

DDD/TAG:IAR/77/29

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Eighteenth Meeting, Rome, Italy, 14 - 21 February, 1978

THE QUINQUENNIAL REVIEW PROCESS

(NOTE BY THE TAC SECRETARIAT)

(Agenda Item 6)

TAC SECRETARIAT

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

ROME 1977

W/18724

THE QUINQUENNIAL REVIEW PROCESS

(Summary of Contents)

The attached note was prepared by the Secretariat in response to a request from the Committee and the CGIAR to examine past experience in quinquennial reviews and make proposals for their improvement in the light of comments received from TAC and CG members on earlier reviews.

The note covers the following points:

- (i) the objectives and scope of the review process as defined by the Bell Subcommittee report in 1973-74 and TAC (Section II, paras 4-10);
- (ii) the review process as determined by TAC at its 18th Meeting (Section III, paras 11-15);
- (iii) the implementation of the review procedures and the views of the CGIAR Review Committee thereon (Section IV, paras 16-21);
- (iv) the views of the CGIAR on past quinquennial reviews as expressed at the September and November 1977 meetings (Section V, paras 22-27);
- (v) Proposals for revised terms of reference and guidelines for quinquennial reviews (Section VI, para 28).

The following annexes are appended:

- ✓ Annex I — The original terms of reference for quinquennial reviews.
- ✓ Annex II — Recommendations from the CGIAR Review Committee relevant to quinquennial reviews.
- Annex III — Draft of revised terms of reference for quinquennial reviews.
- Annex IV — Draft guidelines for future quinquennial reviews.

The attention of the Committee is invited in particular to the views of the CGIAR on quinquennial reviews (Section V) and to Annexes III and IV.

THE QUINQUENNIAL REVIEW PROCESS

(Note by the TAC Secretariat)

I INTRODUCTION

1. One of the originally stated objectives of the CGIAR is "to review the financial and other requirements of those international and regional research activities which the Group considers of high priority and to consider the provision of finance for those activities,etc.". In this task it is to be assisted by its Technical Advisory Committee which was given a mandate to "advise the Consultative Group on the effectiveness of specific existing international research programmes".
2. During the first year of operations of the CGIAR (1971 - 72) this review task was undertaken by regular officers of the World Bank and FAO who submitted reports on three of the then existing four centres to the Centres Week/CGIAR meeting in July 1972. The reports did not follow a standard format and Centre Directors, TAC and CGIAR members felt that some form of standardized review was required, at least for the annual budgetary reviews of centres' programmes and probably over the long-term as well.
3. To this end the Secretariat prepared a discussion paper for the November 1972 meeting of the Consultative Group. This made suggestions on procedures for handling both annual programme and budget reviews and periodic reviews. The Group decided that its members should participate more directly in the establishment of a review process and that both they and TAC should consult with Centre Directors on the composition and role of review panels. The CGIAR finally resolved to implement the proposals of its Secretariat to establish a review team of two to conduct the annual reviews, on a one year's trial basis. Following this period the Group again indicated that it was not totally satisfied and in mid-1973 set up its own Review Subcommittee under the Chairmanship of Mr. David Bell of the Ford Foundation.

II OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

4. The Bell Subcommittee Report was first presented to the CGIAR meeting in November 1973. Following a number of revisions, which reflected the discussions at that meeting, the final report was accepted with the recognition that the review procedures proposed would probably require revision after a year or two of experience.
5. The Report stated the objectives of centres' reviews as follows:
"Requirements
 - 1) With respect to the current and prospective work of each agricultural centre (or CG-endorsed activity), the members of the CG need:

- a. Accurate, current information on the programmes of the centre, in a form which permits non-scientists to understand the objectives and significance of the programmes, the progress that has been achieved and is anticipated, and the costs of each programme;
- b. Assurance from reliable external reviewers that the scientific and technical aspects of the centres' work, both current and prospective, are soundly based; and
- c. Assurance from reliable external reviewers that funds made available to the centre are being used for the purposes intended and with reasonable efficiency, that its future^{1/} budget proposals are a prudent financial expression of well-planned programmes, and that current and projected^{1/} expenditure patterns reflect the stated programme priorities.

- 2) With respect to the system of centres to which the CG contributed financial support (the word system is used here to mean the centres as a group and their relations to each other and to the national agricultural programmes which they serve), the members of the CG need, in addition to material concerning each centre, analytical information placing the present and proposed work of each centre in context of the system as a whole, setting forth forward estimates of financial requirements and availabilities, and identifying issues and alternatives for consideration."

6. Following the terms of reference of this Subcommittee, these objectives spell out the total requirements of the CGIAR and include that information sought annually on behalf of the donors.

7. The specific recommendations of the Subcommittee with regard to the continuing monitoring of programme changes at the IARCs and the periodic reviews required, were as follows:

- 1) "The CG needs an independent assessment of any major change proposed in the research programme of any centre, in the year in which the change is proposed."
- 2) "The CG looks to the TAC to provide recommendations on such a proposal, and the TAC's review can normally be accomplished by assigning one or more of its members or consultants to visit the centre, quite possibly in conjunction with some stage of the centre's own consideration of the proposal. If a more elaborate review process is desired by the TAC, that can be laid on to fit the circumstances of a particular case.

