SCIENCE COUNCIL
CGIAR

Report of the Second External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

January 2008

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

SCIENCE COUNCIL

CGIAR

Report of the Second External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

Review Panel: Lindsay Falvey (Chair)
Johan van Arendonk
Pierre-Charles Lefèvre
Pervaiz Rashid
Maureen K. Robinson
George Sempeho

JANUARY 2008

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Correct citation: CGIAR Science Council (2008) *Report of the Second External Program and Management Review of the International Livestock Center (ILRI).* Rome, Italy: Science Council Secretariat.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS:

- Extracts from the Summary Record of Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting 2007 (AGM07)
- Science Council Commentary
- ILRI Response to the Second ILRI EPMR
- Transmittal letter and Report of the Panel on the Second ILRI EPMR

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

CGIAR Annual General Meeting, 2007 (AGM07)[1]

Agenda Item 6 Evaluation

...

6.c ILRI EPMR

Conclusion and Decisions:

- *The CGIAR endorsed the ExCo recommendations on the 2nd ILRI EPMR.*
- *Concerning the global expansion of ILRI, the CGIAR cautioned that it should be an evolutionary process and should be within the framework of a well-structured and financed strategic plan. It welcomed the pro-active response of the Center management on partnerships. It also noted the importance for ILRI to share lessons from its positive EPMR with other Centers.*

[1] Extract from the Summary record of Proceedings of Annual General Meeting, 6-7 December 2007

Science Council Commentary
on the Second External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of
the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

April 2007

The Report of the Second EPMR of ILRI was discussed at the Seventh Meeting of the Science Council (SC), held at ICRISAT, Patancheru, India, in the presence of Panel Chair, Dr. Lindsay Falvey, the Chair of ILRI's Board of Trustees, Dr. Uwe Werblow, and the Director General of ILRI, Dr. Carlos Seré. The SC thanked the Panel Chair and Members for a constructive and perceptive report. The SC agrees in general with the Panel's analysis of ILRI today and how it should evolve in the future. This analysis draws from the particular history of the institute recognizing the successful transformation from the ILCA-ILRAD merger and the changes that ILRI has undergone since the 1st EPMR.

The Panel's starting point was ILRI at the time of the 1st EPMR, which took place 5 years after the merger of two centers of disciplinary orientation, each with a distinctive culture. The SC is pleased to note the Panel's judgment that today ILRI is firmly established on a route to be a "regionally owned and globally driven livestock research institute"—to quote the DG—with a mission to serve the people that depend on livestock for their livelihoods.

The 2nd EPMR report presents 18 recommendations that the Panel considers important for further improving ILRI's performance as a globally relevant, well managed and financially sound Center, together with a significant number of suggestions particularly in section 3 on the research programs. Eleven recommendations are on strategic planning and research and 7 are on governance, management and finance. The SC is pleased to observe that ILRI has agreed with nearly all of the recommendations and has already made considerable progress towards their implementation. The SC endorses the findings of the review and the recommendations, while recognizing that the global livestock sector is particularly dynamic, given the rate of increase in the consumption of livestock products in the developing world and the current global interest in using land for biofuel production and its potential impact on livestock feed prices.

The SC finds the recommendations (and suggestions) comprehensive and constructive. While accepting ILRI's caveats to recommendations #4 (on pastoralists) and #6 (on People, Livestock and the Environment Theme), the SC expects ILRI to comply with the *intent* of the recommendations. With respect to recommendation #8 (on IPMS project), the SC understands that occasionally Centers are pressured (by e.g. donors) to take responsibility for managing development projects when it is perceived that there are no local institutions to do that. The SC, however, agrees with the Panel that alternative management options, such as private implementation agencies, need to be considered to relieve the Center from the risks (both financial and managerial time) of such involvement. The SC is not persuaded by the argument that ILRI needs to be involved in managing development projects in order to learn about and help evolve an emerging paradigm of "innovation systems". The ISNAR Division of IFPRI is arguably better positioned to undertake needed research on innovation systems.

Strategy and planning

The SC welcomes the Panel's recognition of ILRI's success in its strategy of influencing others to contribute to delivery of ILRI's mission: '*to reduce poverty and enhance sustainable development through livestock related research*'. ILRI is to be commended for its efforts to identify and manage different kinds of partnerships (including joint work with other Centers), which often need to be very complex, to serve research and development purposes. ILRI's high rate of joint publishing with both NARS (60%) and ARIs (53%) illustrates the success of its partnership strategy over a number of years. The SC notes that ILRI has had a CCER on Partnerships commissioned by its Board and encourages ILRI to evolve its partnership strategy towards the more general issue of sustainable agriculture, which is not much discussed in the report. As pressure on land increases due to the need to balance food security with energy security, ILRI's systems approach could have an increasing role to play in relation to sustainable agriculture.

The Panel views 10 years as a suitable general planning horizon for ILRI's research and recommends a five year plan that brings together the research, human resource and finance plans as a good management practice (#1). The SC is pleased to note that despite the difficulties of predicting the funding realities and the dynamics of the livestock sector in the developing countries, ILRI agrees with the recommendation finding it useful to develop a five-year business plan underpinning the MTP particularly for greater clarity in responsibilities for deliverable outputs and outcomes. The SC emphasizes the importance of institutionalizing the System Priorities through their incorporation into the day-to-day business in the annual operational plans as the SP framework plans mature.

The SC supports the Panel's recommendation of a 10 year planning horizon, particularly with respect to location of sites and staffing strategies. ILRI's response suggests that the 10-year horizon will not be reviewed until just prior to the next EPMR. A 5-year implementation plan will however be developed, relating to issues such as geographic scope (response to #2), staffing (response to #1) and a reassessment of the assets at its sites in Kenya and Ethiopia (response to #17). Changes in staffing, expanding geographical location of offices and asset disposal strategies are costly exercises (both in financial and human terms) and thus while welcoming the 5-year planning, the SC urges that the rationale for any changes to these strategies in the context of the 10 year planning horizon should be clearly recorded for the benefit of the next EPMR.

The SC noted that extensive quantitative strategic planning and priority setting exercises undertaken by ILRI in response to the 1st EPMR to provide more focus do not appear to have been referred to in the 2nd EPMR; this illustrates how changes in the individuals involved in management and EPMR teams can advocate different priorities within a Center's overall mandate. The SC would have liked to see how the quantitative analysis has and could continue to provide focus.

With respect to geographical focus, the SC agrees with Panel's recommendation #2 that ILRI '*requires a more geographically distributed allocation of a critical mass of resources*' in order to fulfil its broad global mandate. The SC supports ILRI's approach towards a broadening geographic spread of its research through an evolutionary process. This will necessarily include full consultation with key national partners in the regions as ILRI's global perspective unfolds. However, like the Panel, the SC does not view the Systemwide Livestock Program as the primary means of satisfying ILRI's global mandate. The SC notes the concern of recent EPMRs of the loss of focus on international public goods research in some Centers that have tried to implement

extensive regional programs by location in single countries. Therefore, the SC agrees with the Panel's recommendation that ILRI should share facilities with other CGIAR Centers to achieve the Panel's intent with respect to critical mass and it should collaborate with partners focused on a similar mission of delivering international public goods.

Research focus

The Panel makes a few recommendations for improving and adjusting the focus of the research program. Some of the recommendations (e.g. #4 and #6) are somewhat specific and are only partially accepted by ILRI. The Panel acknowledges that ILRI is best placed to decide on changes at the organizational level, but the recommendations imply that ILRI's ability to address the research topics highlighted could be improved. One such area emphasized by the Panel is research on pastoralists – an area where past involvement has been sporadic. ILCA was involved in such research that included consideration of how changing land tenure influenced the welfare of pastoralists. The SC agrees with the Panel that ILRI's orientation should be changed from considering pastoralists from an environmental point of view to addressing livelihoods issues. The report could have gone deeper in the analysis considering, for instance, decrease in available land and changes in land tenure as they affect the pastoralists. The SC agrees with the Panel's point of view that there are other pastoral communities outside SSA. Lessons learned in SSA might be of benefit in improving the welfare of such communities in parts of Asia.

ILRI has a mandate to conduct research on livestock diseases of importance to developing countries. Comments on the long time it has taken to develop a vaccine against *Theileria parva* need to be seen in the context of a similar effort by groups seeking to develop vaccines against other protozoan parasites, such as malaria. The first identification of a gene that encodes a surface protein of the human-infective stage of malaria was more than 30 years ago. In spite of large investments, predominately by ARIs, no vaccine has been developed so far. However, research has established that immunity to both malaria and theileriosis is mediated by both the antibody and cellular arms of the immune system. Vaccine development is complicated by the latter and a better understanding of the elements that elicit cell mediated immune (CMI) responses is required.

The SC is thus pleased to hear that ILRI considers vaccines still as a key intervention for many animal diseases. The SC agrees with the EPMR Panel that ILRI's approach to vaccine research needs to be carefully considered and it believes that ILRI's current intention to develop different tools for partners through a platform approach is appropriate. The Panel's suggestion to rank diseases through cost-benefit studies (p 27) needs to build on the extensive *ex ante* impact assessment and priority setting work previously undertaken by ILRI after the 1st EPMR.

The Panel acknowledged that the 1st ILRI EPMR recommended discontinuation of research on trypanosomiasis, but provided no further discussion. The disease remains an important livestock constraint in Africa, particularly affecting pastoralist societies. Conventional vaccines have been shown by earlier ILRAD/ILCA research to be an unlikely solution. However, there are continuing but dispersed efforts to work on alternative means to combat the disease (including drug and anti-vector strategies). This work lacks an international focus for application and ILRI may be advised to consider a role in relation to its target livestock systems.

