

CCER of the Systemwide Programme on Integrated Pest Management

Jill Lenné and Tim Chancellor

28th March 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The CGIAR Systemwide Program on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM) was initiated in 1995 and is one of seventeen Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs currently in existence. The main aims of the SP-IPM are to *achieve synergies and greater impact in IPM research and implementation, and to ensure that these activities are fully responsive to the needs of IPM practitioners*. The International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA) is the Convening Centre. Initially, the SP-IPM established seventeen Task Forces to examine key issues in pest management. After an EPMP of the SP-IPM (Gutierrez and Waibel, 2002), a new operational and governance structure was put in place and the membership was expanded to include external partners. The working groups were replaced by four priority areas to add value to CG activities. However, this revised system was not fully implemented due to a conflict over the governance and management of the Program. Although this has now been resolved, the level of activity from early 2005 has been low. The IITA Board of Trustees expressed concern about the viability of the SP-IPM and commissioned this Centre Commissioned External Review (CCER) to examine the issues and to make recommendations about the future of the Program.

The objectives of the CCER are to assess the viability of the SP-IPM; to review the governance, management and mechanisms for its implementation; to identify options for future directions and next steps; and to make appropriate recommendations to improve the functioning, viability and productivity of the SP-IPM. The review was carried out through a combination of consultations with stakeholders and an assessment of key documents related to the Program. One member of the review team attended the SP-IPM Steering Committee meeting held in Nairobi on 26-27 February 2007. The team also interacted via email with a member of the EPMP team.

The need for a Systemwide Programme on IPM was assessed with regard to IPM in the global context, IPM in the CGIAR in relation to the System Priorities, the priorities of the SP-IPM, the potential for the SP-IPM to add value to centre IPM activities, potential impact, and support for the SP-IPM.

The team concluded that there is a continuing need for IPM research to address global pest problems. The SP-IPM has made progress towards creating synergies between the IPM work carried out at Centres and to raise the visibility of IPM within the CGIAR system. Nevertheless, there is a continuing strong perception of low visibility that may be partly due to the fact that IPM does not appear explicitly in the five CG System Priorities. However, an examination of the sub-priorities indicates that pest, disease and weed management contributes to several of the general and specific goals. In addition, the System Priorities do offer *new* opportunities for the SP-IPM, particularly through the emphasis given to fruits and vegetables for income generation and improved nutrition.

The four priority areas where it was considered that the Program could add most value were identified as: IPM collective action research; enhancing IPM outcomes and impacts; IPM policy analysis and IPM information and advocacy. The research outputs from these priority areas were intended to be cross-cutting methodologies and technologies that could be utilised by a broad range of end-users. The new priorities

were incorporated into the MTP for 2007-09. However, to date, this MTP has not been fully accepted or operationalised by the SP-IPM. The review team believes that, before additional work is done on the rolling MTP for 2008-2010, further discussion is needed between SP-IPM partners on a future research framework, taking into account the recommendations made by the CCER and EPMR. In particular, the cross-cutting approach adopted in the MTP for 2007-09 offers the best opportunity for adding value to Centre activities and producing IPGs that can be used by other Program stakeholders. At the same time, in order to maintain its relevance, the Program needs to be able to respond to emerging issues to which IPM can make an effective contribution. Currently, the Tropical IPM whitefly project is the main source of cross-cutting outputs that constitute the 2007-09 MTP output indicators. The review team feels that the SP-IPM should develop clear criteria for identifying a limited number of new thematic areas of research in which there is clear added value to the majority of the partners.

There appears to be considerable support for the continuation of the SP-IPM from both within the CGIAR and from external partners. Representatives of CGIAR Centres and other organisations highlighted the benefits they gained from the exchange of information and ideas and networking with other members. In addition, The Meta-Review of SWEPS in the CGIAR (Bevege *et al.*, 2006) made the following comments about the SP-IPM: “One of the major aims of this program is, therefore, to facilitate such global collaboration through creating alliances with researchers, development workers and policy makers. The program is rated excellent in this effort and recommended as a good example to emulate”.

Recommendation 1: *The SP-IPM coordinator should prepare a short report indicating how cross-cutting research on IPM addresses CGIAR System Priorities.*

Recommendation 2: *The cross-cutting approaches used in the SP-IPM Medium-term Plan for 2007-09 should be used as the basis for further research planning.*

Recommendation 3: *The Program should develop clear criteria for identifying a limited number of new thematic areas of research in which there is clear added value to the majority of the partners.*

The governance and management of the SP-IPM were reviewed with regard to structure and membership of governance and operational arms, roles and responsibilities and implementation mechanisms.

The structure and membership of the operational arms of the SP-IPM have evolved from a community of practice to a formalised Steering Committee and IIWG. Currently both bodies have overlapping membership and include CG and non-CG partners. The review team considers that the Steering Committee has more members than needed to perform its essential functions and be representative and effective. The merit of having an independent Chair of the Steering Committee should be considered. The roles and responsibilities of the governance and operational arms of the SP-IPM were revised and further formalised at the 2007 Steering Committee meeting. The lack of TORs for the IIWG needs to be addressed. The team also feels that the confusion regarding the equity of non-CG members needs resolution. Restricting the Steering Committee to exclusively CG members is unlikely to

continue to foster the open and willing exchanges enjoyed in the past. It is also likely to be a disincentive for non-CG members to participate even in the IIWG. The added emphasis on policy analysis in the MTP 2007-2009 will require this expertise to be represented in the IIWG. The development of TORs for the Convening Center and its Board of Trustees has strengthened the governance of the programme. The critical positions for effective and efficient functioning of the SP-IPM are considered to be the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Coordinator. Ideally, the Chair and the Coordinator should have global IPM vision and international reputations in IPM to enhance the profile of the programme and to give it stronger visibility in the CG and the donor community. Resource mobilization is considered to be one of the most important responsibilities of both the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Coordinator.

Recommendation 4a: *If the SP-IPM continues with the existing structure, it is recommended that it carefully considers the membership of the Steering Committee and IIWG whereby all significant partners can participate in the processes of programme planning and priority setting and decision-making is inclusive, fair and transparent.*

Recommendation 4b: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM resolves the current confusion and carefully considers the merit of a smaller but representative Steering Committee (largely elected on a rotational basis from members of the IIWG) to enhance the effectiveness and transparency of decision-making processes and resource allocation.*

Recommendation 5: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM considers seeking a Chair who is not associated with either a CG or a non-CG member for greater independence in decision-making. For enhancing the profile of the SP-IPM, it would be desirable to seek a person with an international reputation in IPM. With the enhanced emphasis of the SP-IPM on policy analysis, it is also recommended that a member with policy analysis expertise be invited to join the IIWG.*

Recommendation 6: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM should develop TORs for the IIWG to highlight its roles as a discussion and priority-setting forum and clearly distinguish its responsibilities from those of the Steering Committee with which it currently shares many members. It is also recommended that annual evaluation of the Chair be included in the TORs of the Steering Committee and the evaluation report should also be forwarded to the Convening Centre.*

Recommendation 7: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM take account of the suggestions made concerning the required qualities of both the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Coordinator when recruiting for these positions in 2007. It is also recommended that the responsibilities of the two positions for resource mobilization should be greatly enhanced. In addition, the Chair and the Coordinator should consult with existing donors to the SP-IPM on what they expect from the programme.*

As part of the revival process of the SP-IPM, an externally facilitated workshop should be organised in 2007 to discuss the recommendations of the CCER and the EPMR and to effectively operationalize those recommendations on focus, value-addition, substance and process including: improved research planning and priority-

setting processes including necessary capacity building; transparent funding allocation to programme activities; innovative funding streams; a phased resource mobilization plan; and accepting and operationalising the MTP 2007-2009.

Recommendation 8: *It is recommended that as part of the revival process the SP-IPM implements an externally facilitated workshop in 2007 to discuss the recommendations of the CCER and the EPMR and to effectively operationalize those recommendations on focus, value-addition, substance and process.*

Recommendation 9: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM gives urgent attention to improving its priority setting processes and focuses on no more than three key priority themes during the revival phase. In order to achieve a more equitable, demand-driven and transparent process, external facilitation of priority-setting may be needed initially.*

Recommendation 10: *It is strongly recommended that a transparent procedure on 2007 funding allocation be urgently agreed among SP-IPM members based on a) achievement of the outputs in the approved MTP 2007-2009 log-frame, b) start-up development of a selected and further prioritised group (no more than 3) of the identified emerging R4D and c) other activities recommended by this review e.g. facilitated capacity building workshops for SP-IPM members. It is also recommended that the SP-IPM seek more innovative and transparent ways of funding its activities based on proven examples used in other system-wide programmes.*

Recommendation 11: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM urgently develops a phased resource mobilization plan based on focussed and realistic outputs to re-build the programme and, especially, on donor intelligence.*

Based on the Science Council ruling of 2005, the SP-IPM now reports both technically and financially through the Convening Centre, IITA. Unfortunately, this has fostered a perception that the SP-IPM is an IITA programme. To avoid such perceptions, activities supported by the SP-IPM in individual centres should be attributed to the programme in all reports. In addition, reporting to the current donor SDC must be improved.

Recommendation 12: *To avoid further misconceptions and confusion of attribution, it is recommended that the SP-IPM should identify centres involved in all inter-centre activities in its reports and in the rolling MTPs and that individual centres explicitly acknowledge support from the SP-IPM in their reports and rolling MTPs. It is also recommended that the SP-IPM Coordinator clarifies future reporting requirements with SDC.*

Apart from the EPMR, annual meetings of the Steering Committee and the IIWG appear to be the only other opportunities for monitoring project activities. Currently, a robust internal system for monitoring and evaluation is lacking in the SP-IPM. The team feel that internal monitoring should be an important responsibility for the Coordinator through site and partner visits. However, this needs to be embedded in a SP-IPM monitoring and evaluation system.