^{1/} Secretariat underlining

"We recommend that the TAC establish a regular procedure for reviewing major changes proposed by any centre in its annual programme budget, this procedure to include advance notification by the centre to TAC, visits (if necessary) to the centre on TAC's behalf, and any other steps deemed necessary by TAC to permit it to make sound recommendations to the CG."

- 3) "The CG also needs periodic independent external assessments of the overall scientific quality and effectiveness of each centre, and of the continuing need for its work, with special emphasis on the need to ensure that activities are not continued longer than necessary, and that activities of lower priority are replaced by those of higher priority. Such assessments are not appropriate on an annual basis, but should be scheduled no less frequently than every five years. Such assessments are equally needed by the centres themselves, and it is the practice of the centres to organize them (sometimes separately for major segments of the research programme, rather than for a centre as a whole). The CG looks to the TAC to assure that such periodic external assessments are made; it would seem feasible for the TAC to meet its responsibilities in most cases by (1) assuring itself that the centre's own assessment process is adequate, and (2) participating in the centre's assessment process by mutual agreement with the centre's Director. If the TAC considers it necessary, it can lay on a special assessment process separate from that organized by the centre for its own purposes.

"We recommend that (1) the TAC and the centres develop an agreed forward schedule and agreed standards and methods for conducting such periodic external scientific assessments; (2) the TAC adopt a regular procedure for participating in such assessments, reviewing their results, making any independent assessments it may consider necessary, and reporting its judgments to the CG.

"We recognize that meeting these requirements will place increased demands on the TAC in terms of professional talent, time, and resources."

8. The comments which follow are restricted to the requirements of this working paper on the quinquennial review process as there now appears to be general satisfaction with the current style of both the annual programme reviews (e.g. "commentaries" by the Secretariat), and the annual 'overview' in the form of the 'Integrative Paper'. These have gradually improved over the years and now give somewhat greater emphasis to technical aspects of programming.

9. The terms of reference for quinquennial reviews were subsequently elaborated by the TAC at its 8th Meeting in July 1974, in consultation with the centre Directors and on the basis of the Subcommittee Report (See Annex I). TAC and the Directors recog-

nized the potential value of the reviews to the centres themselves in the forward planning of their programmes and in ensuring the validity of the research priorities recognized by their Boards vis à vis the priorities as seen by TAC and endorsed by the CGIAR.

10. The finalized Terms of Reference were believed to be sufficiently broad to cover the totality of the IARC system and yet, at the same time, sufficiently precise to avoid equivocation in interpretation. They include reference to the needs of the recipients of the results of the IARC's work and the need to assess the impact of the centre under review on national research and production in the cooperating countries.

III THE REVIEW PROCESS

11. Details of the organization of the Review Teams and the scheduling of reviews were also discussed with the centre Directors at the 8th meeting of TAC. There was general agreement with the Bell Subcommittee proposal that the reviews should be conducted not less frequently than quinquennially; that the teams should be composed of both TAC members and outside consultants; that the centre Boards and Directors would be invited to submit names of candidates to be included in the team and there would be full consultation with the centre so as to arrive at a final composition of the team acceptable to both the centre and TAC. It was also recognized that the review teams would need to be composed of both subject matter specialists and generalists, the latter being more concerned with administration, management, etc., than the true research programme, and it was agreed that the TAC Secretariat should provide the Secretariat of the Review Teams.

12. Regarding the timing of the quinquennial reviews the centre Directors were unanimous that these should be handled independently of any other review process such as the annual 'in-house' reviews or the periodic donors reviews. Even though this might place an additional burden on the staff, in terms of preparation, the objectives of the several types of review were felt to be sufficiently diverse to warrant their separate handling.

13. The firm hope was expressed that once the review process became satisfactorily established the donor members of the CGIAR would be prepared to accept the Quinquennial Review Reports in lieu of any special review of their own, thus freeing the centres from a plethora of reviews.

14. The duration of missions was also discussed and although many participants in the meeting felt that one month would be required, especially in view of the need to examine outreach programmes, doubts were expressed that the calibre of people anticipated as constituting the Teams would be able to free themselves from other duties for more than 3 weeks at a time.

15. The report of this TAC meeting, including the proposals for the conduct of quinquennial reviews, was subsequently endorsed by the CGIAR.

IV IMPLEMENTATION

16. The selection of teams has followed the criteria laid down with the centre Directors, mutual agreement having been reached in each case without any pressure from either party to the arrangements.

17. Local programmes have been efficiently handled by the centre concerned whilst travel, per diem and honoraria have been handled by the TAC Secretariat.

18. The schedule arrived at with the centre Directors in July 1974 has been fairly closely followed. Review Missions visited IRRI in November/December 1975, CIMMYT in March/April 1976, CIP in November/December 1976, CIAT in March/April 1977, and IITA in October/November 1977. In the cases of IRRI, CIP and IITA, outreach activities were visited immediately prior to the headquarters (and in the case of IITA one visit was made several months in advance to ensure crops being in the ground), and in the case of CIMMYT both during and subsequent to the headquarters visit.

