W. Edwardson

108.

EVALUATION OF

OILSEEDS NETWORK (ETHIOPIA) III

~~3-P-87-0025~~/6

FINAL REPORT

Thomas Development Associates

EVALUATION OF

OILSEEDS NETWORK (ETHIOPIA) III

3-P-87-0025

FINAL REPORT

Prepared for IDRC by

Thomas Development Associates Ltd,
Mallorytown, Ontario

March 1992

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IDRC has sponsored an Oilseeds Network since 1981. The Network has gone through three phases. Phase III, initiated in 1987, is the focus of the current evaluation. Achievements of earlier phases included assignment of an adviser, establishment of an oilseeds library, visits of the adviser to regional projects, germplasm collection, several workshops, publication of a newsletter, collaboration between Canadian and regional projects, and consultancy visits.

The objective of Ph III was to strengthen the oilseed research carried out in S. Asia and E. Africa by establishing effective practical liaison between national oilseed programs. Specific objectives which defined the nature of this liaison included technical support, germplasm exchange mechanisms, information exchange, technical training, and the development of new network forms.

The form of the evaluation was established at the Network Steering Committee meeting in Kenya, January 1991. Two main components were subsequently defined: questionnaires to be sent to a sample of Network members, and an on-site review of the Adviser's Unit in Addis Ababa. Both these activities were undertaken in 1991. Some IDRC-funded oilcrops projects were evaluated separately.

In general terms, the majority of the objectives specified for Ph III has been met. Specific achievements by objective include:

1. National Program Support. The Adviser has contributed significantly to national programs in terms of time dedicated to arranging workshops and training courses, and publishing a newsletter. The number of programs in the Network has precluded annual visits to each one, such that technical support at the program level by the Adviser does not appear to have been significant. Evaluation results suggest that the strong emphasis that the Network should have had in strengthening African programs more than Asian ones has not obviously been achieved. The Adviser dedicated more travel to Asia and N. Africa than to E. & S. Africa. Some of this orientation can be explained by the use of Asian resources in training activities.

2. Germplasm Exchange. The Network has contributed significantly to the exchange of germplasm between member countries, especially as bilateral mechanisms have been ineffective. Germplasm of all the major crops covered by the Network has been multiplied in Ethiopia and redistributed to Network members. 419 accessions are recorded as having been multiplied and sent since the inception of the Network.

3. Information. The Adviser has compiled and published an annual newsletter, with a distribution of approximately 600 recipients world-wide. The newsletter contains both papers and abstracts, and

is seen by members as being a significant source of information on oilcrops. Six workshops have been conducted since the beginning of Ph III, three specifically on Brassicas, one joint workshop on sesame, sunflower and other oilcrops, and two others generally on oilcrops. Several technical bulletins and reviews on different oilcrop topics have been published.

4. Training. During Ph III four training courses have been conducted. A fifth was due to be conducted at the time of the evaluation, but was delayed by difficulties in clearances for participants. Trainees were extremely positive about the content and benefit of the courses, and the majority have applied what was learnt to their research programs. Most trainees were plant breeders; others included agronomists, pathologists and entomologists.

5. New Network Forms. A Steering Committee and Network sub-committees were formed. Originally intended to be involved significantly in Network management, funding constraints reduced the extent to which this was possible. Network members believed that formation of these committees did improve management of the Network by its members.

   The intention to fund collaborative projects was not realized. While some planning was achieved, most projects foundered on bureaucratic constraints to their implementation. While Network members viewed such projects as being important, they were not apparently of such high priority to merit significant attention.

   Sub-Networks achieved different degrees of development and autonomy, the Brassicas Sub-Network becoming the strongest. Most training and workshop resources have been dedicated to the Brassicas. Network members wish the present crop-orientation to continue, though suggest the amalgamation of the other sub-networks.

   Linkages with other agencies in information dissemination and network funding have not been very successful, due to different emphases of these bodies. Some of the material published in the newsletter is now being forwarded to more crop-specific newsletters published by other bodies.