The Panel's intention with regard to moving research on zoonotic diseases to the Theme related to markets (#6) was initially not quite clear to the SC, but clarification identified their perception of additional opportunities, which could arise from a stronger market focus.

The SC would have liked to see more clarity on how the Panel considered ILRI's role in developing its contribution to research on pigs and poultry since these were mentioned, but the SC agrees with ILRI, that relevant research objectives should be identified from an issues perspective rather than being species-driven. For these two domestic species, consideration also needs to be given to ILRI's comparative advantage in an area in which the private sector has heavily invested in developing measures for disease control.

BecA

The SC commends ILRI for establishing the BecA network with the involvement of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) as a collaborator. BecA has been created as a regional "center of excellence" and ultimately to be a driver of economic growth. It has been difficult for countries in the region to pool their resources in support of such centers. BecA seeks long-term approaches, based on partnership for transformation of the economies of the countries in the region. Central to this economic development agenda will be the role of science, technology and innovation. As noted by the EPMR Panel, BecA will provide the opportunity for ILRI to be involved in the study of a range of diseases (#3) depending on the needs of its partners, which will be based on a problem-solving approach in building regional capacity in the biological sciences. The SC agrees with the Panel in suggesting that ILRI maintains a clear focus on its role in collaborations with like-minded partners.

Staff balance, achievements and impact

The SC notes that economists form a remarkably high proportion of ILRI research staff (32% of IRS) and that economists are involved in all themes, although (appropriately) to differing extents. This compares with only 28% in 'animal science/health/genetics and nutrition' disciplines. ILRI should be cognizant of the importance of maintaining an optimal balance of disciplines among its researchers. The SC will be interested to see the Center's vision for disciplinary balance in the long-term as ILRI develops its staffing plan.

The 'Market theme' has the smallest range of disciplines with only 5 out of 19 professional staff not having an economics/economic policy background. The Panel drew attention to this narrow skill base. The SC wishes to encourage ILRI to ensure that its scientists across disciplines are aware of the findings in this rapidly developing area and the implications for the context of their own research. The SC encourages ILRI to plan its activities in this area in the context of the System Priority 5B.

The SC was interested to learn that ILRI's decision to merge the 'Enabling innovation' and 'Targeting opportunities' themes, signalled in the current MTP 2007-2009, superseded the Panel's recommendation to do so. The SC is concerned by the lack of publications in major peer refereed journals in these two themes, given the significant investment in these areas and anticipates that the merger will bring more scientific rigor to the work in the new theme. The SC notes with satisfaction the relatively high level of publications—quantity and quality—in other themes.

The SC is pleased to see that ILRI will address the need to conduct *ex post* impact assessment across its research themes. This activity was intentionally kept dormant for the past six years due to the emphasis on *ex ante* work during the implementation of the strategic plan and systems approach, and the apparent lack of interest on the Center's part on evaluating the impact of discontinued projects for merely accountability purposes. The SC believes *ex post* impact assessment is a continuous need and ILRI's decision to de-emphasize it recently has contributed to its low ratings in the 3a and 3b components of the Performance Measurement System. The SC is pleased to learn that *Outcome Mapping*, a monitoring tool that ILRI has introduced to its teams, is seen as a complementary tool to *ex post* impact assessment, which the SC hopes will facilitate these appraisals.

ILRI RESPONSE TO EPMR RECOMMENDATIONS

The ILRI Board and Management thank the EPMR panel chair and members for their thoughtful review of ILRI's program and management. We found the panel's comments on ILRI's past performance and future directions both insightful and helpful.

We are in agreement with the recommendations of the panel. A specific response to each recommendation is given in the Table below.

No	Recommendation
With Respect to Strategy and Planning	
1	Considering the competitive operating environment, the substantial assets of ILRI and the naturally long horizon for measuring results in livestock research, ILRI should expand its planning horizon to complement the MTP. The Panel **recommends** a planning cycle in which strategic vision and goals with ten year horizons yield strategic five-year business plans, operationalized annually.
	Agreed – ILRI currently has a strategic vision and goals that were developed in 2002 and reviewed in 2005 prior to its 2nd EPMR. The 10-year strategy will be reviewed prior to each subsequent EPMR. ILRI has begun developing 5-year implementation plans that bring together research, resource mobilization, staffing, partnership planning and communications and linking these to annual workplans and performance management. The 5-year horizon is appropriate for planning how research outputs lead to development outcomes.
2	The ambition of global impact requires a more geographically distributed allocation of a critical mass of resources. Projects with global outcomes can beneficially be managed from locations other than east Africa. The Panel therefore **recommends** that ILRI redefine its physical location strategy (using CGIAR Centres wherever possible) and its *modus operandi* for each region. The Board should assess progress in three years through external review.
	Agreed - ILRI accepts this recommendation, recognizing the major programmatic, partnership and financial challenges this acceptance implies. We see an expansion in geographic scope as an evolutionary process in which the Board and management will develop a plan to engage with key partners in different regions and through that mechanism develop strategies and resource mobilization opportunities. Our approach will be to focus on key global livestock issues backed up by a global knowledge management and communications strategy that takes account of the context, needs and opportunities in different regions.
With Respect to Research Programs – Themes	
3	Noting that the BecA network will offer ILRI and its partners opportunities to study a range of diseases, the panel **recommends** that ILRI maintains a clear focus in vaccine research, and that before ILRI enters any new disease for developing a vaccine or diagnostic, it clearly defines its role and that of its partners, and evaluates the viability of any new technology.
	Agreed – In vaccine and diagnostic research we plan to follow two approaches, one when ILRI plays the leadership role (such as for East Coast fever) and one in which ILRI contributes a specific component to a larger initiative led by others. In vaccine projects that ILRI plans to lead, we will carefully consider our comparative advantage, research capacity and financial resources before committing to lead the project. When ILRI is requested to participate in vaccine projects led by NARS or ARI partners, we would agree to provide specific research inputs if we have the capacity and financial resources are made available.
4	As pastoralists are an ancient and continuing component of the livestock sector, and as they are increasingly marginalized by agricultural development, the Panel **recommends** that People, Livestock and the Environment Theme research related to transhumant livestock keeping be oriented to pro-pastoral policies globally and that knowledge developed to date be published in a global context as a priority.
	Partially agreed – Strengthening ILRI's global contribution by publishing methods and practices for pro-poor pastoral research for development is a logical next step. This contribution to global fora will build initially on research results from studies in East and West Africa that have provided important insights such as sustainability, diversification and vulnerability issues for pastoral communities. ILRI's contribution to global pastoral issues will focus on pastoral systems in the tropical zones, as others have comparative advantage in pastoral systems of temperate zones.

5	In view of the imminent new capacity for plant biosciences in BecA, the Panel **recommends** that ILRI maximize use of the facility for the forage genebank activities while also increasing research collaborations, particularly with the CGIAR Centers, that enhance the use of the germplasm.
	Agreed –Our plans for interactions between the forage genebank and BecA would focus on the identification and selection of traits for key abiotic and biotic stresses for a few selected forages. Broad-scale molecular characterization of forages is unlikely to be a priority. We see opportunities for other Centres to use the grass germplasm in the ILRI collection to look for genes of interest to their breeding programs. A critical short-term focus will be to work with CIAT and ICARDA to increase the efficiency of global forage genetic resources in the areas of genebank management and strategic utilization of conserved materials.
6	The Panel views the People, Livestock and the Environment Theme as both broad and uneven. To remedy this, the Panel **recommends** that OP2 be focused on pastoralists and INRM and a refocused OP3 be transferred to the Markets Theme.
	Partially agreed – ILRI recognizes the need for greater focus and coherence within the People, Livestock and Environment Theme. We see the coherence coming from a focus on two main issues, sustainability of land and water resources in livestock production systems and the intensification of crop-livestock systems given the need for greater production from limited land and water. These issues will be considered and implemented through a number of strategic realignments of the theme portfolio over the next 18 months. Research on zoonotic diseases of importance to the poor is a priority for ILRI. We will review how to structure this between the People, Livestock and Environment and the Market Themes.
7	Following success of ILRI facilitating the creation of a large regional initiative (BecA), the Panel **recommends** that ILRI look at how it can generate adequately resourced, high impact initiatives for each Theme.
	Agreed - ILRI will continue to improve its resource mobilization by strengthening the current strategy and how it is implemented. A selected number of livestock issues of global concern to which ILRI research can make a contribution have been identified as priorities for concerted resource mobilization efforts.
8	Given the risks to ILRI of being perceived as conducting development activities, the Panel **recommends** that the IPMS project be managed, budgeted and reported in two parts with research allocated to respective Themes and project management done by the DDG's office, and that ILRI decline management roles in future development projects.
	Partially agreed – To have impact, ILRI research needs to actively engage with development projects and partners. We agree it is critical that ILRI constantly assess its research for development role. We also agree that in the management of large research – development projects, ILRI concentrates on its research role and partners with others who have expertise in development activities. ILRI believes it is important to manage the IPMS project as one entity. However, ILRI agrees to better link the research components and their reporting to its research programme.
With Respect to Cross-cutting Issues	
9	In the interests of continuing to improve the quality of its research output, the Panel **recommends** that ILRI immediately and systematically invest in increasing its Internet capacity for research purposes.
	Agreed - ILRI is committed to expand its internet capacity with increased expenditures in 2007. ILRI and ICRAF are establishing a common ICT unit which should improve our capacity for strategic investment. Currently we are undertaking an internally commissioned review on ICT to advise on practical approaches and the investment required to increase internet capacity, taking into account regulatory and infrastructure conditions.
10	As a critical component of ILRI's systems approach, the Panel **recommends** that ILRI management charge the research themes to conduct ex post impact studies on selected programs using methodologies developed by the new Innovation and Impact Unit, and using external inputs where needed.
	Agreed - ILRI will take steps to strengthen its *ex-post* impact assessment capacity. These will include the participation of scientists who carried out the research, methodological support from impact assessment specialists in ILRI's Innovation and Impact Unit and review by outside experts to ensure objectivity.
11	As part of ILRI's contribution to strengthening capacity, the Panel **recommends** that ILRI make this activity explicit and measurable in research program design and report results for both training and follow up activities.
	Agreed - ILRI has recently recruited a senior Capacity Strengthening Manager and is