19. In view of the diversity of commodities and systems covered by the research of the centres, each individual review to date has been assisted by the compilation of specific questions to augment its terms of reference. These have been compiled from TAC discussions, indications of donors' special requirements, wishes of the centres themselves for outside examination of particular aspects. Wherever possible, the views of the recipients (or at least their representatives) in the producer countries have been sought in addition -- normally during the reviews of outreach activities.

20. Subsequent to the first two reviews at IRRI and CIMMYT, the CGIAR Review Committee endorsed the major role of TAC in reviewing both new initiatives and on-going programmes of the centres, regardless of source of funds. The quinquennial review process was referred to in the following comments of the Review Committee:

"The quinquennial reviews initiated this past year show much promise. With experience it may be appropriate to sharpen the definitions of the purpose of the reviews. The reviews should be concerned with three principal tasks: (1) to evaluate the scientific quality of current programmes, (2) to comment on the scope and balance of current programmes, and (3) to evaluate future plans including the explicit review of centre proposals to continue projects of long standing. Clearly, the onus should be on centres to justify continuance. This latter function of reviewing future plans is particularly important for TAC and the CGIAR. The quinquennial reviews should be planned well in advance, giving the TAC time to establish a high quality review committee which can be briefed well in advance and allow centres time to carefully develop their long-range future plans. The reviews should be analytic and probing in their treatment of programmes, particularly regarding the relative distribution of efforts within

centre programmes . A concise summary of the report should be prepared for the CGIAR. To date, reviews have tended to focus on current programmes and generally have recommended more of everything. In addition to these main areas of investigation, common to all centres, specific questions for review could be posed by TAC, the CGIAR, or individual donors." ^{1/}

21. Recommendations 5 through 10, 15 and 18 of the Review Committee Report (see Annex II), reflect the views of that committee, with respect to review of a centre's total programme, its programme balance, its cooperative programmes, etc., and constitute a sound set of additional guidelines for quinquennial review teams. Specific questions, common to several centres, are already coming under review through the already adopted 'stripe review' process.

V VIEWS OF THE CGIAR ON PAST QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS

22. Despite the care which has been taken by the TAC, by the centres themselves, and by the review teams and their leaders to ensure that the requirements outlined above and augmented as described, have been properly met, the Co-Sponsors and Secretariats have been made aware of a certain sense of dissatisfaction with the results of the reviews to date. This has not been caused by any overt criticism of review reports nor by difficulties or opposition on the part of the TAC or CGIAR over their adoption. Perhaps indeed the opposite would be true. A generally non-committal acceptance is perhaps more responsible for the dissatisfaction than outright opposition would be.

23. At the last two meetings of the CGIAR (14-16 September 1977, Washington and 16-17 November 1977, Paris) a general discussion took place on the quinquennial review process with a view to providing TAC with the CGIAR's comments and suggestions in anticipation of TAC consideration of the matter at its 18th Meeting.

24. At the September meeting of the CGIAR, Centre Directors expressed their opinions on the quinquennial reviews as follows^{2/}:

"The Directors felt that quinquennial reviews done so far had served useful functions both in the reports themselves and in the preparatory activities and in the discussions and exchanges of views that took place. Centres recognized the need to define objectives, strategies and tactics, and quinquennial reviews stimulated such activities. Centres recognized the value of constructive criticism. They also recognized the primacy of each centre's Board in reviewing programme and ensuring proper balance. When Boards had been actively engaged in this, it was not surprising that the TAC Review Panels found themselves in general agreement. Centres were in active dialogue with TAC to explore means of improving the ability of future reviews to detect weaknesses and recommend improvements."

25. The issues raised by the CGIAR at this meeting were compiled by the CG Secretariat in a document which was presented for further discussion at its next

^{1/} Report of the Review Committee, page 97.

^{2/} Extract from the informal summary of proceedings, para 102, September 1977

meeting in November 1977.^{1/} The main points raised in this paper are as follows:

"The basic issue addressed by the Group in September... relates to the primary objective and focus on the quinquennial reviews themselves.. At the September meeting opinion was divided between those who felt the reviews should continue to concentrate essentially on the scientific quality of a centre's research programme and those who felt the emphasis should be on the broader aspects of research — the objectives, strategies and balance of the research programme (.....)"

... "Both the report of the Bell Subcommittee and TAC's quinquennial review terms of reference make clear that a principal purpose of the review is to make an external assessment of the scientific quality of the programme of the centre, but both also expect the review panel to examine the centre's objectives in the light of its mandate, its strategy for achieving that strategy. Neither, however, gives clear guidance on whether the emphasis of the panel's assessment should be on scientific quality or on the broader questions of objectives, strategy and balance. During the September discussion members of the Group seemed to agree that the four panels which had reported so far had addressed themselves primarily to an assessment of scientific quality and only secondarily to the broader questions, but they differed on what the respective weight to be given to these two aspects should be."