Network members did not respond to the questionnaires to the degree hoped for. The final universe of respondents was not sufficiently large to be able to draw conclusions on some topics. Lack of response may itself be an indicator of members' perception of the importance of the Network. General conclusions that may be drawn include:

1. The Network has served principally the breeders of National Oilseed Research Programs (NORPs). Potential impact on the outputs of such NORPs is therefore principally restricted to the development of new varieties. Few NORPs were cognizant of the

development effects of their new varieties. Only 25% of respondents indicated that network inputs had contributed to released varieties, though some indicated that new varieties were still in the pipeline.

2. Respondents generally believe that the Network was not given the resources necessary for it to become self-sustaining during Ph III.

3. Germplasm exchange remains a priority within the Network, and the current crop-orientation is the format the members wish to retain.

4. Members rated workshops above the newsletter in terms of information exchange.

5. Improved research quality was seen to be the main benefit of the NORPs from the Network.

6. The Coordinating Unit in Ethiopia was considered to have been essential to management of the Network. Its location in Ethiopia was considered to have restricted its effectiveness.

It is not possible to determine the impact of the Network on each NORP, or the downstream benefits to oilcrop producers. The difficulty respondents had in defining the linkage between a stronger NORP and benefits at the farm-level suggests that the Network could contribute to this area in future. Other factors also influence the effectiveness of a NORP in its mandated area, and in at least one program supported directly by IDRC, exogenous forces may have been more important in the dissemination of material to producers than the institutional channels of either the NORP or the Network.

While specific impacts are difficult to determine, it is the conclusion of this evaluation that, from the scope of activities supported by the Network, the time the Network has been operating, and the known capacity of some of the NORPs, there has been some benefit to the oilcrop producer from the Network. As monitoring of the use of Network inputs during Ph III was not consistent, this benefit is unquantified, and is probably unquantifiable.

Recommendations from the evaluation include:

1. A shift in focus of the Network from breeding to Production-to-Consumption Systems Research (PCSR). A NORP, by definition, should be more than a breeding program.

2. Continued use of Asian resources in African program development needs to be more strategically defined, to avoid the constraints encountered in Ph III.

3. A return to the original African focus will require a conscious shift of resources away from Asia, and probably a significant reduction in Asian representation on the Steering Committee.

4. Advisory input should focus much more on identified needs of member programs. National programs within a broader PCSR framework will probably benefit more from problem-specific consultancies and individual training attachments than the delivery of generalized services that was the pattern during Ph III.

5. A future Network should be subject to active monitoring, to ensure that the use of Network inputs in delivering NORP outputs can be determined.

6. IDRC should consider direct support to the Steering Committee Chairperson (e.g. a 50% intern scientist position) to catalyze his or her commitment.

7. A Network expecting ultimate benefit for a rural clientele should support its members in defining and using methods for determining this benefit.

1. Introduction

The Oilseeds Network began as an IDRC-supported project in 1981. The project aimed at developing stronger oilseed research in national programs by:

a) Linking oilseed programs researchers in India and elsewhere in South Asia with those in Africa.

b) Exchanging germplasm between the continents to their mutual advantage.

c) Providing relevant information to national oilcrop improvement programs.

d) Developing relevant training.

A network adviser, attached to the oilcrops program in Ethiopia, was employed to fulfill the basic functions of the network. The adviser was to establish a strong network base within the national program in Ethiopia, regularly visit countries in the region to provide support, suggestions and encouragement to national scientists for developing stronger oilseed research programs, facilitate mutual visits of scientists, organize workshops, relevant training courses and information exchange, and facilitate the exchange of germplasm needed in developing improved varieties of oilseeds.

The project has gone through three phases. Phase III is the focus of the current evaluation.

Phase III Objectives

Phase III had several objectives:

A. General

To strengthen the oilseed research carried out in South Asia and Eastern Africa by establishing effective, practical liaison between the national oilseed programs.

B. Specific

To continue support that will increase the effectiveness of national oilcrops programs in the region.

To establish the most effective mechanisms for the exchange of oilcrop germ plasm in the network.

To continue the flow of needed information to national oilseed programs.

To provide middle-level technical training on oilseeds.

To evaluate the feasibility of new network forms in increasing network effectiveness and efficiency.