	finalizing a capacity strengthening strategy for the institute. Procedures will be put in place so that capacity strengthening contributions are explicitly recognized in its program planning, implementation and reporting.
With	**Respect to Governance, Management and Finance**
12	The panel **recommends** that ILRI provide new members of the board with a thorough orientation to the financial issues and trends that shape ILRI's budget, strategy, and capacity as well as to the processes that support the board's responsibilities for financial stewardship and oversight.
	Agreed- An orientation program is being developed and a financial briefing session was presented to the Board prior to its November 2006 meeting. This program will be updated to reflect the changing environment and the changes within ILRI's priorities and structure as well as the evolving requirements of the Finance & Audit committee of the Board.
13	The Panel **recommends** that ILRI management and the board chair redefine the responsibilities and scope of work of the Board Secretary and improve ILRI's practices with respect to meeting preparation.
	Agreed - A detailed checklist on Board meeting preparation and the conduct of Board affairs throughout the year is being developed by the Secretary and the Board Chair and will be implemented by ILRI management and Board.
14	The panel **recommends** that the board increase the quality of its board recruitment process by developing a multi-year strategy for the recruitment of new board members, which supports the global mandate of ILRI and provides it with a board that is a sustained asset to the accomplishment of its work.
	Agreed - The ILRI Board of Trustees will finalize a Board of Trustees Development Strategy which includes the recruitment of Board members based upon complementary skills to ensure continuity in providing oversight to the business of ILRI.
15	ILRI having identified the weaknesses in key management proficiencies, the Panel **recommends** that the DG and DDG institute comprehensive training and development opportunities for all managers and hold themselves and managers responsible for improvements in performance.
	Agreed – ILRI, with external consultants, has reviewed its human resource management and individual manager skills. Follow-up actions identified as part of this review have been agreed. These will be implemented in the next 12 months and their effect monitored and reviewed as part of a continuous management improvement program.
16	The Panel **recommends** that ILRI undertake a comprehensive reassessment of its current sites in Kenya and Ethiopia, exploring all options with respect to the management and disposition of its properties.
	Agreed – Within its evolving global strategy, a comprehensive review of ILRI properties and assets in Kenya and Ethiopia will be conducted with a view to assessing their relevance and increasing their effectiveness and efficiency.
17	The Panel **recommends** that as part of overall improvements to the HR function, ILRI develop a staffing plan which is cognizant of geography, anticipated disciplinary expertise and gender, and is consistent with the ILRI priorities.
	Agreed – This recommendation will be implemented as part of the business planning and globalization of ILRI's activities (response to recommendations 1 and 2).
18	The Panel **recommends** that ILRI continue to improve its financial management through adoption of a new investment strategy, a more comprehensive resource mobilization plan, and more efficient grants management.
	Agreed – An investment policy was approved at the November 2006 Board meeting. In line with recommendation 7, ILRI agrees that it needs to increase its skills and experience in resource mobilization and enhance coordination of resource mobilization activities within the institute. We also concur that, as far as possible, restricted fund raising should focus on large and medium-size and longer-term grants and should also attempt to recover staff costs and overhead to the largest extent possible.

Lindsay Falvey
ILFR, University of Melbourne
3010 Australia

Tel & Fax: +61-3-80801618
email: lindsay.falvey@gmail.com

---

25 October 2006

Dr Per Pinstrup-Andersen
Chair, Science Council
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
Division of Nutritional Sciences
Cornell University
305 Savage Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-6301, USA

Dr Francisco Reifschneider
Director
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433, USA

Dear Drs Pinstrup-Andersen and Reifschneider,

On behalf of the Panel, I am pleased to transmit to you the Report of the Second External Programme and Management Review (EPMR) of the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). The Panel has reviewed ILRI's performance in the four broad areas of: i) mission, strategy and priorities; ii) quality and relevance of the science; iii) effectiveness and efficiency of management (including governance and finance); and iv) accomplishments and impacts. We have also addressed the list of strategic issues received from the Science Council.

The Panel finds ILRI to be a strong research institute that has during the period under review developed a systems-oriented holistic research approach to better address livestock related problems that are relevant to the poor. ILRI's research structure as revised in the latest Medium-Term Plan is likely to allow the Institute to effectively respond to the challenges that the highly dynamic livestock sector in developing countries poses on poor people and the environment.

The Panel also finds ILRI to be a well governed institute with responsive leadership and management. Because the review of ILRI's programs and management takes place within the context of a sound institution, many of the EPMR's recommendations are presented in terms of strengthening current trends and practices, although sometimes with specific requirements for changes in modes of management and delivery.

We would like to express our thanks to the ILRI Board, management and staff, who cooperated with us in every way and provided us with all the information and facilities we required.

Finally, the Panel members join me in expressing our appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the challenging task of conducting this Review, and for the Science Council's excellent support in the form of Sirkka Immonen. We hope that the Report will be useful to ILRI and its partners, as well as to the CGIAR.

Yours sincerely,

Lindsay Falvey
Panel Chair
Second External Program and Management Review of ILRI

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

SCIENCE COUNCIL AND CGIAR SECRETARIAT

Report of the
Second External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

Review Panel: Lindsay Falvey (Chair)
Johan van Arendonk
Pierre-Charles Lefèvre
Pervaiz Rashid
Maureen K. Robinson
George Sempeho

SCIENCE COUNCIL SECRETARIAT

OCTOBER 2006

CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

ANNEXES

PREFACE

Panel Mode of Operation

The 2nd External Program and Management Review of ILRI was conducted under the Chairmanship of Professor Lindsay Falvey. The composition of the Panel and their biodata are provided in Annex 1. The Terms of Reference for conducting EPMRs and the list of the Science Council's (SC) strategic issues to the review Panel are given in Annex 2. The review was carried out in two phases and in addition included prior attendance at the ILRI Board meeting by the Chair and Governance expert and field visits in Africa and Asia as detailed in the Panel itinerary in Annex 3.

The EPMR Panel was guided by the general objectives of EPMRs: (a) to provide the CGIAR members with an independent and rigorous assessment of the institutional health and contribution of the Center; and (b) to provide the Center and its collaborators with assessment information that complements or validates their own evaluation efforts. The Panel made every attempt to conduct the review in an objective and transparent manner with a focus on the future as well as the past.

The information, on which the Panel based its decisions regarding the key concerns and issues, and its assessments and conclusions, was gathered in a number of ways. These included: briefings given to the Panel Chair and members by the SC and its Secretariat; extensive documentation provided by ILRI and the SC and the CGIAR Secretariats documents and data provided to the Panel in response to its particular needs, all provided at an EPMR Internet site (listed in Annex 4); analysis of the CVs of professional staff providing information on their career at ILRI and research merits during 2001-2005 irrespective of employer; review of BoT agendas, minutes and other documentation, observations of the BoT in action (at the March 2006 meeting) and interaction with BoT members individually; briefings and communications during the Initial Visit to ILRI HQs from the Director General (DG), the senior management team, Theme/Program Directors and other research staff, the finance and administration team and research support units; information gathered during Panel member field visits in Uganda (June 2006), Mali, Niger and Nigeria (September 2006) and Thailand China and India (September 2006) to review ILRI research project activities in the field and meet with its clients and collaborators, and email correspondence with a variety of ILRI donors and CGIAR Center DGs.

The Panel decided not to assess every aspect of the Center operations in-depth and it relied, to the extent possible, on the 10 Center commissioned external review reports and one donor report.

The Center was kept informed of the Panel's activities and progress during the review. The Panel Chair and ILRI DG were in regular contact, particularly during the Main Phase. Between the Initial and Main Phases, Panel members prepared first drafts of all the sections of the report and during the Main Phase focused of validating the hypothesis, discussing and agreeing on the main findings and completing final drafts of each section of the report that were agreed by the whole Panel. These Panel drafts were shared with the Center for checking their factual accuracy prior to finalization. At the end of the Main Phase visit, the Panel Chair presented the main findings and recommendations of the Review to a meeting of ILRI staff at which the Board Chair was also present.