Recommendation 13: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM builds an effective internal monitoring and evaluation system that will accommodate on-going monitoring and formative evaluation of both program management and research progress as well as ex ante and ex post evaluation of projects to demonstrate links between research and poverty alleviation. It is also recommended that the SP-IPM contract a consultant to help to develop and establish such a system in the programme.*

There are some good examples of CGIAR pest management and IPM research which have resulted in significant impact. There has been limited assessment of the impact of technical interventions in the SP-IPM to date from either projects and/or pilot sites. The review team believes that there may also be evidence of significant impact from work conducted at some of the SP-IPM pilot sites. Benefits appear to have been greatest at the Morocco pilot sites. Studies are needed in 2007 to capture this potential impact.

Recommendation 14: *It is recommended that priority should be given to impact assessment in those pilot sites where significant achievements appear to have been made e.g. Morocco and Kenya. It is also recommended that - funding permitted – the SP-IPM should initiate actions to ensure that as much as possible is achieved by the programme in 2007 to contribute to future outputs in the MTP 2007-2009 through investment in appropriate activities as outlined above.*

Options to pursue the SP-IPM in future.

A new rolling MTP for 2008-2010 will be submitted to the Science Council in 2007. Firstly, it is hoped that the timing will allow the critical recommendations made by the CCER and EPMP to be included so that there is initial buy-in and ownership by SP-IPM members and the revival process can proceed rapidly. Secondly, the team strongly feels that the MTP 2007-2009 effectively captures the concept of *adding-value* to centre and global IPM activities and should be given a chance to be further operationalised. This is considered to be the best option for pursuing the SP-IPM in future. The added value is targeted at key bottlenecks especially on methodology. This area is supported by the SDC. In addition, the generic outputs on impact assessment, policy, communication and advocacy allow new areas of work i.e. new themes to be accommodated easily without major changes to the logframe from one year to the next.

Recommendation 15: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM accepts the MTP 2007-2009 as a rolling MTP during its remaining lifetime, with modifications for specific activities (e.g. a limited number of new R4D themes), as it effectively captures the concept of adding-value to centre and global IPM activities.*

A sequence of actions for full revival of the SP-IPM to a functional system-wide programme in 2008 is provided.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AVRDC	Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center
AGM	Annual General Meeting
CABI	Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International
CCER	Centre Commissioned External Review
CG	Consultative Group
CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
CIP	Centro Internacional de la Papa
CGIAR	Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
CIMMYT	Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo
DFID	Department for International Development
EPMR	External Programme and Management Review
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
IAPPS	International Association for the Plant Protection Sciences
ICARDA	International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
ICIPE	International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IITA	International Institute for Tropical Agriculture
IHWG	Inter-Institutional Working Group
IPGs	International Public Goods
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
MTP	Medium Term Plan
NARS	National Agricultural Research Systems
R4D	Research for Development
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
SP-IPM	CGIAR Systemwide Program on Integrated Pest Management
SSA-CP	Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Programme
SWEP	System-Wide and Ecoregional Programme
TORs	Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

Background

The CGIAR Systemwide Program on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM) was initiated in 1995 and is one of seventeen Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs currently in existence. The SP-IPM was established as part of the CGIAR response to Agenda 21, the action plan which emerged from the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. In Agenda 21, IPM is highlighted as an important component of sustainable agricultural development.

The main aims of the SP-IPM are to *achieve synergies and greater impact in IPM research and implementation, and to ensure that these activities are fully responsive to the needs of IPM practitioners*. It is expected that these aims will be achieved through close collaboration between CGIAR Centres and external partners and this is reflected in the membership structure of the Program. The Institute for International Tropical Agriculture (IITA) is the Convening Centre for the Program and the Coordinator is based in Benin.

In the early years of its existence the SP-IPM established seventeen Task Forces to examine key issues in pest, disease and weed management and to develop coherent responses to them. One of these Task Forces, on whiteflies and geminiviruses in the tropics, was successful in obtaining funding and developed into a global research project. The other Task Forces were unable to secure financial support to enable them to launch significant initiatives and therefore implementation of activities has been limited. However, additional funding was obtained by the SP-IPM in 1999 and this was used to establish 'pilot sites' in the major agroecologies in Africa. The work at the pilot sites was designed to increase the availability of IPM options in farming communities. It also aimed to develop stronger linkages between the various stakeholders involved in conducting, promoting and utilising the research and research outputs. It was originally intended that additional pilot sites would be established in Asia and Latin America but this failed to lack of resources.

In 2002, an External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of the SP-IPM was conducted (Gutierrez and Waibel, 2002). As a result of the EPMR a new operational and governance structure for the Program was put in place and the membership was expanded through the inclusion of additional external partners. The thematic working groups, which had replaced the original Task Forces, were subsequently dissolved and four priority areas were identified in which it was considered that the Program could add maximum value. However, this revised system was not fully implemented as a result of a conflict that arose over the governance and management of the Program. This dispute had serious consequences and led to the withdrawal of financial support for the SP-IPM from CGIAR funds allocated by the World Bank. Although the dispute was resolved through a formal arbitration process, there was continued uncertainty about roles and responsibilities of organisations and individuals involved in the management of the Program. The effect of this was that the level of activity from early 2005 has been low.

The IITA Board of Trustees has expressed concern about the viability of the SP-IPM. Accordingly, IITA has commissioned this Centre Commissioned External Review

(CCER) to examine the issues and to make recommendations about the future of the Program.

Objectives

The objectives of this study are to assess the viability of the SP-IPM; to review the governance, management and mechanisms for its implementation; and to identify options for future directions and next steps. The expected output of the review is a report to the IITA Board and Management with conclusions and recommendations on specific areas listed in the Terms of Reference (see Annex 1).

This study was carried out at the same time as an External Program Management Review of IITA. The EPMR will examine the findings of the study and, where appropriate, incorporate them within its report to the IITA Board of Trustees.

Process

The review was carried out through a combination of consultations with stakeholders and an assessment of key documents related to the Program. Prior to undertaking the review, the team was provided with an extensive set of documents on the SP-IPM that covered the past five years of Program activities (Annex 2).

Following discussion on the ToR with the Deputy Director General for Research at IITA, it was agreed that the history of the SP-IPM would not be covered in detail as considerable information is already available in other reviews; in particular, Gutierrez and Waibel (2002) and a recent Meta-Review of Systemwide and EcoRegional Programs (Bevege *et al.*, 2006). Further, in view of the evolutionary nature of the current research plan, it was agreed that an assessment of this plan would be based on an analysis of different options that might be considered.

One member of the review team attended the SP-IPM Steering Committee meeting held in Nairobi on 26-27 February 2007. Participants at this meeting were representatives of the CGIAR Centres who had expressed interest in continuing to contribute to the Program. Individual meetings were held with these representatives with a view to determining the nature of the past and current contribution of their Centres to the SP-IPM; the added-value to the Centre from participation in the Program; the commitment and availability of staff; and their perceptions on future priorities for the SP-IPM. A meeting was also held with a representative of an external partner, ICIPE, which has its headquarters in Nairobi.

Meetings were held in Ibadan, Nigeria with a member of the IITA Board of Trustees; the Interim Chair of the SP-IPM Steering Committee; the Program Coordinator; and with scientists at IITA with existing or potential involvement in SP-IPM activities. Conference telephone calls were conducted in Ibadan with selected external partners, donors, and Directors General of CGIAR Centres. Where it was not possible to contact persons by telephone, communication was by email. The team also interacted via email with a member of the EPMR team.

A full list of persons and organisations consulted is provided in Annex 3.

VALIDITY

Need for a Systemwide Program on IPM

Global IPM context

The EPMR of the SP-IPM conducted by Gutierrez and Waibel (2002) drew attention to the complexity of global pest problems. The reviewers suggested that, in the absence of sound policies for IPM, the challenges were likely to increase as agriculture in developing countries continues to intensify. This analysis remains true today and several indicators highlight the dangers of an excessive reliance on pesticide-based pest management strategies. It is difficult to obtain accurate data about trends in global pesticide use and the relative proportion of products with high mammalian toxicity. However, available data do suggest that pesticide sales are increasing and that the use of hazardous products remains high. For example, pesticide sales in Latin America increased by 30 percent between 2003-04 and are projected to increase by 5 percent annually until 2009 (Brodesser *et al.*, 2006). Whilst, the increased use of fungicides accounts for part of this growth¹, hazardous insecticides such as endosulfan, methamidophos and chlorpyrifos are still widely used. More than 99 percent of human poisonings world wide due to pesticides occur in developing countries, even though they account for less than half of overall use (FAO, 2002).

Meanwhile, pest outbreaks continue to cause significant losses in production and to threaten the livelihoods of smallholder farmers. For example, recent outbreaks of the brown planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stål), and associated virus diseases in the Mekong Delta in Vietnam have been exacerbated by the inappropriate use of insecticides (Kenmore, personal communication).

In addition to pesticide misuse, several factors favour the development of pest problems on a global scale. The rapid growth in global trade and the increased movement of people between countries has led to enhanced risks of new pest introductions (Daszak and Cunningham, 2003). This has already led to a series of new disease introductions and the anthropogenic introduction of parasites has been identified as the primary cause of the majority of emerging infectious diseases (Anderson *et al.*, 2004). The successful establishment of introduced pests may be facilitated through changes in climate which favour their reproduction or survival. There is now little doubt that the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations is responsible for the increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century. This was confirmed by the recent contribution of Working Group 1 to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change which also stated that it is 'very likely that hot extremes, heat waves, and heavy precipitation events will continue to become more frequent' (IPCC, 2007).