C. Other

The IDRC Project Summary also identifies certain issues which were to be evaluated during Phase III. Those not mentioned in B above include:

Integration with other international organizations including FAO, the International Sunflower Association, and the Cruciferae newsletter.

The location , function, and donor support needed for an oilseeds research unit which can actively generate and disseminate improved oilseed genetic material and technology to national oilseed programs.

During the Oilcrops Network Steering Committee meeting in Kenya, 14-18 January 1991, discussion focussed on the broader implications of the network, in terms of anticipated results and the final beneficiary. As a result, a statement of goal was derived:

To assist national oilcrop research programmes to improve the welfare of small oilcrop producers and their communities.

It is important to recognize that this evaluation must deal with this goal if the result is to improve the way in which the network serves small farm communities.

Historic perspective

Achievements of Phase I (1981-84)

During Ph I, a functioning network was established:

1. An adviser was contracted and based at IAR, Holetta, with office support.

2. An oilcrops library was started.

3. The adviser visited all oilcrop projects in the region, and reviewed research with participating scientists.

4. In Ethiopia, the adviser supported the highland oilseeds project, and helped develop the lowland oilseed project. The adviser supported the national program in his function as plant breeder.

5. A series of oilseed germplasm collecting expeditions was made, and the number of local oilseed collections was increased.

6. Canadian scientists visited Egyptian and Ethiopian projects as consultants.

7. The first oilseed workshop was held.

Constraints in Ph I

The network was not able to facilitate exchange of germplasm between national programs due to reluctance on the part of each to share material with other national programs. A few exceptions were noted.

Recommendations from Ph I

From the first oilseed workshop held in Cairo in 1983, several recommendations emerged:

1. The network be strengthened by including countries in the region without IDRC projects.

2. A yearly newsletter be started.

3. More technical oilseed training was needed.

4. Bilateral germplasm exchange should be emphasized.

5. More access to relevant published information was needed.

6. Regular workshops and monitoring visits by the adviser should be part of the network.

Achievements of Phase II (1984-87)

During Ph II, the emphasis changed to servicing an established network. The activities included:

1. Maintaining close involvement with the national oilseed program in Ethiopia. The Adviser provided graduate-level teaching to program staff.

2. The Adviser continued liaising with oilseeds programs in the region, providing technical advice and encouragement.

3. Three annual issues of the Oilseeds Newsletter were published, the third with a distribution list of over 600 persons.

4. Some national program scientists from India visited research programs in other countries.

5. The Network Consultant (as opposed to the Adviser)advised on research in several countries.

6. A cooperative project between Agriculture Canada and the Network made rapid progress on oilseed anther culture, with Indian and Ethiopian technicians working in Canada.

7. Grants were made to Somalia for germplasm collection, and to Kenya for a national oilseed workshop.

8. Work was undertaken to increase germplasm exchange.

9. Two further oilcrop workshops were held.

From the second of the two above workshops (the Third Oilcrops Workshop, Ethiopia, 1986), some changes were discussed to increase the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the Network. These included:

1. Developing a separate Brassica Network.

2. Establishing a Network Steering Committee.

3. Improving mechanisms for germplasm exchange.

4. Increasing collaborative research activities.

2. Evaluation Methodology

Initial discussion on the evaluation of the Network was held with IDRC Program Officer responsible for the Network at the IDRC Regional Office in Nairobi in January 1991. This coincided with the Network Steering Committee meeting, which the evaluator was requested to attend. Subsequent to the discussion and the meeting, it was decided to divide the evaluation into two main components:

1. Identification of the principal evaluation issues pertinent to users of the Network, and the use of a questionnaire to elicit users' responses.

2. A review of the Adviser's Unit based in Ethiopia, which was responsible for day-to-day operation of the Network, including provision of the principal inputs.

For each of the components, the following course of action was taken:

1. Evaluation issues were developed in a question form which corresponded to a draft Logical Framework, the latter being prepared for and discussed at the Network Steering Committee meeting in Egerton, Kenya, 14-18 January, 1991. The Evaluation Issues document was circulated among IDRC AFNS Program Staff, their comments being incorporated to the final questionnaire. The main questionnaire, a training questionnaire, and a newsletter questionnaire were mailed separately to different sets of recipients (though some recipients may have been members of more than one set). The recipients in each case were identified by the Network Adviser from a master mailing list maintained by the Adviser's Unit in Ethiopia. A copy of each questionnaire is included in Appendix 2.