Acknowledgements

The 2nd ILRI EPMR Panel wishes to expresses its sincere appreciation to the Board, DG, Senior Management and all staff of ILRI for their support and assistance during this review. The Panel is grateful to the ILRI staff for making its stay efficient and copacetic for the two visits to ILRI in Nairobi and Addis Ababa. The Panel particularly thanks Ralph von Kaufmann who helped in coordinating the review on ILRI's behalf, while also extending its thanks to ILRI's staff in other parts of Africa and Asia, and to representatives of ILRI's partner organizations in Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, Nigeria, China and India for their time and helpfulness. It is with pleasure that the Panel also thank the SC Secretariat, in particular Sirkka Immonen, who served as secretary to the Panel, and the CGIAR Secretariat, particularly Manny Lantin who served as resource person to the Panel, for coordination and management of this review and for guidance throughout. The Panel also would like to thank the SC Secretariat staff for their assistance in logistical matters and report preparation.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ILRI is a successful organization by most measures. It has overcome a difficult merger 12 years ago, and has risen to the challenge of a vastly expanded mandate without benefit of substantial additional resources. To make its task more difficult and its achievements more impressive, it is supposed to conduct research across all major domestic animal species in all regions of the poverty-affected world. To accomplish any of this requires a form of intelligent focus that ILRI has been able to demonstrate. It should be a matter of pride to the CGIAR and beyond that a Center has delivered so much in an increasingly restricted and competitive funding environment, one in which funding increases tend to be modest. This review of ILRI's programs and management takes place within the context of a sound institution. It is for that reason that many of the EPMR's recommendations are presented in terms of strengthening current trends and practices, although sometimes with specific requirements for changes in modes of management and delivery.

ILRI operates in a dynamic setting – more dynamic than that of a single commodity center where the focus is determined by one or a few crops. ILRI's response to the dynamism of its mandate is to focus on systems, in preference to discipline or geography. This has allowed ILRI to launch into global livestock research on a scale and to an extent that would not have otherwise been possible. In doing so, it has modulated its initial identity as mainly cattle and only Africa, and moved beyond the boundaries of its parent organizations. It has skillfully balanced its plans with donor requirements to produce a reasonably focused research program.

In framing its research approach, ILRI has sought to underpin research activity by addressing the primary constraints to assisting the poor. This approach incorporates technical, economic, social and policy research in a coordinated interaction to identify and reduce those constraints. Of course, the approach links with development activities and there is a risk of being pulled from research into development itself, a danger that ILRI has by and large avoided, and which, the Panel hopes with recommendations in this report, it will be able to avoid as it plans its future.

In its planning, ILRI has sought a single, compelling vision to guide it. Recent plans center this vision on a 'revolution' in demand for livestock products in poor countries. The vision has proved useful for refocusing the organization. It can now be widened to include more insight and understanding of the way in which different groups of the poor are affected by this revolution, and in widening ILRI's activities to focus better accommodate both global and species variations by applying its characteristic approach to problem identification and research.

The systems research approach has facilitated ILRI's global expansion through multi-country projects. This has been done with minimal staff located out of ILRI's east African base(s), working at times in unsupported and intellectually lonely conditions. As an initial commitment to global expansion, the minimal staff presence beyond east Africa has been useful, but has only limited potential in the long term, particularly if ILRI is to develop its credibility in distant regions. To move forward with its mandate, ILRI must create a presence in Asia and West Africa, ideally located within other CGIAR Centers wherever possible to create a context for staff and synergies with other Centers.

ILRI's strategy is expressed through a research program framed by Themes. These are designed to break down disciplinary barriers, but they also add a layer of complexity to ILRI's management. Projects are generally well conceived and conducted, yet there are some that would

be better combined with others or cancelled, and others that need to be improved by demanding better quality of outputs, notably publications.

In an evolution of the strategic plan, the Targeting and Innovations Theme brings together elements of two Themes that were separate in the initial conception of the plan, but are now integrated. The new Theme is redefining its role in support of research and global activities throughout ILRI. The Markets Theme is the lens through which management mostly clear views the ILRI vision and its understanding of markets provides loci for parallel technical and policy research. In the Biotechnology Theme, soon to receive a major boost from the BecA investment and network, ILRI's already fine work can be expected to improve even further if it retains focus, reduces duplicative inefficiencies in database and phenotype descriptive work, and considers a wider range of species in a more global approach to its work.

The Peoples, Livestock and Environment Theme is broad, and needs to be rationalized to achieve a critical mass of research capacity in some areas and to increase and focus its publications in other areas in order to match the competent work of the germplasm bank and the impressive work in India supporting nutrition in feed-food selection of crops (both will continue to rely on partnership with other Centers for efficiencies). To create clearer support for enhanced impact assessment, a separate unit has recently been created within the office of the DDG.

The Panel noted throughout its review the readiness of ILRI to engage partners in a collaborative approach to its work. It has overcome many of the barriers that typically prevent collaboration in a highly competitive environment. It has taken the initiative to find more enterprising and efficient ways to work with other Centers and provided support and a home to the effort to create a sub-regional MTP, albeit at some management cost. The values that shaped this approach to other CGIAR Centers and partner organizations are integral to ILRI's culture and are evident through much of the organization.

The Panel hopes that its report, notwithstanding its specific recommendations for improvement, conveys the generally favorable impression it formed of ILRI, its work and its staff. ILRI continues to be a unique center that deserves specific recognition for addressing an orphan component of international agricultural research. It is worth recalling and repeating: livestock are often kept by the poorest of marginalized farmers and the landless; general agricultural research, even that conducted on behalf of poor crop farmers, can easily further marginalize the even poorer farmers who keep some livestock; pastoral communities continue to be pushed to increasingly limited land areas that compromise their once sustainable practices; developed country research is not generally transferable to poor livestock keepers; private sector livestock research is oriented to market opportunities which do not exist for poor livestock keepers; in some cases, NARS are oriented to crop-based developments that do not include livestock or may even further marginalize livestock keepers; rising numbers of urban poor keep some small livestock; and livestock often form integrated components of a farm, no component of which can be understood without understanding the overall system. It is facile to say that if the world did not have an ILRI, we would have to create one, but it is important to ask how we may improve the efficacy of this essential organization.

Continuous improvement is part of any responsible organization and ILRI has proved itself to be responsive and responsible in undertaking a wider mandate than was envisioned properly when it was created. The Panel commends its progress and concludes that ILRI while functioning well will continue to improve by implementing the following recommendations.

Recommendations

With Respect to Strategy and Planning

Recommendation 1. Considering the competitive operating environment, the substantial assets of ILRI and the naturally long horizon for measuring results in livestock research, ILRI should expand its planning horizon to complement the MTP. The Panel ***recommends*** a planning cycle in which strategic vision and goals with ten year horizons yield strategic five-year business plans, operationalized annually.

Recommendation 2. The ambition of global impact requires a more geographically distributed allocation of a critical mass of resources. Projects with global outcomes can beneficially be managed from locations other than east Africa. The Panel therefore ***recommends*** that ILRI redefine its physical location strategy (using CGIAR Centers wherever possible) and its *modus operandi* for each region. The Board should assess progress in three years through external review.

With Respect to Research Programs – Themes

Recommendation 3. Noting that the BecA network will offer ILRI and its partners opportunities to study a range of diseases, the Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI maintain a clear focus in vaccine research, and that before ILRI enters any new disease for developing a vaccine or diagnostic, it clearly define its role and that of its partners, and evaluate the viability of any new technology.

Recommendation 4. As pastoralists are an ancient and continuing component of the livestock sector, and as they are increasingly marginalized by agricultural development, the Panel ***recommends*** that People, Livestock and the Environment Theme research related to transhumant livestock keeping be oriented to pro-pastoral policies globally and that knowledge developed to date be published in a global context as a priority.

Recommendation 5. In view of the imminent new capacity for plant biosciences in BecA, the Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI maximize use of the facility for the forage genebank activities while also increasing research collaborations, particularly with the CGIAR Centers, that enhance the use of the germplasm.

Recommendation 6. The Panel views the People, Livestock and the Environment Theme as both broad and uneven. To remedy this, the Panel ***recommends*** that OP2 be focused on pastoralists and INRM and a refocused OP3 be transferred to the Markets Theme.

Recommendation 7. Following success of ILRI facilitating the creation of a large regional initiative (BecA), the Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI look at how it can generate adequately resourced, high impact initiatives for each Theme.

Recommendation 8. Given the risks to ILRI of being perceived as conducting development activities, the Panel ***recommends*** that the IPMS project be managed, budgeted and reported in two parts with research allocated to respective Themes and project management done by the DDG's office, and that ILRI decline management roles in future development projects.

With Respect to Cross-cutting Issues

Recommendation 9. In the interests of continuing to improve the quality of its research output, the Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI immediately and systematically invest in increasing its Internet capacity for research purposes.

Recommendation 10. As a critical component of ILRI's systems approach, the Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI management charge the research themes to conduct *ex post* impact studies on selected programs using methodologies developed by the new Innovation and Impact Unit, and using external inputs where needed.

Recommendation 11. As part of ILRI's contribution to strengthening capacity, the Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI make this activity explicit and measurable in research program design and report results for both training and follow up activities.

With respect to Governance, Management and Finance

Recommendation 12. The Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI provide new members of the board with a thorough orientation to the financial issues and trends that shape ILRI's budget, strategy, and capacity as well as to the processes that support the board's responsibilities for financial stewardship and oversight.

Recommendation 13. The Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI management and the board chair redefine the responsibilities and scope of work of the Board Secretary and improve ILRI's practices with respect to meeting preparation.

Recommendation 14. The Panel ***recommends*** that the board increase the quality of its board recruitment process by developing a multi-year strategy for the recruitment of new board members, which supports the global mandate of ILRI and provides it with a board that is a sustained asset to the accomplishment of its work.

Recommendation 15. ILRI having identified the weaknesses in key management proficiencies, the Panel ***recommends*** that the DG and DDG institute comprehensive training and development opportunities for all managers and hold themselves and managers responsible for improvements in performance.