Whilst the impacts of climate change on pests are difficult to predict there is increasing evidence that changes in pest and natural enemy abundance and distribution are occurring. Modelling approaches can help to identify likely impacts,

¹ A serious epidemic of Asian soybean rust, *Phakopsora pachyrhizi*, resulted in a large increase in fungicide use in Brazil in 2003-04.

such as the climate probability model that has been developed to predict regions in Latin America prone to whitefly-borne epidemics (Morales and Jones, 2004). A review of research on insect responses to climate change suggests that predictions need to take account of factors such as phenotypic and genotypic flexibility and that much further research is needed in this area (Bale *et al.*, 2002).

Rapid urbanisation in developing countries is fuelling the growing demand for healthy and nutritious food to be made available at competitive prices. Fruit and vegetable production, in particular, provides an increasingly important source of cash income and employment for people in rural and peri-urban areas. However, crop yields are often low and unreliable and the quality of the produce is poor making it difficult to sell. Losses caused by pests and diseases, and the lack of suitable strategies to control them, remain key constraints. Export markets are characterised by increasingly stringent regulations on maximum residue levels and awareness of food safety issues is increasing among consumers in national and regional markets. Consequently, the need for improved sustainable production practices is very clear.

IPM as a concept may have less prominence today than in the past. However, the general principles and approaches underlying IPM remain highly relevant to addressing some of the key challenges of sustainable development. This is reflected in the World Bank's corporate rural strategy *Reaching the Rural Poor* (2003) which commits it to promote environmentally sustainable pest management systems. IPM is one of the World Bank's ten 'Safeguards' and therefore has a high profile. In spite of this, IPM does not feature prominently in World Bank projects (Sorby *et al.*, 2003). A recent review concludes that, with the exception of Mali, the World Bank's country assistance strategies have not adequately incorporated analytical work on pesticide policies (Kelly, 2005). This may have been due in part to the absence of IPM expertise within the organisation and the recruitment in 2003 of an IPM specialist should help to address this deficiency. The World Bank joined SP-IPM as a partner in 2003 and this provides a good opportunity for the CGIAR and other partners to work with the World Bank and to influence its pest management policies.

IPM is an important element of the agricultural development strategy of the SP-IPM's main donor, the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC). Italy has supported the SP-IPM in recent years and DFID and other donors are supporting the Tropical Whitefly IPM project. This suggests that there is still donor support for IPM research that is appropriately targeted.

In summary, there is a continuing need for IPM research to address global pest problems. The CGIAR has substantial expertise in IPM which, used in partnership with other organisations, can make a significant contribution to sustainable food production and enhanced livelihoods of farmers in developing countries.

IPM in the CGIAR

One of the objectives of the SP-IPM is to create synergies between the IPM work carried out at the individual Centres and to raise the visibility of IPM within the CGIAR system as a whole. The SP-IPM has made progress towards achieving this objective. For example, the Program has created synergies through facilitating the development of the large multi-stakeholder Tropical Whitefly IPM project in which

CIAT, IITA and CIP are participating. The SP-IPM has played a similar catalytic role in the development of a new project on leaf miners involving CIP, ICARDA and an associate Centre, ICIPE. The SP-IPM has begun the process of enhancing the visibility of IPM within the CGIAR by initiating work to develop methodologies that can be used as generic tools in IPM implementation. This includes work on farmer participatory research and learning that underpins IPM; and analyses of suitable approaches for assessing crop loss due to pests and for evaluating the impact of IPM interventions. Nevertheless, there is a strong perception that the visibility of IPM in the CGIAR system is low, suggesting that these activities have had limited impact at the system level to date.

The low visibility of IPM in the CGIAR may be partly due to the fact that it does not appear explicitly in the five System Priorities for CGIAR Research (CGIAR, 2005). However, an examination of the sub-priorities indicates that pest, disease and weed management contributes to several of the general and specific goals. Moreover, IPM is specifically mentioned in relation to:

- Priority 3A: Increasing income from fruits and vegetables.
- Priority 4D: Sustainable agro-ecological intensification in low- and high potential environments.

A strong case can be argued that IPM can make a significant contribution to the following areas:

- Priority 2A: Maintaining and enhancing yields and yield potential of food staples.
- Priority 5A: Science and technology policies and institutions.

The CGIAR system priorities do offer *new* opportunities for the SP-IPM, particularly through the emphasis given to research on fruits and vegetables for income generation and improved nutrition. Addressing food safety and quality issues will be a crucial part of this emerging agenda.

The potential contribution of the SP-IPM to these priorities is outlined in the Medium-term Plan (MTP) for 2007-09 which includes a section on ‘Alignment with CGIAR System Priorities’. We suggest that the SP-IPM highlights this more directly by preparing a Table showing how the System Priorities relate to cross-cutting research on IPM. This has been done for several other areas of cross-cutting research, including ‘Nutrition and Human Health’ and ‘Climate Change’. The Table below, which could be expanded suitably, follows the approach that has been taken for these research areas.

Recommendation 1: *The SP-IPM coordinator should prepare a short report indicating how cross-cutting research on IPM addresses CGIAR System Priorities.*

Table 1. Illustration of how Priorities could contribute to Cross-Cutting Research on IPM

Priority area 1	Priority area 2	Priority area 3	Priority area 4	Priority area 5
Sustaining biodiversity	Genetic improvement	Diversification and high value commodities	Integrated NR management	Policies and institutional innovation
	2A: Maintaining and enhancing yields and yield	3A: Income increases from food and	4D: Sustainable agro-ecological intensification in	5A: Science and technology policies and

	potential of food staples	vegetables	low- and high potential areas	institutions
--	---------------------------	------------	-------------------------------	--------------

SP-IPM priorities

During the early years of the SP-IPM, much of the effort of partner organisations was channelled into developing large projects to address pest problems of a global or regional nature. In the limited number of cases where funding was obtained to support further activities the ‘added value’ to the partnership has not yet been fully captured. In its review of the first SP-IPM MTP for 2005-2007, the Science Council suggested that large problem-based research activities should be managed through inter-Centre projects. The Science Council proposed that the SP-IPM should review its approach and focus on activities that would generate the most added-value for the partners. At the same time, the Program should ensure that outputs result in international public goods (IPGs).

The recommendations of the Science Council were acted on during the SP-IPM Steering Committee meeting held in 2005 in Aleppo. The remaining thematic working groups were dissolved and four priority areas were identified where it was considered that the Program could add most value. There areas were:

- IPM collective action research
- Enhancing IPM outcomes and impacts
- IPM policy analysis
- IPM information and advocacy

The research outputs from these priority areas were intended to be cross-cutting methodologies and technologies that could be utilised by a broad range of end-users. The new priorities were incorporated into the MTP for 2007-09 and the response of the Science Council to this research plan was broadly favourable.

There were no approved minutes from the Steering Committee meeting in Aleppo in 2005 and no meeting was convened in 2006. This has caused a degree of uncertainty about the status of decisions reached in Aleppo. The MTP for 2007-09 is very different from the previous MTP for 2006-08, which essentially rolled over activities from the previous year. The current situation is that the Program is committed to deliver the output targets for 2007, which are specified in the MTP for 2007-09, and it appears likely that these will be achieved.

However, at the SP-IPM Steering Committee held in Nairobi there was lengthy discussion about future SP-IPM priorities and participants expressed a preference for the adoption of broad research themes. Some of these themes drew on previous investments of time and resources by the Program; for example, soil health which incorporated earlier work done by the soil biota working group. Other themes, such as climate change, were identified in response to perceived emerging demand and funding opportunities. An attempt was made to rank the priority themes and to identify lead scientists who were willing to accept the responsibility for developing them and liaising with other researchers. An outline MTP was prepared and provision was made for this to be developed through subsequent interaction between the Program Coordinator, the interim Steering Committee Chair and other members of the Steering Committee. The review team believes that, before additional work is done on the rolling MTP for 2008-2010, further discussion is needed between SP-IPM

partners on a future research framework, taking into account the recommendations made by the CCER and EPMR.

Adding value

The 2002 EPMR team concluded that they were not able to clearly distinguish between research carried out under the SP-IPM and activities conducted by the individual Centres and other partners. Similar views about this lack of clarity have been expressed more recently by the IITA Board of Trustees and by the Program's main donor, SDC. The key issue for the SP-IPM is how best it can add value to the individual efforts of its partner organisations. The review team considers that the cross-cutting approach adopted in the MTP for 2007-09 offers the best opportunity for adding value to Centre activities and producing IPGs that can be used by other Program stakeholders.

Recommendation 2: *The cross-cutting approaches used in the SP-IPM Medium-term Plan for 2007-09 should be used as the basis for further research planning.*

We believe that added value can be achieved by:

- Addressing bottlenecks that prevent the effective uptake of research outputs; for example, by facilitating the development of regulatory processes covering areas such as biopesticide registration.
- Promoting the adoption of methodologies and technologies that can be utilised by a wide range of users. A recent example of this is the excellent nematology manual which has just been published and which was supported by the Program.
- Documenting evidence that demonstrates the benefits of IPM research and making this available to policy makers, donors and other stakeholders.

At the same time, in order to maintain its relevance, the Program needs to be able to respond to emerging issues to which IPM can make an effective contribution. Currently, the Tropical IPM whitefly project is the main source of cross-cutting outputs that constitute the 2007-09 MTP output indicators. The potential themes identified during the Nairobi Steering Committee meeting should also be examined to see how they might contribute to the MTP outputs. Focus is critical. We suggest that these themes are prioritised according to the extent to which they address the CGIAR system priorities; respond to the demand of other stakeholders; add value to the work of individual Centres; potentially develop IPGs that contribute to the cross-cutting MTP outputs; have a realistic chance of attracting funding.