2. A visit was made to the Adviser's Unit in Ethiopia between September 2nd and 14th, 1991. At the time of this visit, both the Network and the Oilcrops (Ethiopia) Project were reviewed. Of the time spent in Ethiopia, approximately four days were dedicated to the Network.

   Activities in Ethiopia included interviews with the Network Adviser, file reviews, and discussions with members of the Ethiopian Oilcrops Program about the Network and its interaction with the Program.

   A visit was also made to IDRC Ottawa to review file material held there. As the principal record of the Adviser's activities when visiting member Programs and/or Projects, the Adviser's travel reports were reviewed in detail. The approach to this review is described in section 3.

The evaluation process was affected by some factors beyond the control of the evaluator:

1. Initially, the selection of respondents and the mailing of the questionnaires was to be handled by the Network Office in Addis Ababa. Refusal of the Customs Division at Bole Airport in Addis to release the blank questionnaires significantly delayed the their despatch. Finally, the network and training questionnaires were sent out from Addis, but the newsletter questionnaire was sent out from Canada. The following table indicates the numbers of questionnaires sent and responses received.

Questionnaire	No sent	Date	Responses received
Network	About 40	June	14
Training	About 60	June	24
Newsletter	102	July	0

   The approximate number of network and training questionnaires reflected the uncertainty at the Addis Office of the actual number sent. The total lack of response to the newsletter questionnaire suggested that it was not received by the intended recipients; this was subsequently been found to be the case. A new mailing of the newsletter questionnaire was prepared. Results will be presented in an Annex to this report.

2. During the evaluator's visit to the Adviser's Unit, the Adviser was called away on a family emergency. This reduced the time available for discussions with the Adviser.

3. Project Objectives and Achievements

Objective a): National Program Support

Outputs/targets:

The adviser will continue to devote 30-40% of his time to working with the Ethiopian oilcrops program. Greater emphasis will be on supporting the lowland oilcrops and sunflower programs.

The adviser will review annual technical reports from projects, and visit programs regularly to keep in touch with and discuss oilcroop improvement programs with national oilcrop scientists.

More emphasis will be on interaction with programs in Africa which do not have IDRC support.

In collaboration with the IDRC program officer, the adviser will pursue possible further IDRC support for national programs in Africa. Where necessary, National Program Support funds will be allocated from the project.

National scientists will be encouraged to visit each others' projects. The use of consultants from the network region will be considered.

Achievements

National Program Support represents the most significant use of the Adviser's time of any of the Network's principal objectives. This section considers the Adviser's Terms of Reference and activities.

Network Adviser

General

The Network has had an adviser since its inception in 1981. The original adviser was also responsible for the startup of the Network. He left in 1984. His successor has been Adviser continuously to the present (several extensions were made to his contract). All reference to the Adviser in this section refers to the present incumbent.

The Terms of Reference (TORs) for the Adviser are included in Appendix 3. These are quite extensive, giving the Adviser a broad mandate. At the time of the Unit visit, the Adviser indicated that he did not recall having a specific set of TORs, though he assumed that a set was attached to his original contract.

The Adviser was originally attached to IAR, Holetta. While this had specific advantages for direct liaison with the IAR Oilcrops Program, it posed specific logistical constraints to the running of an international network. To improve communication, the Unit was relocated to IAR's Addis office in late 1988, where the Adviser worked from the Deputy Manager's Office. After a year,

pressure for space caused a further search for new quarters. The final quarters were in an office shared with CIMMYT, which was administered by ILCA. This effectively removed the Adviser from day-to-day contact with the Oilcrops Program.

Administrative responsibility within IDRC for the Unit remained with SARO in New Delhi until 1989, when it was passed to EARO. However, supervision of the Adviser passed to EARO in late 1988. For the various activities the Adviser conducted, approval of travel plans and issuing appropriate authority was a principal administrative function of the Regional Office.