Recommendation 16. The Panel ***recommends*** that as part of overall improvements to the HR function, ILRI develop a staffing plan which is cognizant of geography, anticipated disciplinary expertise and gender, and is consistent with the ILRI priorities.

Recommendation 17. The Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI undertake a comprehensive reassessment of its current sites in Kenya and Ethiopia, exploring all options with respect to the management and disposition of its properties.

Recommendation 18. The Panel ***recommends*** that ILRI continue to improve its financial management through adoption of a new investment strategy, a more comprehensive resource mobilization plan, and more efficient grants management.

1 CONTEXT

Any consideration of absolute poverty alleviation must include livestock because poverty and livestock are inextricably linked – 70 percent of the poor rely on livestock. Hence livestock research that serves international development requires a clear understanding of where the real poor are, the reasons that they are poor and assessment of where research can be applied. This simple requirement is often confused by unconsidered global averages. To emphasis this context, this document introduces some common misconceptions about livestock and the poor in order to demonstrate the critical role played by ILRI in poverty alleviation and livestock development. Within that context, ILRI's strategic contribution is to understand the dynamics of the sector, and to assist the poor to cope with change and to seize opportunities. It is a wide mandate and one in which ILRI has been particularly successful, after having weathered earlier difficult times well while contributing substantially to multiple donor objectives.

1.1 Livestock in the Less Developed World – and ILRI

Livestock research for development offers means of interacting with the really poor by developing technologies and policies that enhance security and health, which are often higher level requirements of the poor than dollar measures. Global figures indicate that livestock are important in providing some 20 percent of food energy and 30 percent of protein, yet these figures mask their relatively higher value to the poor, geographical distributions, excess animal products in some diets and nutrient deficiencies in others, as well as cultural dietary differences. Nevertheless, it may be said without hyperbole that livestock are critical to all conventional considerations of the mandate of the CGIAR and other international development organizations.

The complexity and diversity of opinions about livestock development create misconceptions that haunt much international livestock research. The livestock of the poor are not those that consume grain better consumed by the hungry poor, nor are they usually those which create the major risks of animal-to-human disease transmission, or damage environments or produce the major greenhouse gas emissions, nor is their low productivity inefficient in terms of resource inputs. Such livestock – rabbits and other rodents, poultry, pigs, goats, sheep, cattle, buffalo, yak, camels, horses and others – are numerous, and even though most are remote from the quality standards of affluent markets, local markets can form a part of the dynamic change occurring in poor areas.

One response this market separation is to enhance market-driven intensification of livestock to assist the poor. This can sometimes further marginalize the poor, but otherwise it largely passes them by. In any case, the demands of additional grain production for intensive animal industries, the ethics of animal welfare in intensive production systems, and cultural-rights questions surrounding assumptions that nomadic livestock keepers should become sedentary, raise wider questions in terms of the CGIAR approaches. Sandwiched between assumptions of global proliferation of intensive livestock systems and traditional systems that can benefit from insightful research is the meat of the mission of international livestock research for the poor, expressed as acting 'to reduce poverty and enhance sustainable development through livestock-related research' through policy, markets and technological research. The locus of such research is the various part of the globe where the poor are located – South Asia, SSA and Southeast Asia.

Affluence-driven livestock-product consumption over the past two or so decades, particularly in Asia, indicates rises of three-times for meat and two-times for milk above rich-country rises.[2] Even modest increases in income seem to produce marked increases in demand for animal products. For milk consumption in India and pigs in China, opportunities exist for some cash-poor livestock keepers close to markets to benefit from this increased demand. Such market-driven development seems self-perpetuating and of marginal relevance to the real poor excluded from such opportunities by distance or other barriers. Relying only on the affluence-pull out of poverty argument begs the question of who are the poor.

If the majority of the nearly 50 percent of all people whom we think exist on less than US$ 2 per day are in Asia, the primary regions for poverty-oriented livestock research would seem logically to be in Asia.[3] Of course, cash-poverty is less serious than a lack of basic minimum needs which may place some of tropical Asia's poor above others in colder and less productive subsistence environments. This difference between absolute- and relative- (cash-based) poverty is critical to interpreting the intent of the CGIAR vision, and when coupled with considerations of some parts of Asia having the capacity to address local issues, a relative balance between the livestock research needs of the poor across the globe becomes evident. [4]

Cash comparisons are probably more relevant to urban dwellers, who are the faster rising component of less-developed countries and who may expect to benefit from the apparently continuing decline in livestock product prices associated with efficient, private, intensive production units close to major urban centers.[5] In such cases, the externalities from industrial systems can have serious consequences for the poor, and research to minimize negative impacts is valuable.

A challenge for poverty-oriented research is to discriminate between issues properly addressed by these industries themselves such as waste-concentration pollution, food safety and even animal-human disease transmission. For the poor livestock keepers, it is their location and production system that defines the research opportunities.

Livestock production may be separated into; rangeland systems, integrated agricultural systems and landless systems. In terms of the poor, rangelands include the extensive pastoral systems that continue in Asia (for example, Mongolia and China (Tibet)) and Africa (for example, the Sahel); integrated agriculture includes smallholder mixed crop-and-livestock systems across Asia, Africa and some countries of Latin America; landless systems include urban herders and milkers, backyard monogastric and rodent raisers and scavenging livestock. Potential to improve the welfare of poor livestock keepers exists in all systems, but is naturally greater where favorable market, climatic and feed resources exist – factors that generate their own demand for innovation especially to serve rising affluence. Research is not necessary to accelerate such self-fueling development, but research that learns from it can assist the poor in other regions – it can link to

---

[2] Delgado, C. 2005. Rising Demand for Meat and Milk in Developing Countries: Implications for grasslands-based livestock producers. in D. A. McGilloway, ed., *Grassland: a global resource* (The Netherlands: Wageningen Academic Publishers) 29–40.

[3] World Bank. 2005. Agricultural Growth for the Poor: An Agenda for Development. The World Bank, Washington, DC.

[4] Sachs, 2005. The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time. Penguin, 416pp.

[5] Delgado, C. 2003. 'Rising Consumption of Meat and Milk in Developing Countries Has Created a New Food Revolution'. *Journal of Nutrition* (133) 11. *Supplement II on Animal Source Foods.* Nov. 3907s–3910s.

research that serves the continually marginalized and food-insecure in the complicated milieu of international livestock research planning.

Economically marginalized livestock keepers conceive livestock products differently from those in commercially-linked systems.[6] For example: dung is not simply seen as crop fertilizer but also as material for house construction, cooking fuel and so on; animal power is not just for ploughing but also for traction, packing, working mills etc; frequent small income from milk, eggs, hair and small meat producing animals is valued over delayed higher incomes, milk is not just a fresh product made into butter and cheese to suit tastes but is made storable and transportable through diverse fermented and other traditional products; course hair and wool for family use is valued above finer products, meat is not a primary product but an end-of-life product associated with the production of other perhaps more valuable non-edible animal products, and the financial value of an animal set by a urban market may grossly undervalue its economic value when cultural, self-incremental savings capacity and other values are considered.

Seen from this perspective, assumptions that, (1) livestock systems evolve into commercial markets and (2) that the trend should be accelerated by development research, could be conversely argued to further marginalize the poor and food insecure livestock keepers unless balancing research in their immediate interests forms part of the same program. Focusing on areas of high development potential – defined as access to affluence-driven markets – lead one to ask 'is this research assisting the poor?' The point is worthy of elaboration. Poor people keep environmentally adapted indigenous livestock breeds that are assumed, often without objective evidence, to have limited genetic capacity for higher productivity. Appropriately, ILRI leads in confirming the value of these breeds. They live in subsistence or near-subsistence economic systems and what potential for technological improvement exists is limited by understandably risk-averse lifestyles and often related infrastructural deficiencies. In such circumstances, if research is to be judged by its impact, it needs to be matched by development analysis. For example, belated development of infrastructure and policy change has led to adoption of technologies decades after they had been assumed to have had no impact. Livestock research needs this context, perhaps more than crop-based research.

Past agricultural development analysis has often ignored alternative worldviews of the real poor. One example is assumptions that nomadic pastoral systems tend toward sedentary mixed crop-livestock systems, but this is not universally true and where it occurs may be because policies force such transition. Dire outcomes can result from such assumptions, such as evidenced in the 70 years of well-intended enforced settlement of Mongolian pastoralists. Of course, increases in human population can cause pastoral systems to exceed natural resource resiliencies, but other development components such as education and health services need to be factored into such analyses before reaching conclusions about the viability of pastoralism. In any case, pastoralism is usually the only productive use possible from environments where it has persisted, and ruminants are able to utilize fibrous plant material that has no alternative use. Unclear pastoral land rights are similarly a reflection of a sedentary agricultural orientation to development.

[6] Livestock products include: food; regular cash income from milk, eggs, hair and small animal sales; emergency cash generation flexibility; periodic nutritional balances; nutritional supplements; barter and exchange possibilities; savings that accumulate interest through births; risk-management from diverse income sources; draught power for owners and renters; traction of wagons for passengers, produce and inputs; dung for fertilizer, cooking, heating and house plaster; conversion of unused resources into food; employment; social support networks and mutual insurance, and cultural roles that vary from sacrificial ceremonies with associated health benefits to status items that maintain a social structure.

Rather than assume that existing policies define the research context, objective research such as in ILRI's targeting activities define the context of such livestock systems that will be with us for the foreseeable future and which we understand less about than we do for mixed crop-livestock systems.