"A related point is the requirement for a review of the future plans of a centre. The need for such a review is implicit in the report of the Bell Subcommittee and somewhat more explicit in the terms of reference for quinquennial reviews. The CGIAR Review Committee, moreover, particularly drew attention to the need 'to evaluate future plans, including the explicit review of centre proposals to continue projects of long standing' and recommended that the centres develop a longer-term perspective, which would be reviewed by TAC. In most cases, however, the quinquennial review panels have been hampered in carrying out this task for lack of explicit forward planning by the centres reviewed, though CIAT's preparations for its review marked a clear step forward. In adopting the recommendations of the Bell Subcommittee and the CGIAR Review Committee, the Group is already on record as to the need for forward planning by the centers and the periodic review of their plans, a responsibility placed on TAC."...

... " It is evident from the September discussion that members of the Group are also concerned about the balance among the programmes of the different centres, and whether the resources devoted to their respective research activities are appropriate... it would be difficult for an individual quinquennial review panel to undertake to answer them. The findings of a review panel about a particular centre would be a useful input to consideration of these broader questions, but an individual review panel could hardly become well enough informed about the system as a whole and the issues involved to make recommendations on inter-centre balance and the allocation of resources among centres."

... "The particular emphasis given to reviews will affect their conduct. The Bell Subcommittee suggested various ways in which reviews could

^{1/} CG Secretariat document entitled "Quinquennial Reviews of the Programmes of the Centres", October 26, 1977.

be conducted (including participation in a centre's own reviews) and TAC may wish to consider whether the particular way it has selected adequately meets all purposes. The standard terms of reference for review panels may need recasting to reflect the outcome of discussions on emphasis..."

..."During the discussion in September the point was made that questions on strategy, balance and future planning were policy matters which were very much the concern of the board of trustees of a centre as well as its management. This raises the more general question of what, in conducting a review, should be the appropriate relationship between TAC (and the review mission mounted by it) and a centre's board."

..."A review has two audiences — the Group and the centre itself. On scientific quality, for example, the Group may wish TAC's assurances that the centre's standards are high without having a report in depth on its individual programmes even though the deeper treatment might be very useful to the centre's scientists. Policy matters such as strategy, balance, and forward planning may, on the other hand, be of particular concern to the Group. TAC will wish to consider what is the optimal way in which to carry out a review which will satisfy the needs of both the Group and the centre itself and which will serve to supplement or be a substitute for the external reviews which a centre would itself be mounting. To deal with the separate audiences perhaps a report in two parts — one addressing scientific quality and the other policy and organizational questions — would be a useful innovation. But, however the report is organized, it should discuss frankly any questions, issues and shortcomings of significance to the Group on the one hand and the board and management of the centre on the other."

26. In addition to this CG Secretariat paper, extracts of which have been given above, the TAC Secretariat had submitted for information of and comments by the Consultative Group a preliminary document which gave the background of quinquennial reviews as presented in sections 1,2 and 3 above and made a number of more detailed suggestions on how to improve the quinquennial review process. These suggestions are not reproduced here since it was felt more appropriate to present here the views of the CGIAR itself as expressed at the November meeting and then go one step further forward by presenting draft-revised terms of reference and guidelines for the reviews, which would reflect these views.

27. At the November meeting, CGIAR reiterated most of the points which are summarized above and the Chairman drew the following conclusions^{1/} from the discussions:

"Reviews had to satisfy a variety of interests. On the donor side, there was a distinction between scientists and administrators. The importance of full involvement by Boards of Trustees had been stressed, but this should not interfere with the Boards' responsibilities. As to the conduct of reviews, the Group should consider whether to have a small advance party, as suggested by the CIAT panel. Also, whether panel members should increasingly be drawn from a common pool. Whilst there was no question that reviews should continue to focus on scientific quality, many speakers sought study of objectives or balance, and of forward planning. TAC would now prepare specific recommendations and the matter would be on the agenda of the next Consultative Group meeting."

^{1/} Extract from the draft Summary of Proceedings, page 15, para 1, November 1977

VI PROPOSALS FOR REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE AND GUIDELINES FOR QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS

28. The most practical way of finding out whether the quinquennial review process should be changed in concrete terms is for TAC/CGIAR and the centres to consider the need for amendments to the terms of reference and to reach an agreement on a set of guidelines for the preparation and conduct of these reviews.

1) The need for a revision of the terms of reference.

The existing terms of reference actually include all the points which the CGIAR felt reviews should cover. A revision is mostly needed for changing not the contents of these terms of reference but the relative emphasis of the different tasks entrusted to the Review Panels. In so doing some aspects of the review may be made more explicit.

In line with the suggestions made by the CGIAR as indicated in Section V above the tasks entrusted to the Review Panels may be regrouped under two main headings:

- a) the relevance, scope, objectives of the present programme of the centre and of its forward plans.
- b) the content of the centre's programme and the quality, efficiency and usefulness of its work.