An initial assessment indicates that the proposed themes on 'Food Safety' and 'Climate Change' would meet most of these criteria. However, these two themes are both potentially very broad and it will be important to maintain a focus on aspects in which the CGIAR has a comparative advantage. The 'Food Safety' theme would relate well with the new CGIAR priority on fruits and vegetables and is an area in which the Program could quickly develop research activities.

Recommendation 3: *The Program should develop clear criteria for identifying a limited number of new thematic areas of research in which there is clear added value to the majority of the partners.*

In order to be able to effectively implement the new research plan, there is a need for stronger multi-disciplinarity (see below).

Support for the SP-IPM

There appears to be considerable support for the continuation of the SP-IPM from both within the CGIAR and from external partners. Pest management scientists are strongly committed but, with some exceptions, there is less evidence of interest from researchers with other disciplinary skills who have potentially important roles to play. These include economists, experts in impact assessment, policy analysts, and social development specialists. Their input must be encouraged if the Program is to achieve significant impact in the future.

There is a perception that the low visibility of IPM and the SP-IPM in the CGIAR is partly due to lack of support from senior managers. We discussed the SP-IPM with senior managers at three Centres (CIP, IITA, IRRI) which have participated in the Program since its inception. The support for the SP-IPM from management at these Centres remains strong. We are unsure about the situation in other Centres, but the fact that several were represented at the 2007 Steering Committee meeting in Nairobi (Bioversity International, CIAT, CIMMYT, ICARDA, ICRISAT) suggests that there is still interest in the Program. The SP-IPM needs to invest more effort in documenting benefits to the Centres in order to build on the interest and goodwill that exists. This can be done through a more effective Monitoring and Evaluation system and this is discussed further on pgs. 19-20.

Representatives of CGIAR Centres and other organisations highlighted the benefits they gained from the exchange of information and ideas with other members. This networking function is seen as especially valuable by external partners, some of whom are keen for the SP-IPM to lead the creation of a truly global IPM network or Forum. The review team does not believe that it would be appropriate for the SP-IPM to take the lead in developing such a global network. However, we fully endorse the importance of this networking function of the SP-IPM and encourage future efforts to continue it.

The Meta-Review of SWEPs in the CGIAR (Bevege *et al.*, 2006) made the following comments about the Program: “One of the major aims of this program is, therefore, to facilitate such global collaboration through creating alliances with researchers, development workers and policy makers. The program is rated excellent in this effort and recommended as a good example to emulate”. This assessment demonstrates that the SP-IPM has acted on the recommendation of the 2002 EPMR to become more outward looking. There were some indications during the 2007 Steering Committee meeting in Nairobi that there might be a retreat to a more restrictive partnership approach. We caution against any move towards a less inclusive policy and discuss this later with respect to governance and management issues.

Potential impact

The absence of suitable data and methodologies has made it difficult to clearly attribute impact from many areas of research undertaken by the CGIAR. In a

comprehensive study of CGIAR research investments, biocontrol of cassava mealybug was one of only three cases where significant impact could be conclusively identified (Raitzer, 2003). The benefits from the research on cassava mealybug have recently been described in more detail (Alene *et al.*, 2006). It is possible that there are other examples of CGIAR pest management and IPM research which have resulted in significant impact. Greater efforts are needed in the future to ensure that such benefits can be adequately documented.

There are cases of significant impact from IPM activities conducted outside the CGIAR. A recent example is the Danida-funded Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) in Vietnam, in which IPM is a component. An impact assessment of the increased income due to Farmer Field School training indicates that a total expenditure of USD 6.6 million resulted in an increase in farmer income of USD 23 million after the first year². Returns from investment in IPM research are often underestimated, as the wider gains brought about from enhanced farmer learning are not usually taken into account in benefit-cost analyses (CGIAR, 2006). Thus, IPM research does have excellent potential to make a significant contribution to improve farmer livelihoods.

Impact assessment studies are being conducted in the current phase of the Tropical Whitefly IPM project. The impact assessment component of this project builds on previous work led by CIP on crop loss and IPM impact assessment. In view of the successful outcomes from research carried out to date in the project, there is a strong probability that significant benefits will be recorded. Based on the limited interaction the review team was able to have with NARS representatives, we believe that there may also be evidence of significant impact from work conducted at some of the SP-IPM pilot sites. Benefits appear to have been greatest at the Morocco pilot sites. This is discussed under Implementation (see pg. 21).

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Structure and membership

The initial structure of the SP-IPM was a semi-formal association of representatives from interested CG centres – a community of practice. It was dominated by entomologists. This structure was retained from 1995-2001 with the same Chair and Coordinator although there was potential to rotate the chair. In response to the EPMR recommendations (Gutierrez and Waibel, 2002), in 2002, the Steering Committee was established with membership of CG centres and an elected Chair for a three-year period. Terms of reference were developed for the Steering Committee, the Chair and the Coordinator.

In 2002-2003, non-CG members were invited to join the Steering Committee. These included the FAO Global IPM Facility, the World Bank, Crop Life International, the Pesticide Action Network, IAPPS, CABI, ICIPE and AVRDC. Membership disciplinary coverage also broadened to include pathologists and a nematologist as well as entomologists and socio-economic and policy expertise. All CG and non-CG

² Based on information obtained from the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (<http://www.ambhanoi.um.dk/en/menu/AboutUs/News/>) Full report not yet available.

members of the Steering Committee were also members of the IIWG. Additional members are invited as needed. Members of the IIWG were also members of specific thematic working groups or task forces whose make-up has changed over the lifetime of the SP-IPM.

In 2007, a restricted Steering Committee meeting (only CG members) was held as part of the revival of the SP-IPM. The TORs of the Steering Committee, the Chair of the Coordinator were slightly modified (see below). For example, under the TORs of the Steering Committee, the TOR “*Proposes and approves new members of the SC (CG only) and IIWG (external partners)*” was included. Terms of Reference were also developed for the Convening Centre and its Board of Trustees to formalise and strengthen the governance of the SP-IPM.

Existing structure and membership

The structure and membership of the SP-IPM evolved during its 12-year existence. From 2002-2003, it broadened its membership from an exclusive CG body to include expert IPM partners from outside the CG. Overwhelmingly, the feedback from members (both CG and non-CG) to a questionnaire prepared for the recent Steering Committee meeting (Nairobi, Feb. 2007) indicated significant advantages in being part of such a forum to discuss and exchange experiences, knowledge and ideas. It is noted by the review team that this intangible achievement has not been captured during past evaluations of the SP-IPM. However, several of the non-CG members have since indicated their concerns about being excluded from the 2007 meeting. Moreover, the new Steering Committee TOR “*Proposes and approves new members of the SC (CG only) and IIWG (external partners)*” implies that in future the Steering Committee will include only CG members. Restricting membership of the Steering Committee to exclusively CG members is unlikely to continue to foster the open and willing exchanges enjoyed in the past. It is also likely to be a disincentive for non-CG members to participate even in the IIWG.

Recommendation 4a: *If the SP-IPM continues with the existing structure, it is recommended that it carefully considers the membership of the Steering Committee and IIWG whereby all significant partners can participate in the processes of programme planning and priority setting and decision-making is inclusive, fair and transparent.*

The level of participation of NARS in the SP-IPM has been questioned on several occasions (e.g. by the Science Council and by the SWEP Meta-review; Bevege *et al.*, 2006). Although NARS are not represented on either the Steering Committee or the IIWG, they have been extensively involved in project implementation, especially at the pilot sites. The SP-IPM should clarify the important role of NARS partners in the SP-IPM to avoid any further criticism.

Possible changes to the structure and membership

There is significant overlap in the membership of the Steering Committee and the IIWG. During 2002-2005, there was common membership of the two bodies. At the 2005 Steering Committee meeting, a proposal was made to reduce the size of the Steering Committee to six members: three CG and 3 non-CG members. The MTP

2007-2009, which has been accepted by the Science Council, indicates that this decision appears to have been made by the SP-IPM. However, to date, this has not been operationalised due to the conflict that arose during 2005-2006 regarding the Convening Centre. Currently (as raised above), there is uncertainty and confusion as to the future membership of the Steering Committee.

Recommendation 4b: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM resolve the current confusion and carefully consider the merit of a smaller but representative Steering Committee (largely elected on a rotational basis from members of the IIWG) to enhance the effectiveness and transparency of decision-making processes and resource allocation.*

In governance, there is a need for robust clarity on the relationships between host and partner institutes and between governance and planning and implementing bodies. Independence of the Chair of a steering committee is considered an important principle of good governance. There is no doubt that the SP-IPM would benefit from an independent Chair with an international reputation in IPM.

The MTP 2007-2009 includes IPM policy analysis as a key priority area for the SP-IPM. Currently, there is no policy analyst expertise included in the membership of the Steering Committee or the IIWG. In the past, members with policy expertise from the FAO Global IPM Facility and the World Bank have participated. The merit of including policy expertise in the SP-IPM was also recommended by the EPMP of the SP-IPM (Gutierrez and Waibel, 2002).

