also advocate a professional reward system that fully recognizes valuable contribution of task force leaders/ members/ scientists. Involving Centre DGs to formerly endorse institutional representatives on the SP-IPM could pave the way for appropriate reward systems (centre-specific) to the scientists.

interim Science Council Commentary on the
First External Review of the
Systemwide Programme on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM)

The interim Science Council (iSC) is pleased to accept the report of the first external review of the SP-IPM which was discussed at TAC 82/iSC in Lima in the presence of Dr. Peter Neuenschwander, SP-IPM Programme Leader and representative of the convening centre. The SP-IPM review panel chair, Dr. Andrew Gutierrez and panel member Dr. Hermann Waibel addressed the group through a teleconference call. The iSC wishes to thank Drs. Gutierrez and Waibel for undertaking this important review.

The iSC received a joint response to the review from IITA, the convening centre, and the SP-IPM Steering Committee. A detailed report of a subsequent inter-centre IPM Working Group meeting in Quito, Ecuador has also been received. The iSC offers the following comments based on all three documents.

The iSC would like to re-iterate the following major points made by the panel and in the subsequent discussion which are timely and deserve highlighting in the context of this review.

- First, IPM is critical to sustainable production systems for human health, economic efficiency and NRM considerations. In its report, the panel has highlighted the increasing importance of IPM with respect to a number of developments worldwide, which are central to the CGIAR mission and strategy.

- Second, a systemwide IPM programme is very important to the enhancement of IPM efforts occurring in most centres. Over the past 10 years the IPM approach has become increasingly 'mainstreamed' within the centres, a very positive development in the Council's view, and one which the SP-IPM has certainly contributed to.

- Third, in view of funding instability and uncertainty, a phenomenon experienced by many if not most of the SWPs, the iSC believes that core CGIAR support is critically needed for the SP-IPM to provide the "glue" to hold together the diverse activities of these highly effective systemwide programmes. This is discussed in more detail below.

The Council would also like to put on record its appreciation to the donors who have steadfastly supported this programme since its initiation in 1995, in particular the governments of Norway and Switzerland and to acknowledge the start-up funding from the CGIAR. There were many other donors that supported individual SP-IPM projects and activities.

The review report itself highlights some of the achievements of the SP-IPM to-date, underscores areas that need improvement and suggests a strategy for upgrading the programme for the future.

The panel has identified a number of positive results emerging from this systemwide programme, the most important of which is the improved communication among IARCs and their partners resulting in strengthened inter-centre cooperation in IPM research. The panel attributes much of this success to the dedication and commitment of the founding SP-IPM coordinator who helped foster good communication and collegiality among scientists from IARCs, ARIs, and NARIs/NGOs. This, in turn, facilitated the process of developing a 'centre without walls', which is now apparent. The iSC believes these early initiatives reflect a commitment and a sincere desire for achieving SP-IPM objectives.

The panel also noted that some individual taskforces (the operational components of the SP-IPM) are operating well and was particularly impressed with the whitefly taskforce, citing this as an example of a model programme to achieve inter-centre leverage in tackling serious global pest problems. The Council concurs with this assessment although it would have liked to see a richer analysis and assessment of the activities, outputs and early impacts of this initiative[1]. Although some outputs from this initiative are identified in the report, e.g., journal publications and book chapters, there are not many due to the limited duration of the project (initiated in 1997) and to the lack of procedures in place which identify the publications as those coming from the SP-IPM initiative. As such, the panel found it difficult to attribute specific research outputs to this or any other taskforce. The iSC recommends that in the future this be clearly designated.

While the report is generally very enthusiastic about IPM in general, there are several areas where improvements in the operation and management of SP-IPM are required. These relate to:

1) the specific objectives of the SP-IPM which only partially reflect the priorities laid out in the guiding principles and strategies adopted by the IARCs, and the lack of a formal mechanism within SP-IPM for setting priorities;
2) insufficient attention to methodological questions;
3) the narrow disciplinary focus and, specifically, the lack of input from economists and other social scientists; and,
4) insufficient dialogue within and beyond the CGIAR--particularly in establishing and strengthening policy dialogue related to IPM.

While the panel attributes some of these shortcomings to the fact that the programme is just beginning and to the specificity of funding (a view confirmed in the joint response), the panel has identified some major issues here as well. To some extent the panel's recommendations address these issues.