Mixed crop-livestock systems in Asia as well as Africa, offer perhaps the greatest potential for assisting the poor through research. This extends beyond technical research to such areas as socio-economics and policy to inform decisions on whether to protect smallholders from being displaced by factory farming. Linked with this is continued reliance on proven indigenous genetic resources, which as in pastoral and landless systems, incidentally assists conservation of genetic resources in a manner more likely to be sustainable than industrially oriented activities. Landless livestock production conducted in backyards or unused lands is a means by which the poor apply their labor and limited capital to economic and nutritional benefit, and thus represents a further valid area of pro-poor research.

Within the wide and diverse needs of international livestock research for the benefit of the poor, ILRI has taken different approaches according to the trends of different epochs, and these responses inform us of ILRI's current iteration. Beginning by seeking a single technical solution such as a vaccine or new breed, a broader conception evolved that considered the value of a wider range of livestock products such as draught and milk, and this has now been further widened to accommodate some of the profound complexities of interrelationships in traditional production systems. These three faces in ILRI may be seen as; the separate ILCA and ILRAD initiatives (1973-1993), the phase of merger and consolidation under Hank Fitzhugh as the DG (1993-2001) and the current systems approach steered by the present ILRI DG Carlos Sere (2002-). The former two are well documented in past files and in the minds of some external observers, while for this EPMR the present approach of holistic systems – from production, to markets, to institutions, to policy – sets the context.

ILRI's current approach in the light of all the above has been to select a common conceptual framework for discussion and planning. This is based on defining the determinants of beneficiary well-being and then identifying interventions for improved policies in order to identifying practical research opportunities. From this logic, actions are derived to secure livestock assets, improve livestock system productivity and to improve market opportunities. This is hardly revolutionary, which should provide comfort to donors that past work has been useful and is being built on in a systemic manner. This emphasis on working within systems has already revealed some deficiencies in some past development assumptions, such as the risk of adopting research outputs often being too high for the absolutely-poor unless some protection or confidence is provided. Such security may be assisted through participatory planning of research. A specific type of researcher for a specific research approach is therefore required, which seems to favor those educated in development environments.

1.2 ILRI Operational Context

Attempting 'to reduce poverty and enhance sustainable development through research' across the globe on an annual budget of some US$ 34M would be difficult for a mono-commodity center, and is even more complex for ILRI with its responsibility for all domestic animal species of the poor in integrated social, economic and technical systems of production. Clearly, ILRI cannot be expected to conform to conventional modes of livestock research management and must take a different approach to its work in a declining funding environment. Figures

presented in the financial management section of this EPMR indicate that in constant 2005 dollars the ILRI budget declined after merger and has been largely rebuilt to a fairly constant level since 2002.

As a product of the merger of ILCA and ILRAD, ILRI manages within a unique organizational and geopolitical heritage. It also inherits the orphan role assigned to livestock in agricultural science and the perceived failure of at least one of its antecedents to meet its objectives. Being assigned a global mandate at merger placed ILRI in a disadvantageous resource position compared to the four mono-crop Centers established in the CGIAR some 35 years earlier. Nevertheless, ILRI has produced some remarkable outputs, and it has also undergone much internal self-analysis and revision.

Also unlike most CGIAR Centers, ILRI has been forced to radically revise its structure, mandate, approaches and self-image as a result of merger and changing external circumstances. In so doing, it has achieved international best practice in some cases, such as its biotechnology research, yet more focus and quality control is needed, which the Board and management seem to appreciate in facing high-level issues specific to ILRI.

The meta-issues facing ILRI may be captured by such polarized and leading questions as: Is it the international livestock research center or the cattle center for Africa? Is it a rehashed convergence of ILCA and ILRAD activities or is it a genuinely new vision for livestock research? Are its MTPs shaping the research agenda or is it formed by the funding environment? Is it creeping into development activities or is it engaged in insightful research designs suited to development outcomes? Does ILRI overemphasize the assumption of a 'revolution' that may trickle down to the poor, or is it reorienting to an emerging marginalized livestock sector? And if ILRI did not exist, how would global livestock needs of the poor best be approached? These questions – some implied and some verbalized – challenge management and governance, and also in general terms the CGIAR and the EPMR. They provide a basis for checking the analyses presented in this report and we therefore return to them in our final section.

1.3 The Residual Effects of the Merger

ILRI displays the vigor of a younger organization, perhaps as a result of its hybrid birth from two older institutions. Yet such heterosis is accompanied by identifiable traits of each parent, such that one Theme looks a little like ILRAD and one can see ILCA in other Themes. Since 1999, ILRI has been slowly metamorphosing into a new institution with a different mission and approach to that of its antecedents. External observers may not have noticed this gradual change, which has required planning, management, recruitment, organization and supervision of activities while continuing to meet past agreements and wider CGIAR requirements. The previous EPMR described an institution that was recoiling from an ill-planned merger while searching for a future role. While largely recovered from that recoil, ILRI is now different from the sum of its former parts.

The current MTPs (2006-2008 and 2007-2009) are the continuing instruments of reorganization around multidisciplinary teams in a limited number of themes – a major contrast to the discipline-based structure of the past. It is this structure of activities that confuses onlookers who expect to see broadly-based geographical or technical programs and find only 'Themes' stretched across locations and disciplines with the expectation of generic outcomes that will serve a wider global audience. Thus discipline-based and geographically-specific research projects have been

replaced, in conceptual terms at least, by firstly defining where research can be useful and understanding the drivers of change in livestock systems (Targeting Opportunities Theme), understanding change processes and influencers (Enabling Innovation Theme – now merged into Targeting Opportunities Theme), determining market access (Marketing Theme), producing biotechnologies to suit the previous three situations (Biotechnology Theme), and then understanding the interactions between the major components of the system in the People, Livestock and Environment Theme 5.

Reforming financial and other systems has occurred in parallel with reengineering the organization. ILRI considers that its funding has increased since the last EPMR, although as indicated earlier, the real quantum has at best been maintained and proportion of restricted funds has increased. Reserves management has been conservative in preparation for infrastructure investment and places ILRI among the most prudent of CGIAR centers.

But before presenting great detail, it is important to say that donors to ILRI should be particularly pleased with the process of self-reinvention of which they are part, for ILRI is best conceived as a partnership with its donors as it increasingly adds value to donor ideals and policies related to research for development. Now, in 2006, it is not possible to say ILRI as a simple cobbling together of ILCA and ILRAD programs. Of course, some programs continue – as they should, but the processes of planning and reorganization of activities and management systems has integrated these continuing programs with new activities that enhance the probability of beneficial research outputs and in some cases, direct development outcomes. The transformation of its parents into ILRI has, through its planning processes, also acknowledged many changes in the external environment.

1.4 External changes

Drivers of change in the external environment have become more evident in recent times and interact in a manner that is determining the role and nature of ILRI. Among these drivers are: (1) changes in donor support; (2) uneven technological development; (3) information technology (IT) developments; (4) international legal developments; (5) CGIAR reformation, and (6) shifts in the socioeconomic environment of ILRI's targeted beneficiaries.

1. Donor financial support for the CGIAR Centers in general has not kept pace with development-oriented donor funding over the past decade and has only partially been replaced by project-specific funding, and often under conditions that unrestricted core donors will fund the full overhead costs of projects. At the same time, contributions from the World Bank, which come with requirements over CGIAR programs, have been tied to other contributions in a competitive fundraising environment. In the case of ILRI, major reductions in funding accompanied the latter days of ILRAD and ILCA and the 'lost' funds have been difficult to replace in real dollar terms, and the gap yawns wider when new funds are tied to specific projects or programs. Coupled with these changes is refocusing of the international agenda around such foci as the Millennium Development Goals.
2. Technological changes in molecular genetics and genomics for example, have advanced rapidly in recent years and are expected to continue. While mainly oriented to humans and plants, spin-offs exist in the animal sciences, including the implications of crop-residue quality and quantity for the animal feeds of the poor. Commercial opportunities in the field are dominated by private sector interests that engage contract researchers in

government and university research bodies. ILRI should not compete in this arena, yet it also cannot assume that commercial interests will develop products of value to the poor or the food insecure. Such a change in the external environment behooves ILRI to remain informed of developments in the field as a knowledge-broker for those who act on behalf of the poor.

3. Information Technology continues to develop quickly and to offer potential benefits to the poor and poor countries through information access and even education and training. However, increased dependence of researchers on real-time interaction across high-speed links to utilize databases and capacity in other locations may well be limited by the location of CGIAR scientists in countries with poor IT access and services.
4. Legal frameworks have advanced for the IPR of genetic resources, which have been regularized by the Convention on Biological Diversity of 1998 by establishing national sovereignty over genetic resources.[7] Together with patents, such regulations primarily affect CGIAR crop Centers, with the exception that forage species and the Forage Gene Bank continue to be managed within ILRI.
5. CGIAR 'renewal' has encouraged the reorientation of ILRI focus to poverty reduction. Changes within CGIAR itself have included ILRI in leadership of the MTP process for Eastern and Southern Africa, the SLP (since 1995) and various chair and committee roles. CGIAR is now attempting to reduce fragmentation through development of a coherent research agenda to address 20 system priorities related to: conserving animal resources; genetic improvement; high-value products; natural resources management, and policies and institutions.[8] ILRI contributes to each of these five overarching priorities but not to all 20 detailed priorities.
6. In addition to these drivers, ILRI's ultimate client base is also changing. This is partly the so called 'livestock revolution', which may be placed in an overall development context of continued rising affluence in Asia accompanied with an increased separation between subsistence and commercially oriented systems, and the now-critical marginalization of some pastoral and landless livestock systems.