Recommendation 5: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM considers seeking a Chair who is not associated with either a CG or a non-CG member for greater independence in decision-making. For enhancing the profile of the SP-IPM, it would be desirable to seek a person with an international reputation in IPM. With the enhanced emphasis of the SP-IPM on policy analysis, it is also recommended that a member with policy analysis expertise be invited to join the IIWG.*

Roles and responsibilities

One of the key advantages of the system-wide programme approach is to create opportunities for all stakeholders not only to input their respective interests but also to harness their varied expertise in a complementary fashion. Written agreements that define the roles and responsibilities of each body are necessary. Annex 4 lists the latest terms of reference (TORs) for the Convening Centre, Board of Trustees, Steering Committee and its Chair and the Coordinator. The main roles and responsibilities of the key governance and management bodies of the SP-IPM are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Roles and Responsibilities of the key SP-IPM Governance and Management Bodies

Body	Roles and responsibilities (TORs)
Convening Center (CC)	Manage the SP-IPM Coordination Unit Fiscal and reporting responsibility for SP-IPM funds Represent SP-IPM within and outside the CG Serve as ex-officio member of the SC through the DDG-research
Board of Trustees	Overall responsibility for and financial oversight of SP-IPM

(BOT)	Approve the SP-IPM MTP project Approve changes to the SP-IPM mission, policy and TORs
Steering Committee (SC)	Nominates and elects the Chair and recruits the Coordinator for appointment by the CC Evaluates the Coordinator performance for the CC Approves Coordination Unit and SP-IPM work plans Approves new thematic groups <i>Proposes and approves new members of the SC (CG only) and IIWG (external partners)</i> Recommends SP-IPM mission and policy statements and TORs of component bodies for approval by the BOT
Chair	Promotes SP-IPM within and outside the CG system Provides overall leadership of the SP-IPM Promotes collaborative links within the SP-IPM and with other allied organisations Chairs and assists with the organization of SC and IIWG meetings <i>Supports the Coordinator for fund raising, advocacy and public relations</i>
Coordinator	Serve as contact point catalyse and facilitate approved activities, mobilize and disseminate technical and material resources and facilitate communication between IIWG members and other stakeholder/partners Develop information and publicity materials and manage the SP-IPM website Serve as secretary to the SC to facilitate and organise SC and IIWG meetings Prepare biannual progress reports, technical reports to donors, other reports and minutes of SC meetings and report on the SP-IPM MTP to the CC <i>Take the lead to generate and facilitate responses to funding opportunities, including gathering donor interest</i> Prepare for approval and manage SP-IPM work plan and budget Report to the DDG of the CC and the Chair of the SC

Italics indicates roles and responsibilities discussed below

The 16 member IIWG is a discussion forum and advisory body to the Steering Committee but has no formalized TORs for the IIWG. Its main roles and responsibilities include to discuss and develop the SP-IPM vision and policy, to identify priorities for inter-institutional collaboration, to agree on programme, process and budgetary issues to strengthen collaboration, to promote networking, and to review progress (SP-IPM Bi-annual Report 2003-2004).

The recent modifications of the TORs of the Steering Committee and its Chair as well as those of the Coordinator provide further clarity to the governance and management of the SP-IPM. In addition, the development of TORs for the Convening Centre and the Board of Trustees strengthen the governance of the SP-IPM. Further strengthening of the roles and responsibilities of the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Coordinator would be beneficial to the SP-IPM (see below). Currently, the Steering Committee evaluates the performance of the Coordinator but not the Chair.

Recommendation 6: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM should develop TORs for the IIWG to highlight its roles as a discussion and priority-setting forum and clearly distinguish its responsibilities from those of the Steering Committee with which it currently shares many members. It is also recommended that annual evaluation of the*

Chair be included in the TORs of the Steering Committee and the evaluation report should also forwarded to the Convening Centre.

The critical positions for effective and efficient functioning of the SP-IPM are considered to be the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Coordinator. Ideally, the Chair and the Coordinator should have global IPM vision and international reputations in IPM to enhance the profile of the programme and to give it stronger visibility in the CG and the donor community.

The Chair should act as an ambassador for IPM and play an important role in resource mobilization by interacting and lobbying donors, in particular at the AGM. Currently, this role is down-graded to one of “*supporting the Coordinator*” (Table 2). One option would be for the Chair to play a key role in identifying opportunities for funding from specific donors. The Coordinator should be a full-time appointment and not a shared position with the Convening Centre. This is especially critical during the next two years while the SP-IPM is being revived. Resource mobilization is considered to be one of the most important responsibilities of the Coordinator who should pursue the best opportunities identified by the Chair. Currently, this responsibility is not given sufficient profile and clarity in the above-listed TORs of the position (Table 2). In addition, the incumbent currently implements this role at a distance, rarely having a chance to interact face-to-face with donors. Moreover, by vesting the key role of resource mobilization in the Coordinator, any issues of conflict of interest among scientists with regard to mobilizing resources for themselves and other CG centres or for the SP-IPM at the expense on individual centre-based activities should be reduced.

Consultation between SP-IPM management and the SDC, the current major donor, does not appear to have been done in the recent past. Our discussions with SDC indicated that it sees the main role of the SP-IPM as a provider of IPM tools and methodologies and a facilitator of capacity building of NARS partners. In addition, SDC would like the SP-IPM to enhance its contribution to IPM policy development and to engage more with the private sector. Further funding from SDC would be more assured if these priorities were taken on board by the SP-IPM. It should be noted that a former donor to the SP-IPM was most concerned about the lack of interaction with the programme: “Our experience with the IPM has not been positive....we never received reports on what had been done with the funds. We were never invited to seminars/workshops etc.... besides while all Centers/programmes that we fund have always tried to meet and speak with us at least at AGM, the IPM never gave signs of life”. If the SP-IPM is to revive donor interest, it must improve its interactions with donors.

Recommendation 7: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM take account of the suggestions made concerning the required qualities of both the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Coordinator when recruiting for these positions in 2007. It is also recommended that the responsibilities of the two positions for resource mobilization should be greatly enhanced. In addition, the Chair and the Coordinator should consult with existing donors to the SP-IPM on what they expect from the programme.*

Finally, we are concerned that the implementation as well as oversight and decision-making roles of the SP-IPM are currently vested in largely the same scientists who are

members of both the Steering Committee and the IIWG. This not a recipe for good governance and has potential for conflict of interest. One option to avoid this would be to adopt the recommendation above on reducing the size of the Steering Committee with representative members elected on a rotational basis from the IIWG.

Implementation mechanisms

Assessment of working relationships between key bodies

As the review team did not have an opportunity to observe working relationships among all bodies across the SP-IPM, brief comments only are possible on some of these. Firstly, one member of the team attended the 2007 Steering Committee meeting in Nairobi. He noted that the meeting process, although fairly informal, was satisfactory and cordial. However, the priority setting process for future thematic activities could be improved. The team also noted that the working relationship between the interim Chair of the Steering Committee and the Coordinator functioned well.

Secondly, the review team noted that the relationships between the Coordinator and members of the Steering Committee and IIWG are working well. The current Coordinator is a good communicator who shares information throughout the SP-IPM as well as with crop protection scientists in the Convening Centre. He has been active in mobilizing and disseminating technical information such as Briefs and other documents (e.g. the SP-IPM Manual on Plant Nematology was completed and distributed during the CCER) and maintains and updates the website regularly.

Above all, there is a need for a strong and close working relationship and understanding between the new Chair and the new Coordinator if the SP-IPM is to be revived satisfactorily, to mobilize sufficient resources and to function effectively in future. Although frequent face-to-face interaction may be difficult, the two should keep in close contact by e-mail and tele-conferencing. The communication problems experienced in 2005-2006 must be avoided if revival of the SP-IPM is to be effective and sustained.

Planning

The rolling Three-year MTP and modified log-frames (i.e. outputs, intended users, outcomes and impacts) as required by the Science Council for adjustment of implementation are used by the SP-IPM. Formal planning processes involving all members are carried out annually at the IIWG meetings after which adjustments are made to MTP and log-frame documents for submission to the Science Council after approval by the Convening Centre's Board. One concern of the panel is that SP-IPM planning processes have always been "internal", involving a relatively narrow disciplinary group. As far as we are aware, there has not been any external facilitation of planning and priority-setting processes. Facilitation may have helped the SP-IPM think and plan more strategically, to make progress and, in particular, to mobilize resources more effectively.

Recommendation 8: *It is recommended that as part of the revival process the SP-IPM implements an externally facilitated workshop in 2007 to discuss the*

recommendations of the CCER and the EPMP and to effectively operationalize those recommendations on focus, value-addition, substance and process.

Priority setting

From discussions with SP-IPM members and observations at the Steering Committee, mechanisms of priority setting for potential areas of research are informal and qualitative and could be much improved. Based on some of the themes developed by the SP-IPM, priority setting seems to be more a reflection of individual or groups of scientists' expertise and preferences. There is no evidence of demand driving priority-setting processes. There has also been a lack of focus and a tendency to choose too many themes to develop and promote when funding has been limited. For example, in the recent 2007 Steering Committee meeting, six emerging R4D themes were selected when a focus on two would have better reflected available funding. Resource mobilization for particular past themes may have been more successful if larger start-up budgets had been given to fewer themes. Key priority areas could have been better developed before approaching donors. Furthermore, there has been insufficient interaction with the current donor, SDC, who has clear views of where the SP-IPM should focus (see above).

Recommendation 9: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM gives urgent attention to improving its priority setting processes and focuses on no more than three key priority themes during the revival phase. In order to achieve a more equitable, demand-driven and transparent process, external facilitation of priority-setting may be needed initially.*

Funding allocation within the SP-IPM

Due to the conflict in the SP-IPM with regard to the Convening Centre, the recent past history of fund allocation has been unsatisfactory. In 2005, even though funds were available, there was no agreement on priorities. Although funds were allocated in 2006, the lack of a steering committee meeting compromised transparency. Funds are available for allocation in 2007 but, as this was not agreed at the recent Steering Committee meeting, decisions will have to be made by email exchange – again compromising transparency.