The Network Adviser had the function of both facilitator of Network activities, and provider of technical assistance to Network members. In a very real sense, the success of the Network depended on the extent to which the Adviser achieved both of these roles, especially in terms of the scope of his activities.

An essential part of this process was regular visits to each of the Network member Programs or Projects. In order to determine the services provided by the Adviser, a review of travel reports between 1984 and 1990 was conducted (67 are on file at IDRC Ottawa).

Travel reports

A travel report is the traveller's own record of what he or she achieved during travel status. The way in which such a report is written has a major influence on the extent to which the actions of the traveller can be interpreted.

The Adviser's travel reports are written in such a way that it is seldom that the reader can discern when the Adviser made a substantive contribution to a discussion, project development, oilcrop testing methodology, etc.. Each report is much more a narrative of events, and a description of the countryside the Adviser was passing through. It is clear that the Adviser could have benefitted from some feedback on the content of his reports, if future reports were to have become a more significant record of his achievements.

The Adviser's 1984 Terms of Reference were used to establish a matrix of interventions, against which the above-mentioned 67 travel reports were compared. This matrix is shown in Appendix 4. Relative to the Adviser's Terms of Reference, the findings of this exercise can very briefly be summarized:

1. The Adviser did not visit each of the Network-member projects annually.

2. On an annual basis, using 1987 and 1988 as examples, the Adviser travelled internationally approximately 70 days (this includes time in transit). An internal IDRC memo of 7 December 1987 questioned whether the Adviser budgetted enough time on each project visit to get a thorough understanding of each one, and to develop a strong and sustainable interaction. The travel reports

do not demonstrate a significant degree of interaction, though questionnaire respondents were positive about the contributions of the Adviser.

3. After 1986, very little of the Adviser's emphasis was on the technical aspects of Network projects, much more being on activities of international liaison and workshop arrangement.

4. If the travel reports are a reasonable indicator of the Adviser's input to the Ethiopian program, he did not provide the 30-40% of his time to this activity. The lowland team advised the evaluator that the Adviser had not visited Melkewerer within the eighteen months prior to the evaluator's visit. It is noted that the Adviser files a separate Activity Report with EARO which indicates travel within Ethiopia. The CPS PO indicates that the Adviser makes regular visits to Ethiopian sites.

When requested to provide his own breakdown of time spent on different activities, the Adviser provided the following information:

	%
Visits to projects, workshops	30
Newsletter/proceedings writing/editing	>20
Correspondence with network members	10
Travel administration	5
Germplasm exchange	5
Technical assistance to IAR	<30
Other	>1
Total	**100**

File reviews at the Unit indicated that the 10% of the Adviser's time spent on correspondence included little time spent on reviewing annual technical reports.

The following represents the division of travel time (number of visits) between major geographical destinations during the 1984-90 period as indicated in the 67 travel reports:

Destination	No of visits	%
Asia (less India)	7	10
India	17	25
Europe/North America	9	13
North Africa (incl Ethiopia)	17	25
Southern Africa	15	22
Others	2	3
Total	**67**	**Approx 100**

The Adviser's most frequent destinations were India and Egypt. Southern Africa received relatively less attention than North Africa.

The indication by IAR staff at Melkawerer that the Adviser had not visited the lowland station during the previous eighteen months disagrees with the activity reports filed by the Adviser with EARO. According to a communication (05/03/92) from the CPS Programme Officer, EARO, the activity reports indicate that the Adviser made 10 trips to Melkawerer during 1990 and the first half of 1991, two to Kulumsa and Awassa, and 15 to Holetta during the same period. A comparison of the dates of the four travel reports for 1990 reviewed by the evaluator indicates only one discrepancy: the Adviser apparently visited Holetta on 19 April 1990, when he was, in fact, in China.

National Program Support Funds were not initially under the Adviser's control. However, responsibility was transferred to him during financial year 1987/88. During this period support was provided for National Workshops in Sri Lanka and Kenya, and local germplasm collection in Somalia. Subsequent budget restrictions resulted in this source of funding reverting to Program Officer control. The Adviser believes that the National Workshop in Kenya was his best initiative in stimulating attention on oilcrops.