Under the first heading the review would deal with the mandate of the centre and its interpretation. It would also discuss the rationale for the present and future priorities and for the policy, strategy and procedures adopted by the centre. It would also address the question of the relationships with other centres and other national and international institutions.

Under the second heading, the review would assess the results and impact of the activities of the centre and discuss the present programmes individually, both from the scientific and technical point of view and from the point of view of resource needs and management.

The final output expected from the review could remain the same as stated by the original terms of reference, e.g. "to report to the Chairman of TAC its views for any changes in the basic objectives or orientation of the centre programme elements^{1/} and on means of improving the efficiency of operations and ... make proposals for overcoming any constraints identified..."

Draft-revised terms of reference are submitted for consideration by the Committee in Annex IV.

^{1/} This word ("elements") could be deleted so as to avoid the present over-emphasis on the consideration of individual components.

2) Proposed guidelines for the quinquennial reviews.

The experience gained from the quinquennial reviews of IRRI, CIMMYT, CIP, CIAT and IITA should enable TAC to formulate guidelines for future reviews. The guidelines proposed by the Secretariat in Annex IV are tentative, and should be amended and elaborated by the Technical Advisory Committee. These guidelines take into account the comments received from TAC and the CGIAR on earlier reviews, those of the centres themselves, and of the Chairmen of preceding Review Panels. It is suggested that a second draft of these guidelines be prepared during the 18th Meeting on the basis of comments received from TAC members. This second draft could then be submitted for comment to the Centre Directors, and a final draft could be considered jointly by TAC and the Centre Directors at the 19th Meeting.

TAC QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS OF THE INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The major objective of such missions has been defined by TAC in agreement with the Directors of the International Centres as follows:

"on behalf of the Consultative Group, to assess the quality and value of the scientific programmes of the Centres in order to assure the Consultative Group members that the operations being funded are being carried out in line with declared policies and to the full international standard expected."

It is hoped that the review will inter alia assist the International Centres themselves in planning their programmes and ensuring the validity of the research priorities recognized by the Boards of the Centres.

In pursuance of the main objective, defined above, the Mission is requested to give particular attention to the following aspects of the Work of the Centre:

- (i) the results of past research and training programmes at the Centre and the use to which the results have been (or are planned to be) put;
- (ii) the relevance, scope, content and objectives of the present and planned programmes of research at the Centre in relation to (a) the broad mandate of the Centre, and (b) the immediate and long-term needs for increased food supplies globally, and to advise on the future composition and balance of the programme of research;
- (iii) the current conference and training programmes being undertaken or planned by the Centre and the factors affecting the use of trainees by the recipient countries once their training has been completed;
- (iv) the effectiveness of the work conducted under the information service and outreach programmes of the Centre, and its impact on recipient countries;
- (v) the expenditures of the Centre in relation to the quantity, nature and quality of its research and training programmes;
- (vi) the adequacy of the resources available to implement the programmes of research and training recommended above;
- (vii) the constraints which may be hindering the achievement of the Centre's objectives, and possible means of reducing or eliminating such constraints;
- (viii) the effectiveness of coordination of activities at the Centre, both in respect of internal consistency and balance of programme elements, and in particular with reference to its linkages with other national and international organizations;
- (ix) any other specific question which concerned members of the CGIAR may request TAC to examine.

On the basis of its review, the Mission will report to the Chairman of TAC its views on the need for any changes in the basic objectives or orientation of the Centre's programme elements, and on means of improving the efficiency of operations, and will make proposals for overcoming any constraints identified under item (vii). While the Mission should feel free to make any observations or recommendations it wishes, it must be clearly understood that the Mission cannot commit the sponsoring organization, viz., the CGIAR/TAC.

EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Recommendation 5: We recommend that all projects undertaken by a centre be regarded as components of its total integrated programme regardless of sources of funds and that the entire programme be subject to the review procedure as outlined in this report.

Recommendation 6: We recommend that each centre develop an objective set of criteria for programme choice and periodically reassess the balance of its programme with respect to: (1) research and technology development, (2) training, (3) cooperation with national programmes and advanced research institutions, and (4) communication and exchange of information between centre scientists and others in related fields.

Recommendation 7: We recommend that centres continue to develop and strengthen their cooperation with national programmes, insofar as this is essential to accomplish their research mandate. Beyond this centres should remain alert and responsive to additional opportunities for cooperation to the extent that extra-core funds are available, that these activities do not compromise or distort the central research mission of the centre and that they are within the centres' capacity to staff and manage.

Recommendation 8: We recommend that all support to a centre other than that provided through the CGIAR be classified as extra-core funding. Further, we recommend that these funds be used to supplement activities supported by core funds and/or to finance activities that the centre may wish to undertake primarily to benefit a particular country.

Recommendation 9: We recommend that any proposal for a new project to be supported by extra-core funds should be forwarded by the centre to TAC for review when (1) there is a question as to whether the purpose of the activity lies within the centre's mandate, (2) acceptance has implications for future core support, (3) the proposed activity might put undue additional strain on centre management, or (4) the extra-core funding is particularly large.