In contrast to other system-wide programmes, the SP-IPM has implemented a rigid funding allocation system. The System-wide Livestock Programme and the System-wide Genetic Resources Programme have been more flexible in allocating funds and used a diversity of funding streams including start-up grants, competitive grants and specific dissemination funds. There is now an opportunity for the SP-IPM to initiate a competitive grant system for start-up funds for the recently identified six emerging R4D themes. This will allow the SP-IPM to realistically focus on two or three of these themes initially. There is also a need for clear guidelines for the competitive grant fund including the right to terminate support after two years if the theme has not been successful in mobilizing additional donor funding. This will give opportunity to support additional themes.

Recommendation 10: *It is strongly recommended that a transparent procedure on 2007 funding allocation be urgently agreed among SP-IPM members based on a)*

achievement of the outputs in the approved MTP 2007-2009 log-frame, b) start-up development of a selected and further prioritised group (no more than 3) of the identified emerging R4D and c) other activities recommended by this review e.g. facilitated capacity building workshops for SP-IPM members. It is also recommended that the SP-IPM seek more innovative and transparent ways of funding its activities based on proven examples used in other system-wide programmes.

Resource mobilization

Most SWEPs have been chronically under-funded in relation to indicative planning budgets (SWEP Meta-review; Bevege *et al.*, 2006). This is exemplified by the SP-IPM where only three of the initial task forces were able to attract enough funds to implement programs while the majority was largely un-funded. Currently, the only viable project is the Tropical Whitefly Project, initiated in 1995 and now in Phase III. Moreover, the SP-IPM lost its funding from the World Bank due to poor rating for governance and management in 2005. It is not clear when funding will be resumed. The SP-IPM currently relies on its sole donor SDC although Italy may allocate further funds in 2007. Norway, a consistent donor in the past, has now reallocated its funds to the SSA-CP. The SP-IPM, and in particular, the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Coordinator, need to be more aware of *which donors* give priority to IPM (e.g. SDC) and *what* they are likely to fund (e.g. SDC wants the SP-IPM to concentrate on developing IPM tools and methodologies and capacity building of NARS) and *how* to make proposals more attractive to donors.

Recommendation 11: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM urgently develops a phased resource mobilization plan based on focussed and realistic outputs to re-build the programme and, especially, on donor intelligence.*

Reporting

In general, reporting of the annual progress of the SP-IPM through the minutes of the Steering Committee meetings has been timely and comprehensive. It is noted however that no minutes were produced from the 2005 Steering Committee meeting and no meeting was held in 2006 due to internal conflict. The minutes of the 2007 Steering Committee meeting demonstrate that the SP-IPM has now put the conflict behind it and is beginning to revive and re-build. The SP-IPM also produces a bi-annual report, summarising technical progress made during the reporting period. This report also highlights specific themes such as partnerships, learning and adoption and awareness and impact. These are also available on the SP-IPM website.

Based on the Science Council ruling of 2005, the SP-IPM now reports both technically and financially through the Convening Centre, IITA. Unfortunately, this has fostered a perception that the SP-IPM is an IITA programme. Moreover, there have also been examples where individual centres have reported outputs achieved under the SP-IPM in centre reports without acknowledging the contribution of the SP-IPM.

Reporting to the current donor SDC has been informal; there is apparently no agreed format. Reports have included the Steering Committee minutes and the bi-annual SP-IPM report. According to SDC this appears not to have been completely satisfactory as the donor feels that she has not received the report she needs.

Recommendation 12: *To avoid further misconceptions and confusion of attribution, it is recommended that the SP-IPM should identify centres involved in all inter-centre activities in its reports and in the rolling MTPs and that individual centres explicitly acknowledge support from the SP-IPM in their reports and rolling MTPs. It is also recommended that the SP-IPM Coordinator clarifies future reporting requirements with SDC.*

Monitoring and evaluation

The SP-IPM was externally reviewed once since its birth in 1995 (Gutierrez and Waibel, 2002). Although the TORs of the EPMP required comments on the adequacy of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, the panel chose to be silent about it. Apart from the EPMP, annual meetings of the Steering Committee and the IIWG appear to be the only other opportunities for monitoring project activities. Currently, a robust internal system for monitoring and evaluation is lacking in the SP-IPM. The team feel that internal monitoring should be an important responsibility for the Coordinator through site and partner visits. This would enable periodic feedback to other members/partners. However, this needs to be embedded in a SP-IPM monitoring and evaluation system.

Publishing of research in peer-reviewed journals and books is also a useful monitoring and quality control measure and should be included in a SP-IPM monitoring system. Currently, this is not always included in the SP-IPM bi-annual reports although the 2001-2002 report lists publications from the Tropical White Fly Project. Relevant conference outputs have been included in several reports. Two thousand copies of SP-IPM publications are produced and distributed to members of the Steering Committee but there is currently no monitoring of the distribution of publications.

Other SWEPS e.g. the AHI has introduced a monitoring system (Bevege *et al.*, 2006). This includes internal monitoring through workshops, progress reports and field visits. Such mechanisms could be considered and used by the SP-IPM.

Recommendation 13: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM builds an effective internal monitoring and evaluation system that will accommodate on-going monitoring and formative evaluation of both program management and research progress as well as ex ante and ex post evaluation of projects to demonstrate links between research and poverty alleviation. This system should complement and be coherent with the Performance Measurement Reports (PMR) for program monitoring to the Science Council and current CGIAR external periodic review processes. It could include: adopting “results-based management”; instituting a regular annual internal stakeholder workshop review process that will provide a formative self-evaluation mechanism for management and implementers; and require obligatory publishing of research in peer-reviewed journals and books as a means of monitoring progress and providing a quality control measure. It is also recommended that the SP-IPM contract a consultant to help to develop and establish such a system in the programme.*

It is noted that this is very similar to Recommendation 24 (Bevege *et al.*, 2006).

Implementation of the MTP 2007-2009 and the future

The SP-IPM MTP 2006-2008 was written by the SP-IPM. The Science Council commented that it was too general and lacked clear output targets. The MTP 2007-2009 was written by previous Chair of the Steering Committee. Conceptually, it is very different to the MTP 2006-2008 as it concentrates on *outputs that add-value* to activities that are being implemented by individual centres or that have been implemented by the SP-IPM. During the 2007 Steering Committee meeting however, the members did not appear to be aware of this conceptual difference and considered the 2007-2009 and 2006-2008 MTPs to be similar. The MTP 2007-2009 has been accepted by the Science Council. Minor concerns were raised about the need to improve impact pathways and to clarify some of the terminology e.g. social learning platform. At the least, the Outputs included for 2007 must be delivered by the SP-IPM (Table 3).

Table 3. SP-IPM MTP 2007-2009 Outputs to be delivered in 2007

Outputs	Outputs to be delivered in 2007
Output 1: IPM Collective Action Research documented and lessons learned	SP-IPM Tropical Whitefly IPM Project adopted as first social learning platform IPM-relevant CG collective action initiatives published on SP-IPM website
Output 2: Strategies and methods for strengthening IPM outcomes and impacts developed	Standardized methodologies for creating global harmonized database on whiteflies and white-fly transmitted viruses published Ex-ante baseline datasets for impact assessment for 4 countries available
Output 3: IPM relevant policy guidance materials developed	CGIAR social, economic and environmental research relevant to pest and pesticide management incorporated into the SP-IPM website
Output 4: IPM Information and Advocacy products developed and disseminated	SP-IPM brief on the Contribution of IPM to achievement of the Millennium Development Goals IPM project database and resource directory updated on the SP-IPM website

Consultation with the SP-IPM Coordinator indicated that these outputs can be delivered in 2007 if actions necessary to achieve some of them are put in place soon. In addition, consultations between the SP-IPM Coordinator and the coordinator of the Tropical Whitefly project also indicated that the project had a good track record in timely achievement of outputs and it was likely that 2007 whitefly outputs would also be delivered. It therefore appears that the SP-IPM is likely to deliver its 2007 outputs.

Resources permitting, additional activities could also be carried out in 2007 to contribute to outputs for delivery in 2008 and 2009. For example, expert analyses could be made in Output 2 on impact assessment as well as in Output 3 on policy through contracting consultants to assess how delivery of these outputs will add-value to global IPM research and research within the CG and to help to identify indicators for quantifying achievement. If indicators are not identified now, there is a significant danger that the added-value will not be captured.

There has been limited assessment of the impact of technical interventions in the SP-IPM to date from either projects and/or pilot sites. The successful pilot sites e.g. Morocco and Kenya offer potential for impact assessment studies, providing adequate baseline data was collected when they were initiated. The Moroccan site appears to have achieved substantial impact by expanding to other sites, reaching many thousands of farmers, influencing the national research agenda and funding to support the pilot sites, and empowering farmers for spontaneous spread and uptake. The MTP 2007-2009 includes an activity for “*Ex-ante impact assessment for four countries*” under Output 2. This could be captured in 2007 through a specific study. Impact assessment of the Tropical White Fly Project is planned in 2008-2009.

Similarly, a policy analyst consultant could be contracted to assess opportunities where policy guidance materials are especially needed. For example, it is likely that there is a need in the area of protocols for registration of alternatives to synthetic pesticides e.g. biopesticides (Wabule *et al.*, 2004). Initial work on biopesticide registration in West Africa was done by IITA through a DFID Crop Protection Programme study (Cherry, 2004). Such a study would contribute to Output 3. And, based on the feedback from SDC on the need for the SP-IPM to engage with the private sector, efforts could be made to link with relevant companies to develop and deliver IPM Information and Advocacy. This would contribute to Output 4.