1.5 Responses to 1st EPMR

The first (1999) and only previous EPMR of ILRI produced 14 recommendations (28 items). ILRI's self-assessment of actions in response to recommendations and the 2nd EPMR Panel comments on the implementation are presented in Annex 5. The Panel considers that ILRI has fully implemented nine of the recommendations. Other recommendations have been addressed partially or not at all, mainly because they were superseded by events or ILRI taking wider actions that subsumed the intention of the recommendations. In these areas ILRI has exceeded the actions recommended by developing strong scientific leadership and incisive decision-making; integrating global evaluation of all animal feeds with nutritional evaluation of dietary options; reorganization of the institute, and ceased some operations in the LAC region. Those areas where some further action is pending include more *ex ante* impact assessment than that housed in the Targeting Opportunities Theme by addition of *ex post* impact assessment, and operationalizing the global mandate in terms of staff operating bases. The previous EPMR was upbeat about the critical role to be played by a revamped ILRI but it failed to relate resources to the challenge of expanding globally. Thus it is concluded that ILRI has not only implemented the

[7] The International Treaty on Plant genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture of 2004 addresses the exchange of plant genetic resources important for food and agriculture to allow multilateral exchange of germplasm for major food crops.

[8] System Priorities for CGIAR Research 2005-2015. Science Council, 2005.

vast majority of the recommendations that were practical, but has exceed their intent in some cases. Means of continuing to improve ILRI form the basis of ILRI planning, which is discussed in Chapter 2.

2 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND PRIORITY SETTING

ILRI's strategic directions and priorities have improved markedly since the 1999 EPMR and in the 11 years since merger, these have yielded management documents that reflect ongoing changes in direction and focus, including changes in structure and function. The 2006 EPMR looked at a number of issues important to ILRI planning at the present time: the assumptions on which plans are based, the strategies to implement the mission, financial planning, determining priorities and geographical considerations, and to the extent it still had an effect, the integration of the parent entities.

2.1 Strategic Assumptions

MTPs need to define the objectives, strategy and activities that combined with available resources identify ILRI's niche. This begins with defining the target beneficiaries and then determining the modes of assisting them through research; matching priority research areas with potential partners and donors; and then designing the means of influencing the international agenda and other researchers while conducting high quality scientific research that levers other funds and benefits.

ILRI planning is based on three premises: the Livestock Revolution, the multiple roles of livestock in the livelihood strategies of poor people and the need to address global issues. The latter premise reflects the reality of livestock in various systems, from social to economic, from farming to nomadic – and as such is appropriate to the mandate to "reduce poverty and enhance sustainable development through livestock-related research." The Livestock Revolution is used by ILRI, and now some other agencies, for the trend of market development. The Panel is pleased to see Livestock Revolution terminology better contextualized in the new MTP, with a clearer acknowledgment that increased demand for livestock products potentially increases environmental pressure and threatens to further marginalize poor livestock keepers.

In noting that rapidly developing economies consume more meat and dairy products, ILRI aims to "reduce poverty by enhancing the participation of poor people in dynamic livestock value chains" This takes ILRI beyond working only with be the poorest livestock keepers. The strategy also recognizes threats to the poor from trends in consumption, and ILRI's response has been to orient its assistance to this group to policy safety nets based on perceived rates of return on ILRI's investment. Policies that empower the poor are to be applauded, but the integration of policy research for the very poor in ILRI research could be better enunciated.

ILRI's mandate orients it to the global role of livestock in crop-livestock and subsistence farming, traditional nomadic pastoral, landless and other poverty-related livestock keeping systems. In fact ILRI's programs, activities and donor contributions support this orientation. The Panel suggests that the MTP balance the importance of the expansion in livestock product demand with clear explanations and operational details of activities of benefit to the really poor and marginalized livestock keepers.

Another approach to analyzing priority setting is to investigate the processes of project initiation, the allocation of unrestricted funds, and the relationship of objectives to such specific indicators as animal species. Such an analysis indicates that the MTP process is top-down for general implementation plans that allow Theme Directors to develop OPs in a bottom-up process consistent with strategies within funding availability. While unable to determine how real

stakeholder inputs feed into planning processes connected to the development of MTPs, the Panel finds that ILRI's general approach yields pragmatic priority setting reflective of the external environment.

For the allocation of unrestricted funds, ILRI acknowledges broad CGIAR System priorities, donor realities, stakeholders interests including regional and sub-regional research organizations (in Africa at least) and global livestock-interested bodies. Theme directors receive a rolling three-year allocation from core funds to make strategic appointments to new areas and attract funds for larger projects by matching contributions. Core funds are also allocated to rapid response and politically charged areas; a current example is Avian Influenza. ILRI maintains that its defined priorities managed through incentives is balanced by a quality management process in which concept notes and proposals are all reviewed for congruence with the strategy.

In terms of priority setting with respect to species, ILRI, while responsible for all agriculturally important livestock species, makes no specific allocations on this basis, which perhaps explains ILRI's traditional and dominant emphasis on cattle, and to an extent, small ruminants. Overall, the Panel concluded that the process of setting and managing priorities has continuously improved and that the next steps include specific actions to meet the broader livestock mandate.

2.2 ILRI's Mission and Strategy

ILRI's mission is still valid and appropriate: "to reduce poverty and enhance sustainable development through livestock-related research." The mission is divided into three general "pathways": securing the assets of the poor, improving the productivity of their livestock systems, and improving market opportunities. Clearly ILRI cannot accomplish all that these pathways imply, and hence its strategy includes influencing of others to also contribute towards these ends. Seventeen (to be 15 after January 2007) Operating Projects (OP), including SLP projects, are grouped into four (previously five) Themes: Targeting Opportunities and Enabling Innovation; Market Opportunities; Biotechnology; and People, Livestock and the Environment, into which the ILRI-related research activities of BecA and IPMS can be seen to be subsumed. Capacity strengthening is embedded in most projects and is overtly recognized as a significant component in many.

The Themes grew out of the issue-driven restructuring of ILRI linked to the adoption of a new strategic plan in 2002. Themes incorporated a number of pre-existing projects that were consistent with the new strategy, and rationalized the termination or completion of a number of old projects over the period 2000-2006 (Table 2.1). Given the relatively long-term nature of livestock research, the development of a theme-based strategic framework indicates a laudable effort to reshape ILRI's focus. Themes are flexible in nature and can accommodate changes in the external environment, as well as the changes within ILRI as an institution.

The OPs reflect an approach to gender inclusion and awareness uncommonly mature in research planning. This results from the mode of operation of the Targeting Opportunities and Enabling Innovations Theme, which underpins all research in the ILRI plan, and to the systems approach employed throughout ILRI. An ILRI commitment to participatory research inherently includes all players. This ensures that ILRI deals with all persons in a livestock area, including children where they are engaged as herders, for example. The Panel notes that the level of gender inclusion and awareness accrues both from the overall approach of ILRI and because the role of women in livestock, although it varies widely, is particularly important across cultures. This fact

and ILRI's approach will ensure a continued openness to gender without the need to address it as a specific issue in planning. To consolidate its gender-related findings, an 'Innovation and Impact' monitoring unit in the DDG's office will include gender in its scope of work.

Table 2.1 Discontinued ILRI Research (2000-6)

Research Area	ILRI's Reason for stopping
Tryps vaccines	Low probability of success
Rumen microbes; detoxification	Alternative suppliers; Lack of critical mass
Greenhouse gases from animals	Alternative suppliers; Limited applicability
Feeding trials for different rations	NARS role; Reoriented to crop-feed research
Ethiopia Highlands & Mountains	Too location-specific; Resources better elsewhere
Livestock – Malaria research	Limited importance of livestock
Trypano-tolerance field work	Poor outputs; No success in converting research
Dairy technology	Location specific NARS activity
Smallholder dairy program	Completed in Kenya; Broadened to global level
Poverty diagnosis and mapping	Resources shifted to strategic interventions

2.3 The Process of Planning and Reporting: MTPs

In ILRI's complex social, economic, political, cultural and biophysical working environment, the MTP becomes the primary instrument of communication and management. ILRI strategy and plans as presented in MTPs serve to document the gradual process of consolidating ILRI and resolving the last vestiges of the merger. Past programs have been assessed and difficult decisions to terminate activities have been made and staff have either been deployed or have left ILRI. Past programs or expertise cannot be recaptured or easily recreated, which argues for the criticality of the MTP. ILRI management should be congratulated on the progress made, which is often not visible in the minutiae of short-term plans.

Overall, analysis of the MTPs indicates that ILRI has transcended much of the old ILCA+ILRAD structure and confirm that ILRI has increased emphasis on social, economic and institutional aspects of livestock research while retaining a few areas where it has a specific advantage.

As useful as MTPs are, more consistent reporting within the MTP format would assist both monitoring and review functions. As part of the progressive improvement of MTPs, the Panel considers the next step to be clear indications of who is responsible for outputs and what resources are allocated per activity. Once the ten year contextual plan and MTPs are as comprehensive as they should be, the active MTP should be the only document required for planning, monitoring, reporting and resource management.

Existing MTPs also indicate that in addition to the elimination or evolution of existing projects, new projects have also been initiated (see Annex 6 for a diagram of evolution from old Projects to new Themes and Operational Projects). The presentation of activities within the MTP heightens the impression that management of systems-research is complex. Reporting of outputs by Themes in some cases and projects in others, hides regional or disciplinary outputs and thereby adds an additional analytical task when making the case for a global presence. Creating more transparency in reporting regional activities would seem to support ILRI's rationale for its structure as a means of breaking down past programmatic and geographical silos – including an

overwhelming east African focus. A cross-cutting reporting structure for geographical coverage, at least, is needed for the MTP to fully reflect ILRI's mandate and strategy.