Recommendation 10: We recommend that all centres develop more effective forward research programme planning procedures and include as advisors international scientists with competence in the appropriate areas.

Recommendation 15: We recommend continuation of the TAC quinquennial reviews for evaluation of scientific quality, scope, and balance of current programmes, and to evaluate future plans, including explicit review of centre proposals to continue projects of long standing. We also recommend that the TAC give greater emphasis to periodic, across centre analysis of particular topics (stripe analysis).

Recommendation 18: We recommend that the desired size and indicative plan proposals from centres be reviewed by TAC. TAC should make appropriate recommendations to the CGIAR, after the discussion of any proposed adjustments with the centres. The CGIAR approved plans would then form the guidelines for the preparation of the centre's next biennial budget. Until this process is in operation, centres should recognize that proposals for budget increases will be reviewed very carefully in the spirit of our recommended period of consolidation.

TAC QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS OF THE INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES

DRAFT REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) has charged its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) with the conduct of quinquennial reviews of the value and effectiveness of the International Agricultural Research Institutes, Centres and Programmes which derive their financial support from the members of the CGIAR. It was agreed by TAC at its Meeting held in that the work of the should be reviewed by TAC in 19.. The present Review Mission is being organized in accordance with that decision.

Scope and Purpose of the Review

The major objective of such missions has been defined by TAC in agreement with the Directors of the International Centres, and accepted by the CGIAR, as follows:

"on behalf of the Consultative Group, to assess the quality and value of the scientific programmes of the Centres in order to assure the Consultative Group members that the operations being funded are being carried out in line with declared policies and to the full international standard expected."

It is hoped that the review will inter alia assist the International Centres themselves in planning their programmes and ensuring the validity of the research priorities recognized by the Boards of the Centres.

In pursuance of the main objective, defined above, the Mission is requested to give particular attention to the following aspects:

- (i) The relevance, scope and objectives of the present programme of work and budget of the Centre and of its forward plans for the next five years in relation to:
 - a) the immediate and long term needs for increased food supply (and improved human welfare) in developing countries;
 - b) the mandate of the Centre and its own interpretation thereof;
 - c) the mandate and programmes of other related national and international institutes and organizations;

- d) the policy, strategy and procedures adopted by the Centre in carrying out its mandate, and the mechanisms for their formulation;
 - e) the Centre's priorities and the rationale for the present and future overall size, composition and balance of the programme in the fields of research, training, information exchange and related cooperative activities.
- (ii) The content of the Centre's programme, and the quality, efficiency and usefulness of the work of the Centre with particular reference to:
- a) the results of past research and training programmes at the Centre and the use to which the results have been put (or are expected to be put);
 - b) the current and planned research, information exchange and training programmes, their methodologies and the role of the scientific disciplines therein;
 - c) the adequacy of the research support and other facilities;
 - d) the present and potential impact of the work conducted under the information services and outreach programmes of the Centre on cooperating countries and their feedback to these and other programmes of the Centre;
 - e) the management of the Centre; the coordination of its activities, both in respect of achieving internal consistency and balance of programme elements and effective cooperation with basic research and education institutions, national research and development programmes and other international institutes and organizations.
 - f) the constraints which may be hindering the achievement of the Centre's objectives and the implementation of its programmes, and possible means of reducing or eliminating such constraints;
- (iii) Any specific questions which concerned members of the CGIAR, cooperating institutions, the Centre Director or its Board of Trustees may request TAC to examine.

On the basis of its review, the Mission will report to the Chairman of TAC its views on the need for any changes in the basic objectives or orientation of the Centre's programme elements, and on means of improving the efficiency of operations, and will make proposals for overcoming any constraints identified under item (ii).

While the Mission should feel free to make any observations or recommendations it wishes, it must be clearly understood that the Mission cannot commit the sponsoring organization, viz., the CGIAR/TAC.

DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE QUINQUENNIAL REVIEWS

The experience gained from the quinquennial reviews of IRRI, CIMMYT, CIP, CIAT and ITTA should enable TAC to formulate guidelines for future reviews. The guidelines proposed below by the Secretariat are tentative, and should be amended and elaborated by the Technical Advisory Committee. These guidelines take into account the comments received from TAC and the CGIAR on earlier reviews, those of the Centres themselves, and of the Chairmen of preceding Review Panels. It is suggested that a second draft of these guidelines be prepared during the 18th Meeting on the basis of comments received from TAC members. This second draft could then be submitted for comment to the Centre Directors, and a final draft could be considered jointly by TAC and the Centre Directors at the 19th Meeting.

Most of the guidelines set out below have already been followed to varying degrees. Those which are new proposals are marked by an asterisk.

1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Quinquennial Review is commissioned by TAC in response to a request from the CGIAR. The essential aim of the Review should therefore be first to meet the needs expressed by this forum and, secondly, to the extent possible, to assist the Centre with the scientific and technical aspects of its programme management. Thus, the Review Report should be prepared in such a way that it can assist CGIAR members to assess the usefulness of their past contributions to the Centre, and to take decisions for their future commitments.