Recommendation 14: *It is recommended that priority should be given to impact assessment in those pilot sites where significant achievements appear to have been made e.g. Morocco and Kenya. It is also recommended that - funding permitted – the SP-IPM should initiate actions to ensure that as much as possible is achieved by the programme in 2007 to contribute to future outputs in the MTP 2007-2009 through investment in appropriate activities as outlined above.*

A new rolling MTP for 2008-2010 will be submitted to the Science Council in 2007. Firstly, it is hoped that the timing will allow the critical recommendations made by the CCER and EPMR to be included so that there is initial buy-in and ownership by SP-IPM members and the revival process can proceed rapidly. Secondly, it is essential that any lasting bitterness from the conflict period is not used to reject the concepts embodied in the MTP 2007-2009 because it was not written by the SP-IPM. The team strongly feels that the MTP 2007-2009 effectively captures the concept of *adding-value* to centre and global IPM activities and should be given a chance to be further operationalised.

Recommendation 15: *It is recommended that the SP-IPM accept the MTP 2007-2009 as a rolling MTP during its remaining lifetime, with modifications for specific activities (e.g. a limited number of new R4D themes), as effectively captures the concept of adding-value to centre and global IPM activities.*

Role of and benefits to the Convening Centre IITA

Terms of reference for the Convening Centre IITA were developed during the 2007 Steering Committee meeting. As indicated above, this has strengthened the governance of the SP-IPM. These include:

- Manage the SP-IPM Secretariat/Coordination Unit
- Have fiscal responsibility for SP-IPM funds and provide financial and advocacy support to the SP-IPM
- Represent the SP-IPM within and outside the CG as requested and as needed
- Serve as ex-officio member of the Steering Committee, through its DDG-research
- Manage the SP-IPM MTP project and report performance measures.

Although these roles and responsibilities are not new, formally articulating them for the first time provides IITA and the SP-IPM a good opportunity to discuss how IITA can more effectively support the SP-IPM. The issue of the requirement to report on the delivery of outputs from the SP-IPM through the IITA MTP was discussed above.

After the agreement was made that IITA would continue to host the SP-IPM as the Convening Centre, it was felt timely to reassess the best location of the Coordinator and the Coordination Unit especially as a new Coordinator is being recruited in 2007. Options include any one of IITA's facilities: Ibadan, Nigeria; Cotonou, Benin; Kampala, Uganda or Dar es Salaam, Tanzania as well as Nairobi. The last option, suggested by the former Chair of the Steering Committee, is based on the concentration of CG centres and access to donor representatives. There are advantages and disadvantages of all five options. These need to be discussed in detail by IITA prior to making the decision. As this may affect recruitment, it might be best to resolve this issue before recruiting the new Coordinator.

What are the benefits to IITA in hosting the SP-IPM? Firstly, the SP-IPM provides additional resources (staff and material support) that will potentially be used at times for IITA activities. Secondly, it adds visibility to IITA's profile as a leader in IPM both inside the CG and globally. Thirdly, it gives IITA's crop protection scientists greater credibility both inside the CG and globally. There is a potential disadvantage: any shortfalls in funding may have to be met from IITA's core resources.

Options for pursuing the SP-IPM in future

The review team identified four options regarding the future of the SP-IPM. These include: termination; continuing the SP-IPM under the pre-2005 model; continuing the SP-IPM under the post-2005 concept based on the MTP 2007-2009; and transforming it into a Challenge Programme.

The first option is to terminate the SP-IPM and subsume any on-going projects such as the Tropical Whitefly project within relevant centres. We considered this option as the IITA Board has registered concerns about its future; this led to the commissioning of this CCER. The team feels that much more would be lost than gained through termination of the programme. It is likely that a) IPM visibility in the CG would be reduced which may affect donor support across the CG; b) the credibility of IITA crop protection scientists may be compromised which may also affect donor support for IITA IPM activities; and most importantly, c) the highly prized exchanges among crop protection scientists through the Steering Committee and IIWG meetings would be lost. The only advantage seems to be saving resources that may be used for other activities. However, based on the priority that SDC gives to IPM, it is not likely that the resources could be allocated to other activities, rather they may be re-directed outside the CG.

The second option is to continue the SP-IPM under the pre-2005 model based on themes and task forces. New themes could be developed and prioritised. The SP-IPM would have to revert to an MTP similar to the 2006-2008 model. But this was not well-received by the Science Council. The greatest disadvantage of this option is its poor track record in resource mobilization. The team feels that such a reversion is a backwards step. There is far more to gain for the SP-IPM by considering the third option.

The third option is to accept the MTP 2007-2009 as a new concept with embedded potential to add value to CG IPM activities. The team feels that the current MTP merits a chance to be operationalised at least for its lifetime. This MTP is the first genuine attempt by the SP-IPM to capture added-value to other CG IPM activities and to potentially make a global contribution. The added value is targeted at key bottlenecks especially on methodology. This area is supported by the SDC. In addition, the generic outputs on impact assessment, policy, communication and advocacy allow new areas of work i.e. new themes to be accommodated easily without major changes to the logframe from one year to the next.

The potential to transform the SP-IPM into a Challenge Programme will only become clear after the third option (discussed above) has been given a chance to be proven successful. It is considered premature to further develop this option now. Instead, it is suggested that the SP-IPM seek opportunities to link to existing Challenge Programmes, especially the SSA-CP which has just initiated its implementation phase. SDC is keen to see links made to other CG activities such as research networks, programmes and non-CG activities in the regional programmes that they support.

A sequence of actions

CG partners who attended the 2007 Steering Committee meeting in Nairobi were clearly committed to SP-IPM revival. After consulting the extensive documentation and talking to a wide representation of SP-IPM partners and CG managers, the review team strongly believes that there is an on-going need for the programme and that there is good potential for full revival to a functional system-wide programme in 2008. To achieve this, it will be important to complete all necessary actions required in 2007 based on the recommendations of the CCER and EPMP.

Suggested actions:

- The SP-IPM coordinator should prepare a short report indicating how cross-cutting research on IPM addresses CGIAR System Priorities. This should be presented at the AGM 2007.
- As part of the revival process the SP-IPM, an externally facilitated workshop should be organised in 2007 to discuss the recommendations of the CCER and the EPMP and to effectively operationalize those recommendations on focus, value-addition, substance and process including:
 - a. The size and membership of the Steering Committee and the IIWG
 - b. Potential new members with required skills e.g. IPM policy analysis

- c. Improved research planning and priority-setting processes including necessary capacity building
 - d. Transparent funding allocation to programme activities
 - e. Innovative funding streams
 - f. A phased resource mobilization plan
 - g. An effective internal monitoring and evaluation system including necessary capacity building
 - h. Impact assessment activities in relevant pilot sites
 - i. Accepting and operationalising the MTP 2007-2009
- Further discussion of the best site for the Coordination Unit and the key qualities required by the new Chair and Coordinator prior to their election/recruitment.
 - Include explicit attribution of SP-IPM achievements in all future reporting across all CG centres actively involved in the programme
 - Hold discussions with SDC to clarify priority activities to be implemented by the SP-IPM and future reporting requirements.

REFERENCES

- Alene, A.D., Manyong, V.M. and Coulibaly, O. (2006) Responding to food supply shocks through global partnerships in technology development and transfer: the case of the IITA-led biological control of cassava mealybug in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Outlook on Agriculture* **35** (4), 255-261.
- Anderson, P.K., Cunningham, A.A., Patel, N.G., Morales, F.J., Epstein, P.R. and Daszak, P. (2004) Emerging infectious diseases of plants: pathogen pollution, climate change and agrotechnology drivers. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **19**, 535-544.
- Bale, J.S., Masters, I.D., Hodkinson, C., Awmack, T.M., Bezemer, V.K., Brown, J., Butterfield, A., Buse, J.C. and Coulson, J. (2002) Herbivory in global climate change research: Direct effects of rising temperature on insect herbivores. *Global Change Biology* **8**, 1-16.
- Bevege, I., Eggar, P. and Debela, S. (2006) Meta-Review of CGIAR Systemwide and Ecoregional Programmes.
- Brodesser, J., Byron, D.H., Cannavan, A., Ferris, I.G., Gross-Helmert, K., Hendrichs, J., Maestroni, B.M., Unsworth, J., Vaagt, G. and Zapata, F. (2006) Pesticides in developing countries and the International Code of Conduct on the CGIAR (2005) System Priorities for CGIAR Research 2005-2015. Science Council Secretariat, December 2005.
- CGIAR (2006) Natural resources management research impacts: evidence from the CGIAR. CGIAR Science Council, FAO, Rome.
- Cherry, A. (2004) Pan-African Workshop on biopesticide registration. Pp.93-100, In: Wabule, M. N., Ngaruiya, P. N., Kimmins, F. K. and Silverside, P. J. (2004)

Registration for Biocontrol Agents in Kenya. Proceedings of the Pest Control Products Board/Kenya Agricultural Research Institute/Department for International Development Crop Protection Programme Workshop, Nakuru, Kenya, 14-16 May 2003, KARI/PCPB, Nairobi, Kenya and Natural Resources International Ltd., Aylesford, UK.

Distribution and the Use of Pesticides. Source: <http://www-naweb.iaea.org/nafa/fep/public/2006-AGES-CoC.pdf>

Daszak, P. and Cunningham, A.A. (2003) Anthropogenic change, biodiversity loss and a new agenda for emerging diseases. *Journal of Parasitology* **89**, S37-S41.

Gutierrez, A. P. and Waibel, H. (2002) Review of the CGIAR Systemwide Programme on Integrated Pest Management. CGIAR, FAO, Rome.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2007) Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Summary for Policy Makers. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Kelly, L. (2005) The Global Integrated Pest Management Facility. Addressing Challenges of Globalization: An Independent Evaluation of the World Bank's Approach to Global Programs. Case study, Operations Evaluation Department, World Bank, Washington DC.

Morales, F.J. and Jones, P.G. (2004) The ecology and epidemiology of whitefly-transmitted viruses in Latin America. *Virus Research* **100**, 57-65.