There has been some use of regional scientists as consultants, though it would appear to be less than the Questionnaire responses would indicate (this is attributed to some reference to the Adviser as a consultant). One visit of an Indian scientist to Ethiopia and Sudan on sesame is recorded, but the impression is also recorded that the consultant learnt more than he contributed. Attempts to bring the same scientist to Ethiopia on sabbatical were dropped when the budget exceeded any possible allocation of funds. The general lack of success in this area does not specifically reflect on the Adviser's efforts (though note the emphasis below on liaison). To a certain extent, the number of training courses given with regional scientists can be interpreted as a successful use of regional expertise in oilcrop research development. It should be noted that significant consulting input to the Network has been provided by an IDRC intern scientist based in Delhi, who is also a primary member of the Indian Brassica program, and a member of the Network Steering Committee.

Liaison

It is important to review both the meaning and value of liaison in the context of a Network intended to serve the interests of national programs and small projects. Liaison can be understood in terms of between projects, and in the broader sense of between the Network and other bodies.

Much of the Adviser's time was spent in broader liaison activities, though the planning and implementation of workshops and courses are also elements of liaison in the narrower context. From the Adviser's travel reports, it is often difficult to determine the precise value of some of the international activities, especially when only the adviser attended the meeting, or when the focus-crop at the meeting was not one covered by the Network (e.g. groundnut, though it is noted that groundnut is included in the

Ethiopia project; the Network Consultant subsequently advised against any more groundnut-focused Advisory involvement).

Travel reports do not focus on the establishment of collaborative research activities, one of the intended new network forms during Ph III. It is known that there were some specific bureaucratic constraints to exchange of scientists and materials. Certainly a more useful result of the Adviser's liaison time would have been a successful by-passing of some of these constraints, or a convincing of intended collaborators that such a linkage could have more than superficial benefits so that they themselves might have been stimulated to overcome these problems.

General

The Adviser's mandate was extremely broad. Given the number of programs included in the Network, and its geographic coverage, it may reasonably be asked whether the Adviser could have delivered the expected services, especially as the frequency of training courses and workshops increased, and as the Network split into sub-networks.

The current leader of the Ethiopian program indicated that the Adviser was especially supportive during the period when program leadership changed. His presence was clearly a stabilizing factor during a period of uncertainty. It is not possible to determine whether there has been a significant gain technically as a result of his interventions. However, the presence of the Network Unit in Ethiopia has been a significant factor in the development of the Ethiopian program.

Basing the Adviser in Ethiopia has, to some extent, restricted his capacity to service the Network, especially given the earlier location of the Unit at Holetta. However, it is difficult to provide an objective assessment of the extent to which this is relevant compared to what may have occurred had the Unit been based elsewhere. While travel to and from Ethiopia is not especially easy, the country is centrally located within the Network's target area, and air services are efficient.

The Adviser's greater emphasis on Asia during his travels undoubtedly relates partly to a general intent to effect knowldedge and capacity transfer from that continent to Africa. Had the Steering Committee been a more effective organ, it could have substituted for Advisory effort in this area.

It is important to determine whether the Adviser's shift in emphasis over time from technical support to international liaison, workshop and course arrangement, and newsletter publication, reflects the principal need of recipient programs. Most programs have responded positively on the value of these activities to them, and have not suggested that there could have been a significantly better use of resources, though a broad interest in collaborative research is noted. This is not evinced in the number of successful collaborative efforts that were established. Had these been a major priority to recipients, probably more would have been established. It does not specifically reflect on the Adviser that not more were established.

While there is some doubt about some specific areas, it is the opinion of the evaluator that the Adviser broadly met his terms of reference, and that the Network has advanced significantly (i.e. made significant contributions to national programs) as a result of his efforts. The evaluator believes that the Adviser could have been steered more effectively in the execution of his duties, and that the value of the Network to the national programs could be significantly better understood had the Adviser been more effective in his monitoring of the delivery and use of inputs. It is noted that the Adviser did receive specific recommendations on where to focus his energies on more than one occasion, and that the directions he followed may have been the result of his perception of what was recommended.