The iSC agrees with the spirit of **Recommendation # 1** particularly on the need and relevance of SP-IPM in the future. Given the dimensions of the global pest problems and its likely increasing importance over time, an inter-institutional mechanism must exist to capture the latent complementarities across the various research, extension and developments organizations focusing on IPM. The Council is pleased to note that the SP-IPM intends to build on its existing partnerships and to increase its visibility and interactions outside the CGIAR. This has recently begun with the inclusion of new members to the Working Group

[1] More generally, while the panel did address a number of important issues related to effective implementation of the SP-IPM in the CGIAR, there were specific TOR for this review which the iSC felt the panel had not addressed sufficiently. These are discussed in the Annex to the iSC Commentary.

in their recent meeting. The iSC agrees that greater emphasis should be made for the development of methodologies and cross-cutting science at an inter-centre level and that scientific outputs and other services from SP-IPM should be made available to as a wide a range of clients as possible.

The Council endorses **Recommendations #2, #3 and #4** of the panel. The need to more thoroughly analyse SP-IPM taskforces with respect to the scope and extended problem definition is related to the need for greater focus, systematic priority setting and an appropriate strategy for implementation. The iSC is pleased to note that the SP-IPM has already taken steps to re-organize its taskforces into thematic groups away from fund seeking for special projects to more pro-active assistance in decision-making processes involving wider stakeholder groups, with sunset clauses to ensure continued relevance and viability. The number of individual taskforces within SP-IPM has also been reduced at the inter-centre meeting

The panel emphasised the need for more interaction between SP-IPM and other SWPs and particularly with IFPRI on policy analysis and ISNAR on managing policy change through partner institutions, and, the need for greater expertise and use of GIS and modeling work. On the latter point, there is a need to enhance the technological basis of research and implementation in IPM at IARCs. This ties in to an observation of the panel about the quality of research outputs in the SP-IPM, noting insufficient "research quality enhancement effect" through SP-IPM. While the Council is aware of research spillover benefits within the SP-IPM, e.g., the influence of the whitefly taskforce on approaches used in the other taskforces, it nevertheless urges the SP-IPM to focus more strongly on publishing the results of its work in high quality refereed journals jointly with key participating institutes wherever possible.

The Council agrees that the lack of input from economists in the research design and analysis stages and on broader policy related issues remains one of the weaknesses of the SP-IPM to-date. The panel has identified three specific areas where economists could play a key role in upgrading the capacity of the SP-IPM: in economic crop loss assessments, linked to re-assessing priorities for the programme; in policy analysis (effects of distortions in crop protection policy); and in impact assessment (and methodology development). The Council concurs with the panel's assessment in this area and also emphasizes an equally important need to bring in a stronger social analytical basis to IPM, particularly to address areas such as collective action--so critical to success in IPM.

The iSC agrees with the first part of **Recommendation # 5**, on the need to elevate and enhance IPM in the CGIAR, that it should be a more visible part of its agenda. With respect to the creation of a 'virtual IPM centre' for organizing and managing the SP-IPM for the future, the Council does not support the virtual centre as proposed by the panel. The current SP-IPM members have much of their interaction already in virtual mode and iSC encourages the programme to make more use of all available technology.

The iSC agrees that the SP-IPM programme leader and co-ordinator positions are crucial for the future development of SP-IPM within the CGIAR and its co-operation with non-CGIAR Centres and ARIs. However, given the systemwide nature of this programme and issues related to governance, the iSC recommends maintaining the programme leader and coordinator within the CGIAR system. Indeed, the panel was quite positive about the

previous co-ordinator's ability to make genuine strides toward developing a 'centre without walls' and in fostering good communication and collegiality amongst scientists from the IARCs, ARIs, and NARIs/NGOs. A consideration perhaps overlooked by the panel is the need to work within legal and operational mandates of Centres and their partners if policy changes and field-level implementation and impact are to be achieved.

While the iSC concurs with the panel's view on the need for making the SP-IPM work more effectively across centre mandate boundaries, helping focus systemwide IPM research priorities and facilitating the solution of regional and global pest problems, the panel does not provide compelling evidence that re-structuring alone can do that. If, for example, funding has been and remains the key constraint to more effective system-level research in the SP-IPM, moving the Secretariat outside of the convening centre structure will not make it any more effective. The iSC does not share the panel's view that the SP-IPM had limited visibility and effectiveness as a result of placing the SP-IPM Coordinator's position "deep within hierarchy of the convening centre". While IITA certainly gained from its involvement in SP-IPM, the same should be said of many other collaborators in the programme. Indeed, mutual gain is one of the main purposes of systemwide programmes. Furthermore, the largest effort in this systemwide programme, the whitefly global project, is led by CIAT, and the newly emerged leaf miner project is led by CIP.