Raitzer, D.A. (2003) Benefit-Cost Meta-Analysis of Investment in the International Agricultural Research Centres of the CGIAR. CGIAR Science Council, FAO, Rome.

Sorbey, K., Fleischer, G. and Pehu, E., (2003) Integrated pest management in Development, Review of Trends and Implementation Strategies. ARD working paper 5, World Bank, Washington DC.

Wabule, M. N., Ngaruiya, P. N., Kimmins, F. K. and Silverside, P. J. (2004) Registration for Biocontrol Agents in Kenya. Proceedings of the Pest Control Products Board/Kenya Agricultural Research Institute/Department for International Development Crop Protection Programme Workshop, Nakuru, Kenya, 14-16 May 2003, KARI/PCPB, Nairobi, Kenya and Natural Resources International Ltd., Aylesford, UK.

Annex 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs) FOR CCER ON SP-IPM

1. Review the history of the SP-IPM, its current organization, research plan vis-a-vis expected outcomes.

2. Consult with Steering Committee members, SP-IPM Program Scientists, involved institutions, donors, and other stakeholders on:
 - a. Programme substance and research priorities (including monitoring and evaluation measures),
 - b. The need for the SP-IPM programme
 - c. Value added to the Centers involved and the CGIAR system
 - d. Governance, management and/or operational responsibilities and mechanisms
 - e. Options for pursuing the programme in the future, presenting pros/cons.

3. Present a report to IITA Board and Management with conclusions and recommendations on:
 - a. The validity of the programme
 - b. Responsibilities for governance, management and implementation
 - c. Mechanisms for governance, management and implementation
 - d. The role of IITA in the programme and governance
 - e. Options (with pros/cons)
 - f. A sequence of actions.

Annex 2

SP-IPM DOCUMENTS CONSULTED BY THE REVIEW TEAM

James, B. et al. (2003). Bridging the gap with the CGIAR Systemwide on Integrated Pest Management Project, In: “Integrated Pest Management in the Global Arena”, CABI Publications, UK

IITA (2006). Integrated Pest Management: Towards 2015. A business plan.

IITA (2006). Research for Development Strategy: Towards 2015.

SP-IPM (2004) Minutes of the Inter-Institutional Working Group Meeting, CIMMYT, Mexico, 23-26 February, 2004

SP-IPM (2003) Minutes of the Inter-Institutional Working Group Meeting, AVRDC, Taiwan, 2-6 March, 2003

SP-IPM (2002) Minutes of the Inter-Institutional Working Group Meeting, Quito, Ecuador, 3-6 April, 2002

SP-IPM (2001) Minutes of the Inter-Institutional Working Group Meeting, ICIPE, Nairobi, Kenya, 8-14 March, 2001

SP-IPM (2007) Minutes of the Steering Committee Meeting, Nairobi, Kenya, 26-27 February, 2007

SP-IPM (2005) Rolling MTP 2006-2008

SP-IPM (2006) Rolling MTP 2007-2009

Africa-wide IPM Partnership Workshop (2002) Towards effective implementation of Parasitic Weed IPM in cereal-legume cropping systems in Africa, IITA Benin, October, 2002.

SP-IPM. Better lives from healthy soils: Integrated pest management in soil agro-ecosystems

SP-IPM (2001) Capitalising on experiences in farmer participatory research and learning for Integrated Pest Management, September 2001

SP-IPM (2001) Report from a Workshop on Assessing the Impact of Participatory Research and Extension Methods in IPM, Nairobi, March 2001

NFDP Phase II. National Fadama Development Project. A Pest Management Plan

Annex 3

PERSONS CONSULTED BY THE REVIEW TEAM

<i>Person</i>	<i>Designation/Organisation</i>	<i>Contact details</i>
Dr Paula Bramel	Deputy Director General (Research), IITA	p.bramel@cgiar.org
Dr Braima James	SP-IPM Coordinator	b.james@cgiar.org
Dr Henri Maraite	IITA Board of Trustees	marait@fymy.ucl.ac.be
Dr Robert S. Zeigler	Director General, IRRI	r.s.zeigler@cgiar.org
Dr Ren Wang	Deputy Director General (Research), IRRI	r.wang@cgiar.org
Dr Pamela Anderson	Director General, CIP	p.anderson@cgiar.org
Dr Aziz Lagnaoui	IPM specialist, World Bank	alagnaoui@worldbank.org
Ms Eva Erisgen	Crop Life International	
Ms. Katharina Jenny	Senior Advisor, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	katharina.jenny@deza.admin.ch
Ms Marina Puccioni	Ministero Affari Esteri, Italy	puccioni@iao.florence.it
Mr K. Magara	Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya	z.magara@yahoo.com
Dr Saadia Lhaloui	INRA-CRRA, Morocco	Lhaloui@hotmail.com , slhaloui@yahoo.com
Dr Francisco Morales	Coordinator, Tropical Whitefly Project, CIAT, Colombia	f.morales@cgiar.org
Dr Danny Coyne	Nematologist, IITA, Kampala	d.coyne@cgiar.org
Dr Kong Luen Heong	Entomologist, IRRI, Philippines	k.heong@cgiar.org
Dr Segenet Kelemu	Plant Pathologist, CIAT, Colombia	s.kelemu@cgiar.org
Dr Jürgen Kroschel	IPM specialist, CIP, Peru	j.kroschel@cgiar.org
Dr Julie Nicol	Nematologist, CIMMYT, Mexico	j.nicol@cgiar.org
Dr James Legg	Entomologist, IITA, Mikochene	j.legg@cgiar.org
Dr Frances Nwilene	Entomologist, WARDA, Ibadan	f.nwilene@cgiar.org
Dr Hari Sharma	Entomologist, ICRISAT, India	h.sharma@cgiar.org
Dr Aziz Lagnaoui	Senior IPM Policy Advisor, World Bank, USA	alagnaoui@worldbank.org
Dr Kai Sonder	GIS specialist, IITA, Ibadan	c.sonder@cgiar.org
Dr Charles Staver	Bioversity International, Italy	c.staver@cgiar.org
Dr Manu Tamo	Entomologist, IITA, Cotonou	m.tamo@cgiar.org
Dr Amor Yahyaoui	Entomologist, ICARDA, Syria	a.yahyaoui@cgiar.org
Dr Jaw-Fen Wang	AVRDC, Taiwan	jfw@netra.avrdc.org.tw
Dr Bernhard Löhr	Entomologist, ICIPE, Kenya	blohr@icipe.org
E. A. Heinrichs	Secretary General, IAPPS, USA	ehinric@vt.edu

Annex 4

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE GOVERNANCE AND OPERATIONAL ARMS OF THE SP-IPM

Structure/Position	Terms of Reference
Convening center	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manage SP-IPM Secretariat/Coordination Unit. 2. Have fiscal responsibility for SP-IPM funds; provide financial and advocacy support to SP-IPM and approve SP-IPM income and expenditure statements. 3. Represent SP-IPM within and outside the CGIAR as requested and as needed. 4. Serve as <i>Ex-Officio</i> member of the Steering Committee, through its DDG-Research. 5. Manage SP-IPM MTP project and report for performance measurements.
Board of Trustees (BOT) of the SP-IPM Convening Center	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall responsibility for SP-IPM. 2. Approve SP-IPM MTP project. 3. Provide financial oversight and advocacy support to SP-IPM. 4. Approve (review) changes to SP-IPM mission, policy and TORs.
Steering Committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nominate and elect the Chair. 2. Recruit the SP-IPM coordinator for appointment by the convening center. 3. Evaluate Coordinator performance and forward report to Convening Center. 4. Approve annual workplan for coordination unit. 5. Propose and approve new members of the Steering Committee (CGIAR centers only) and IIWG (external partners). 6. Approve new thematic groups (e.g., as would be proposed by the IIWG) in line with the MTP of the SP-IPM and to show clear functional linkages with MTPs of participating CGIAR Centers. 7. Approve SP-IPM workplans and budget prepared by the Coordinator. 8. Evaluate thematic group activities to assure quality and delivery of MTP of SP-IPM and participating centers. 9. Recommend SP-IPM mission and policy statements for approval by BOT of Convening Center. 10. Recommend SP-IPM terms of reference for various categories of structures and officials for approval by BOT of Convening Center.
Chair, Steering Committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promote SP-IPM within and outside CGIAR system. 2. Provide overall leadership of the SP-IPM. 3. Promote collaborative links within the SP-IPM and with other allied organisations. 4. Chair and assist with organization of IIWG and Steering Committee meetings. 5. Support coordinator for fund raising, advocacy and public relations.
Program Coordinator	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Serve as the contact point to catalyse and facilitate approved activities, mobilize and disseminate technical and material resources, and facilitate communication between IIWG members and with other stakeholder groups. 2. Develop information and publicity materials in collaboration with members of the IIWG, and manage the SP-IPM website. 3. Serve as Secretary to the SC to prepare the agenda for IIWG and Steering Committee meetings in consultation with the Chair of the SC,

- and organize IIWG and Steering Committee meetings.
4. Prepare and distribute bi-annual progress reports, technical reports to the donors, and reports of IIWG and Steering Committee meetings, and keep the minutes of Steering Committee business meetings.
 5. Take the lead role to generate and facilitate responses to funding opportunities, include gather information on donor interest.
 6. Prepare SP-IPM workplan and budget for approval by the Steering Committee.
 7. Manage workplan and budget as approved by the Steering Committee, and prepare the annual financial report in consultation with the Chair for submission to the Steering Committee.
 8. Coordinate the development of SP-IPM MTP to assure links with individual Centers MTPs.
 9. Reporting on the SP-IPM MTP to the Convening Center.
 10. Report to the DDG of Convening Center and Chair.
 11. Organize external evaluation of the program with the Chair and Convening Center.
-