The MTP process is also linked to a rolling three-year budget cycle, which should be seen as an opportunity to develop more nuanced and strategic business plans. Within the general funding constraints and greater reliance on restricted funds, two issues need to be considered: the value of periodic zero-based reviews of projects, and an aggressive approach to full cost recovery on projects supported by restricted funds.

Zero-based reviews examine ongoing projects for the benefits of their continuation. It forces projects to re-argue their value in the medium and long-term in order to justify the continuation and level of resource allocation, and helps to resolve the natural inertia that grows around projects over time. Reviews are typically conducted on a three-year schedule. In addition to questioning a project's continuation, reviews should also consider restructuring projects to improve efficiency and perhaps merge with other projects.

Full cost recovery for projects, particularly those funded with restricted funding, is a critical financial practice as the number of short-term and restricted projects grow. ILRI's financial performance indicator of for indirect costs for restricted projects indicates some way to go in the full recovery of costs. Refining costing and budget methodologies to ensure as full a recovery of indirect costs as possible requires enhanced accounting capacity in budget development and monitoring and reporting. The Panel, therefore, urges progressive improvements to full cost recovery for restricted projects to provide ILRI with the maximum discretion possible over the use of its unrestricted resources.

Considering the competitive operating environment, the substantial assets of ILRI and the naturally long horizon for measuring results in livestock research, ILRI should expand its planning horizon to complement the MTP. The Panel **recommends** a planning cycle in which strategic vision and goals with ten year horizons yield strategic five-year business plans, operationalized annually. (Recommendation 1)

Enhanced planning for longer intervals would not impede the planning and monitoring required for MTPs and would strengthen overall strategic planning, resource development and resource allocation.

2.4 Priority Setting

In addition to CGIAR priorities, ILRI notes that its priority setting is based on such criteria as: impact on poverty, user-demand, ILRI's value-adding capacity and creation of IPGs. The Panel was unable to satisfy itself that donor influence and resource availability were not significant factors in priority setting, which is normal and would be expected in the current funding environment and which is understood by ILRI. Because of this, the planning process needs to recognize such external forces in an open fashion. The policies and actions of global investment banks and donor organizations with respect to livestock development and research are a critical component of the planning context and should form an analytical prelude between the mission and the strategy by which ILRI may make an impact. It is suggested that future ten year plans and MTPs include a summary of detailed analysis livestock research and development in general, and that if ILRI does not have this capacity that it seek external assistance.

As ILRI differs from most CGIAR centers in covering more than one or two staples, priority-setting also extends to geographical coverage and choices about animal species, which in addition to cattle might be expected to include poultry, goats, sheep, pigs and perhaps even less conventional species like rabbits – even though some species, regions and approaches may be then be rejected in the targeting of global issues.

2.5 Contributions to CGIAR System Priorities

Livestock research is emphasized in the CGIAR System Priorities (SPs). ILRI's research contributes to topics within all five SP areas. Some of ILRI's research is directly geared towards specific goals identified under three of the SP areas, and other research components contribute to those goals: SP1, *Sustaining Biodiversity for Current and Future Generations;* SP2, *Producing more and better food at lower cost through genetic improvements;* and SP4, *Poverty alleviation for sustainable management of water, land and forest resources*.

In SP1, the major area of ILRI's emphasis is on 1C, *Conservation of Indigenous Livestock*, mostly from the Biotechnology Theme and with some from the Targeting and Innovation Theme. In addition, some research relates to 1B from the perspective of conservation of forages. ILRI's research related to livestock breeding is relevant for SP 2D (Genetically enhancing selected high-value species) and its work on food-feed crop and forage selection with (CGIAR crop centers) addresses 2C. A large part of ILRI's research is directly geared towards SP 3B, *Income Increases from Livestock*, including research conducted under the Themes of Markets and Biotechnology. Research under Theme People, Livestock and Environment contributes to 4D, *Sustainable Agro-ecological Intensification of Low- and High-Potential Environments*, 4A, *Integrated Land, Water and Forest Management at Landscape Level* and 4C, *Improving Waster Productivity*. ILRI considers that the second largest Priority area that its research contributes to, is SP5, *Improving Policies and Facilitating Institutional Innovation to Support Sustainable Reduction of Poverty and Hunger*, where all priorities are covered, especially 5D, *Improving Research and Development Options to Reduce Rural Poverty and Innovation* as this is the major activity of the Targeting and Innovation Theme. The Panel considers that this research is also relevant to ILRI's livestock and natural resource management related research.

The Panel concludes that ILRI's research seems to fit very well with those SPs which address livestock issues, including livestock related institutional and policy areas. However, there are some areas, such as zoonotic animal disease where ILRI's engagement may be justified, while they are not within the SPs.

2.6 Geographic Prioritization, Global Coverage and Regional Activities

In 1995, the newly formed ILRI explored the meaning of a global mandate through workshops with partners that produced inventories of researchable livestock issues beyond the scope of its predecessor organizations. After confirming that most of the poor and poor livestock keepers resided in South Asia (36%), SSA (30%) and SEA (11%), ILRI's considered its most appropriate niche to be SSA with some activities in South Asia and liaison presences in China and SEA. ADB, ACIAR and IFAD assisted early work in SEA that subsequently ceased, while South Asian work focused on partnerships with ICRISAT, and demonstrated the benefit of such inter-center leverage. Details about ILRI's current activities in Asia are given in Annex 7.

ILRI's theme-based structure, which operates through Themes rather than regions or disciplines sets ILRI apart from NARS' structures and orients ILRI to IPG-related research. However, it also tends to orient of the geographical coverage of its work to content and ideas more than loci of operations, which is confirmed by the majority of IRS (94%) being based in Africa.

The Panel understands and queries ILRI's contention that it achieves its global approach through IPG research it conducts and that there is a continued priority placed by international donors on SSA. The Panel also sees the strides ILRI has made in initiating viable global presences and the improved efficiency it has experienced with global sites that are well-selected, particularly when associated with other CGIAR centers, and encourages ILRI to locate a greater proportion of it staff to other regions. While addressing globally important issues from one base may be appropriate for a policy institute in a developed country, ILRI is now at a stage of addressing its global presence to enhance its credibility outside east Africa.

As an illustration of the benefits of raising ILRI's profile in other geographic regions, the Panel considered the perceive value of ILRI's role and agenda in the Asian-Pacific region as reflected by the relationship between ILRI and donors that focus on the region, especially Australia and Japan. Australian funding of IARCs, channeled through ACIAR in an usually transparent and policy-driven approach, totaled about A$10M (US$7.5M) in 2005 for both core funding (55-60%) and projects that met partnership, geographical and performance guidelines (40-45%). For core funding, which is allocated according to sustained impacts of a CGIAR center in the Asia-Pacific region, ILRI has now slipped to the lowest funded category. Regardless of the amounts of funds involved, given the disproportionate influence on the Asian agenda enjoyed by Australia and its interest in livestock, its decisions with respect to ILRI can send a perhaps erroneous signal to other donors interested in the region.

Funding from Japan tells a similar story. Its contribution to CGIAR in general has declined from 12.6% in 1995 to 3.3% in 2004 with an emphasis on IRRI (29.6%); ILRI received only 2.2% of its funds from Japan in 2003 and 2004, and in 2005 and 2006 received less than US$250,000. The small amounts committed to ILRI from donors who are active in Asia are only one indication of ILRI's perceived relevance to the region. It seems that more than one donor views ILRI as an African-focused institution. The balance between dispersed activities and staff location, and between mandate responsibilities and necessary focus is a constant factor in donor relations and requires diligence to maintain.

In stating that ILRI will, after 2007, expand "South Asia operations to include market opportunities, livestock feeding, emerging diseases, utilization and conservation of animal genetic resources, crop-livestock integration and issues associated with the intensification of livestock systems" ILRI implies the allocation of significantly more resources and ILRI-led projects. As this does not seem achievable by simply linking Asian activities with those of SSA, the Panel assumed that staff and budget would clearly be allocated to Asia, although this is not yet evident in the MTP. Intentions to "work with other CGIAR Centers in the latter regions" is similarly laudable and the preferred mode of operation, yet the implementation of this intent is similarly not easy to find in the plans.[9]

The Panel feels that the previous EPMR was overly ambitious in implying the ease of global expansion without major resource reallocations. Having formulated an approach to global

[9] ILRI Medium-Term Plan 2007-2009: Livestock - A Pathway out of Poverty.

involvement within its resource base since 2002, ILRI is now challenged by the need to establish its reputation globally through reasonable levels of presence. The Panel sees this challenge as one that ILRI has struggled with since it was founded, and continues to attempt to resolve. With flexible Themes and the BecA initiative now advanced, it is time for this challenge to be accepted, for a critical mass of staff to be located in other CGIAR locations (for example, ICRISAT and IRRI), and for alternative delivery mechanisms to be tested in other areas.

The ambition of global impact requires a more geographically distributed allocation of a critical mass of resources. Projects with global outcomes can beneficially be managed from locations other than east Africa. ***The Panel therefore recommends that ILRI redefine its physical location strategy (using CGIAR Centers wherever possible) and its modus operandi for each region.*** The Board should assess progress in three years through external review. (Recommendation 2)