Network Consultant

Support was also provided to the Network by a Network Consultant. The Terms of Reference for this position are contained in Appendix 6. The Consultant provided regular feedback to the Adviser on technical matters, and generally attended workshops, where he would present a paper. The Adviser was originally identified and contracted through the efforts of the Consultant. The Consultant recommended to the Adviser early in 1987 (memo dated 14/01/87) that the he dedicate one-third of his time to the Ethiopian program, one-third for projects in Africa, and one-third for other Network responsibilities. The Consultant viewed the ensuing years a period in which the African component of the Network should become more significant.

Objective b): Germplasm Exchange

Outputs/targets

The dialogue between Indian and Ethiopian officials begun in Ph II will be followed up by the Adviser to ensure that bilateral exchange continues between these two countries.

Other network countries with fewer constraints to exchanging germplasm will be encouraged to exchange on a bilateral basis.

The collaborative nursery, as recommended at the third workshop, will be instituted, using Ethiopia as a base for receiving the seed samples and distribution of the nursery.

Achievements

Germplasm exchange and its use in national breeding programs has been one of the core intents of the Network as it was originally conceived, and is a fundamental reason why the Network is principally a network of plant breeders. From the perspective of the Network Consultant (memo to Adviser, 14/01/87), success in distribution of germplasm would have justified the Network's existence.

Germplasm exchange between India and Ethiopia was a specific issue, and was the focus of bilateral discussions during Phase II. While an exchange

mechanism was identified, through India's NBPGR, the Network has not succeeded in achieving exchange. The problem appears to lie with NBPGR, as the individual scientists who were the source of germplasm generally sent to NBPGR the material requested. Only material that bypassed NBPGR was received by other Network members. Discussions with NBPGR were still ongoing at the end of Phase III (Newsletter No 8, p1).

Bilateral exchange in general appears to have been a constraint in the germplasm component of the Network. The Adviser indicated that several countries (e.g. Egypt, Sudan) would not exchange material bilaterally. As the Network was considered by these countries an international entity, exchange by this channel was much more effective.

Informal exchange between Network members at workshops has also been a common mechanism, though is not quantifiable.

The Adviser established an oilcrops nursery with the support of IAR. The general mechanism established was that a country or scientist had to send material to be included in the nursery in order to be eligible to receive material of the same crop from the nursery. The following Table indicates the numbers of accessions of each major oilcrop received during three different periods. The nursery was originally established in 1987, but did not become a significant collection until 1988. One hundred percent of questionnaire respondents indicated both having sent and received germplasm through the Network, and that it was their main channel for obtaining such material. Most of the material was in good condition on receipt.

In at least two countries of the Network, the direct multiplication and distribution of varietal material from elsewhere has been a significant element in crop development in those countries. In both cases, Brassicas have been the crop disseminated. In Nepal, Indian Brassicas are grown extensively in the terai. While the national program through the Network has tested and released Indian varieties under local names, direct trading across the border may have been more significant in the current extended use of Indian germplasm. In China, spring rapeseed areas have been able to use single and double low varieties from Canada, Sweden and other countries directly for production. The specific contribution of the Network to this development is not known.

Numbers of entries of germplasm received and countries of origin

Up to July 1988

Brassica	
Nepal	11
Sweden	8
Ethiopia	5
China	8
India	31

Linseed	
Ethiopia	2
Nepal	1

Niger	
Ethiopia	8
Nepal	1

Safflower	
Egypt	10

Groundnut	
Nepal	4

Sesame	
Somalia	13
Philippines	16
Sri Lanka	3
Egypt	14
Israel	20
Ethiopia	9
Kenya	2
Nepal	1
Pakistan	1
Mexico	6
Greece	7
B. Faso	1
China	19
Iran	2
Bulgaria	9

Sunflower	
Ethiopia	8

August 88 - July 89

Brassica	
Bhutan	4
Mexico	1

Linseed	
Ethiopia	1

Niger	
Ethiopia	1
Mexico	1

Safflower	
Spain	30
Cyprus	6

Safflower (cont.)	
Canada	3
Mexico	7
Ethiopia	3

Sesame	
Tanzania	9
Nicaragua	9
India	11
Bangladesh	1
Mexico	11

Sunflower	
Canada	33
Mexico	7

August 89 - July 90

Brassica		Safflower	
Kenya	1	Cyprus	2
		Pakistan	3
Linseed			
		Sesame	
China	1		
India	2	Sudan	20
Kenya	1		
Ethiopia	1	Sunflower	
Niger		Kenya	2
		Yugoslavia	16
Bhutan	1	Canada	12
Ethiopia	3		