With respect to the future management structure of the SP-IPM, the iSC endorses the following structure proposed by the SP-IPM Working Group recently[2]:

- The chair of the SP-IPM Steering Committee would be a DG or DDG of one of the participating CGIAR centres, on a 2-3 year rotating basis;
- The SP-IPM Coordinator position would stay within the participating institutions as long as it remains a systemwide programme;
- Virtual methods and coordination for communication with partners to be used to the optimal extent;
- In order to ensure stability to the SP-IPM, minimum financial support to cover facilitation costs should be provided by the CGIAR on an on-going basis subject to performance review of the systemwide programme;
- The centres accept SP-IPM as a research partner with full partnership status in publications.

The SP-IPM shares several management structural problems with all systemwide programmes. The iSC suggests that budget line items for any CGIAR (core) support be shown as a separate line item in the coordinating centre budget, and that any contribution to the SP-IPM be indicated in the budgets of each participating centre. The systemwide programme coordinator should present an aggregate annual budget and an aggregate rolling workplan as part of the normal MTP process. This would provide not only programme accountability, but greater visibility. And it would greatly enhance effectiveness of programme review and impact assessment.

Notwithstanding some of the constraints and limitations of the programme to-date, it is evident that the SP-IPM has accomplished a number of achievements thus far, chief of which

[2] This should not be taken to mean the iSC endorses such a structure for all systemwide programmes, although some elements here may be relevant for other systemwide programmes.

appears to be the excellent rapport and working interactions amongst members of the SP-IPM. The iSC believes the essential groundwork has been laid for achieving complementarities and synergies amongst partners within this programme. As such, the iSC considers that SP-IPM continues to be an important systemwide programme and needs to be supported to further enhance adoption and use of IPM practices.

Finally, the iSC commends the partners for their rapid and very thorough response at the recent inter-institutional IPM Working Group meeting to a number of the key issues raised.

Annex

iSC Commentary on Additional Items in the Review Terms of Reference

While the panel had addressed a number of major issues in the report, and covered some of the TOR quite adequately, the iSC noted that other specific elements of the TOR for this review were not addressed in enough depth, as discussed below. These are summarised for SP-IPM programme leadership action, and for attention in future reviews.

While the panel has emphasized the need for greater internal coherence of the CGIAR research portfolio as a pre-condition for SP-IPM to perform its role effectively, the question of how effective SP-IPM has been in achieving a more coherent agenda for IPM in the CGIAR is not clearly addressed in the report, nor what has been the added value in scientific terms, over and above what participants would have achieved independently. This, of course, relates to TOR 2.2 (a), which in the Council's view has not been addressed fully.

Further, the panel concludes that SP-IPM has been a useful concept for restructuring pest management research and implementation across the CGIAR. The Council would have liked to see more evidence of this in the report. While agreeing that the SP-IPM is a useful concept, it is not shown clearly enough that the SP-IPM has had a major impact--much less a restructuring effect--on IPM research in the CGIAR System at large. The report does not discuss the extent to which other IPM research being done by CGIAR and non-CGIAR centres has been influenced by or integrated into this programme.

While it is true that the limited time frame of its operation represents a constraint, it must be recognized that the SP-IPM has received funding since 1996 and any lessons that could be learned with respect to constraints in securing funding for a topic that is obviously of high priority would be extremely useful. While the panel mentions a failure to secure adequate funding for various reasons, those reasons are not identified in the report. The convening centre's response also highlights the atmosphere of very weak funding for SP-IPM but without indicating possible reasons why.

The treatment of governance aspects of the programme (TOR #4) and its overall effectiveness with respect to accountability, decision-making, reporting structure, etc., is extremely brief in the report. The iSC is pleased to see, however, that this was a topic addressed in considerable detail at the last inter-centre IPM Working Group meeting which has resulted in a more formal operational and governance structure. The iSC also endorses this new structure.

The analysis of the two taskforce projects, the whitefly and parasitic plant management, were handled quite differently. The whitefly project is treated very briefly, without a description of research activities undertaken, major objectives, critical results, etc. This is unfortunate since it is clearly the most successful of the taskforces and is perhaps in the best position to be documented and from which valuable lessons could be drawn. Even though there was little discussion, the panel considered this a model project. The discussion of the parasitic plant management project is descriptive, presumably because it is still in the early phases of implementation. While there were clearly some positive dimensions to this work, e.g., farmers were actively involved, there were also a number of weaknesses pointed out by the panel, e.g., data insufficient for rigorous analysis (p. 20), management issues (p. 27) that need attention. More generally, for either taskforce, there were no conclusions drawn out on the major benefits from using the SP-IPM concepts compared with other crop protection projects running in the Centres. This would provide the critical evidence for continuing with this concept in the future.