The Quinquennial Review should be conducted as a joint undertaking of TAC and the Centre concerned. It should not be seen as an inspection of the Centre but as a means for the Centre to share its problems with TAC and for TAC to assist the Board and the Centre Director to find solutions compatible with the declared policies of the CGIAR.

As indicated in the terms of reference, the Review Panel's opinions and recommendations may not be shared by TAC which may choose not to endorse parts of the Review Report and to add its own comments and recommendations when submitting the Report to the CGIAR.

Similarly, the Centre Director and its Board of Trustees may not agree with some of the Panel's opinions and recommendations. In this case, the final version of the Panel's Report should record these differences of opinion.

2. THE PREPARATORY PHASE

2.1 Timing. Preparations for the Review should start at least one year in advance by determining the timing of the Review and its duration, in consultation with the Centre Director. The timing should be arranged so as to allow the Review Panel to visit most of the Centre's field experiments just before their completion. In principle, the Review Panel should spend about two weeks^{1/} at the Centre's Headquarters. Visits to cooperative programmes should be organized for some of the Panel's members before the review starts at Headquarters.

2.2. Composition of the Review Panel. The Chairman of the Review Panel should either be a TAC member or have already participated in a Quinquennial Review. The Centre Director should be consulted before the Panel leader is selected by TAC.

The size of the Panel will depend on the complexity of the programme of the Centre to be reviewed. In general, the Panel should have at least five members (not including the Panel Chairman). Because of the necessity of reviewing a broad range of activities in a relatively short time, the Panel may be composed of up to nine or ten people, including the Chairman.

At least three quarters of the Panel's members should be well acquainted with the CGIAR System and, preferably, three or four of them should have already participated directly in a preceding Quinquennial Review. (*)

Panel members should not have had a direct involvement in the formulation of the Centre's present programme. They should not be members of the Governing Bodies of the Centre or of another Centre with which it has direct relationships.

The Centre should be invited to suggest names for potential Panel members, with alternates. Not more than half of the Panel's members^{2/} should be

^{1/} It proved not possible to have high calibre Panel members for a longer period.

^{2/} Unless also proposed by TAC.

drawn from this list. Other members should be chosen from a list^{1/} including present and former TAC members, former participants in Quinquennial Reviews, names suggested by TAC members, CG donors and co-sponsors and the CG and TAC Secretariats. Staff members from CGIAR donor or co-sponsoring agencies may also be selected in their capacity as scientists or managers of R & D programmes, and not as representatives of these agencies to the CGIAR.

Up to half of the Panel may be composed of highly specialized scientists (in specific disciplines or crops). Other members should be selected for their broad experience in agricultural research management in developing countries and/or in the socio-economic problems (*) related to the regions/ commodities concerned. Specialists with experience in the management of multi-disciplinary research programmes are desirable.

Before nominating Panel members, it would be essential to enquire whether candidates have personal relationships^{2/} with staff members of the Centre to be reviewed. (*)

Panel membership should include persons from those developing countries which are the most concerned with the cooperative programme. They should not have been directly responsible for the formulation and implementation of these programmes, however, and should be selected in their personal capacity for their scientific competence and knowledge of the research and development problems which the Centre is addressing.

Reviews of cooperative programmes usually call for contacts with officials from the cooperating countries. Where necessary, one or two of the Panel members visiting these programmes must be fluent in the language of the country. (*)

The proposed composition of the Panel (with alternates) should be established through joint consultations between the Chairman of TAC and the TAC Secretariat on the one hand and the Centre Directors concerned on the other. The interest and availability of the proposed Panel members should be ascertained by the TAC Secretariat which should then submit a final proposal first to the Centre Director and next to TAC, for approval. The composition of the Panel should be mutually agreeable to TAC and the Centre Director,

1/ A list ("roster") has been compiled but still requires further expansion.

2/ e.g. teacher/student or former colleagues.

although TAC may reserve its right to make the final selection since the reviews are conducted under its responsibility.

2.3 Terms of Reference and Related Questions. The terms of reference of the Review should be based on the standard terms of reference adopted by TAC. These may be modified or expanded at the request of TAC or CGIAR members, the Centre's Director or its Board and cooperating institutions to fit in with the specific features and problems of the Centre. Such modifications should, however, be kept in line with the general objectives of the reviews. Questions which are of a very specific nature should not be incorporated in the terms of reference but assembled in a separate list which should be submitted for approval to TAC by its Secretariat after consultation with the Centre concerned.

2.4 Documentation. The TAC Secretariat should provide the Panel's Chairman and members with the following documents, at least four months before the start of the Review:

- (i) The terms of reference and the list of specific questions to be addressed by the Panel.
- (ii) The Brochure on the CGIAR System. (for new members only)
- (iii) The Report of the CGIAR Review Committee. (for new members only)
- (iv) The guidelines for the Quinquennial Review (*).(for new members only)
- (v) Selected reports of Quinquennial Reviews.
- (vi) Relevant extracts from TAC reports.

The Centre should provide the Panel's Chairman and members with the following documents, at least three months before the start of the Review:

- a) The charter and other basic documents establishing the Centre.
- b) A review of the interpretations of the mandate, as evolved by the Board of Trustees over the years.
- c) A statement of the present objectives, priorities and strategies of research, training, information exchange and related cooperative programmes, with an explanation of their rationale in terms of food demands and other requirements in the countries served by the Centre.
- d) A plan for the work of the Centre during the next five years, with an indication of the results expected to be obtained during each of these years, the resources required for the main programme components including changes anticipated in the present staffing pattern.

- (e) The programme of work and budget of the current biennium and the proposed programme of work and budget for the following year.
- (f) Reports of major planning conferences, internal reviews, expert meetings which have had a major influence on the guidance of specific programmes of the Centre.
- (g) Agreements with other Centres and other institutions which have major cooperative activities with the Centre.
- (h) Documents on the major non-core projects of the Centre, in particular those to be visited by the Panel.
- (i) Any other document which the Centre feels it important to distribute before the review. 1/

2.5 Preliminary Consultations with the Centre Director and its Governing Bodies.

As indicated above, the preparatory phase calls for a number of consultations between the Centre Director and the TAC Secretariat on the terms of reference, the timing of the Review, and the composition of the Panel. Consultations are also required to determine the itinerary and the programme of the Review Panel, including the visits to cooperative programmes.

Consultations prior to the Review should also cover other aspects. As requested by the CGIAR, the Reviews should place increased emphasis on the overall policy aspects, priorities and strategy of the Centre in the light of its mandate, of the changing socio-economic context in which it operates and of the priorities and policies formulated by TAC/CGIAR. The Reviews should also consider the interface between the activities of the Centre concerned and those of other Centres and of other national and international institutions.

The experience gained so far indicates that these aspects cannot be handled satisfactorily during the short time available for the Review unless some preparatory work has been carried out in advance. This may include the following:

- (i) Consideration by the Chairman of the Panel and Panel members from TAC and the TAC Secretariat of the documents prepared by the Centre on its mandate, priorities, strategies, etc., as listed under 2.4 a) to i).
- (ii) Preparation by the TAC Secretariat of a preliminary analysis of the mandate, policies, strategies and priorities of the Centre, and of its relationships with other IARCs, national programmes, and international institutions. This analysis would essentially identify issues without, at this stage, making recommendations or conclusions. (*)

1/ It is customary for the Centre to provide additional documentation during the first days of the Review.

- (iii) The draft should be discussed at a meeting attended by the Chairman of the Panel, selected Panel members, the TAC Secretariat, the Centre Director, and members of its Governing Bodies to this meeting, as deemed appropriate. (*)
- (iv) This analysis should then be reviewed by the Panel Chairman and the TAC Secretariat after this meeting, and be distributed to Panel members. If time permits, it should also be considered at the TAC Meeting preceding the Review and TAC's comments should be referred to the Panel. (*)

3. THE CONDUCT OF THE REVIEW

Responsibility for the conduct of the Review lies with the Chairman of the Panel who is selected for his experience and competence in handling such Reviews. It is therefore not intended to provide him with specific guidelines here, unless TAC decides otherwise. A few remarks will be presented on the logistical aspects of the Review:

- 1) The draft report should be completed and agreed upon by the Panel on or before the last day of the Review. Appropriate time and facilities should therefore be given it for report preparation.
- 2) At the very beginning of the Review, an outline of the report should be agreed upon by the Panel with an indication of the allocation of tasks among Panel members.
- 3) Clear instructions should be issued by the Director of the Centre, after the consultation with the Panel Chairman, as referred in Section 2.5, on the scope, nature and contents of the presentations to be made by the staff.
- 4) During the course of the Review, the Centre Director should be consulted by the Chairman of the Panel on each of the major recommendations which the Panel intends to make.
- 5) On the last day of the Review, the conclusions and recommendations of the Panel should be presented orally to the Centre Director in the presence of his Programme Directors and members of his Governing Bodies as deemed appropriate.
- 6) A copy of the draft report should be left with the Centre Director for comments.

4. FINALIZATION OF THE REVIEW REPORT AND SUBMISSION TO TAC/CGIAR

The draft report should first be submitted to the next TAC meeting for consideration in closed session. The main purpose of this first submission to TAC is for

the Committee to consider whether the report fulfills the terms of reference of the Review. TAC may identify gaps or points which require clarification. It may also make suggestions for its final presentation and present preliminary comments.

After this meeting, the Chairman of the Panel and the Secretary should prepare a revised draft, taking into account those comments received from TAC and from the Centre Director, which they consider acceptable on behalf of the Panel. The revised draft should then be cleared with the Panel members, and printed for presentation to TAC and the CGIAR by the Chairman of the Panel^{1/}.

TAC may or may not endorse parts of the report, but is not expected to change its contents for which the Panel is responsible. TAC may submit separately its comments on the report to the CGIAR.

^{1/} The Centre Director should be invited to attend these presentations and present his views and those of his Board of Trustees on the recommendations of the Panel.