Source: Oil Crops Newsletter

Of importance in assessing the relevance of germplasm exchange to national oilcrop programs is the number of new varieties developed from breeding activities which specifically utilized the exotic material. Only 25% of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated that network inputs, including germplasm, had contributed to released varieties, though some indicated that new varieties were still to be released. This is an area where more attention by the Adviser to the technical content of most oilcrop programs could have been more effective in monitoring the use of such basic Network inputs. It is noted here that varietal development, unless a result of direct multiplication and dissemination of exotic material, as in Nepal and China, is generally a long-term process, and that the majority of payback to germplasm exchange in terms of varietal release may not be evident for several more years.

Objective c): Information

Outputs/targets

The Adviser was to ensure a continued flow of information among Network members. This was to include:

1. Compiling an annual Oil Crops Newsletter.

2. Ensuring that national programs received oilseeds abstracts, computer profiles, and searches when needed.

3. Organizing a workshop at 1-2 year intervals.

4. Reviewing books and journals received by the Network for relevant articles for distribution.

5. Compilation of a multi-authored monograph on nigerseed, possibly followed by sesame or safflower monographs organized by the Adviser.

Achievements

The Adviser has compiled and editted a Newsletter on an annual basis since 1984. By the end of Phase III, the circulation list had grown to about 600. Most of the distribution of material concerning abstracts and searches took place through the medium of this newsletter. Questionnaire respondents considered that the Newsletter was second to workshops in the dissemination of information, but 67% of them had contributed material to the Newsletter. The major value of the Newsletter to recipients was in keeping them abreast of activities of other members, though provision of information essential to their programs, and a means of publication of their results, were both quoted as secondary benefits. While not a peer-reviewed publication, 83% of respondents indicated that their institutions regarded the Newsletter as a formal publication.

The following Table indicates the general content of the Newsletter in different years. The Newsletter gradually focused more on scientific papers over time.

Summary of Contents of the Oil Crop Newsletters

Number	Contents
1	11 progress/situation reports
	3 scientific papers
2	11 reports and articles
	5 scientific papers
	154 selecteed references
	10 abstracts of new papers
3	10 reports and articles
	15 scientific papers
	7 MS/PhD summaries
4	5 reports and articles
	20 crop-specific papers
	11 entries in bibliography/abstracts
5	28 papers
	13 abstracts
6	7 progress reports and new records
	18 papers
	7 abstracts

7	22 papers 44 abstracts
8	23 papers 2 articles 83 abstracts

Source: Newsletter Tables of Contents

Workshops became a significant part of Network activities. During the latter part of Phase III, the Network was divided into four sub-Networks, each of which was intended to run separately, and to hold its own workshops. In the case of Brassicas, this approach was successful. However, the other sub-Networks have been less active. The following Table indicates the Workshops organized and sponsored principally by the Network.

Oil Crops Workshops

First Oil Crops Workshop, Cairo, September 1983

Second Oil Crops Workshop, Hyderabad, February 1985

Third Oil Crops Workshop, Addis Ababa, October 1986

Special Brassica Meeting, Uppsala, May 1987

Fourth Oil Crops Workshop, Egerton, January 1988

Brassica Sub-Network, Second Workshop, Pantnagar, January 1989

Other Oilcrops Sub-Network Workshop, Hyderabad, January 1989

Third Brassica Sub-Network Workshop, Shanghai, April 1990

Sesame, Sunflower, Other Oilcrops Joint Workshop, Shanghai, June 1991

Fourth Brassica Sub-Network Workshop, Saskatoon, July 1991

At the time of the Unit visit, several publications were in the pipeline, including:

Screening and breeding techniques for Alternaria blight resistance in oilseed Brassicas: A Review.

Oilcrops: Technical Bulletin on Identification of diseases and insect pests of Brassica Oilcrops.

Oilcrops: Screening and breeding techniques for drought resistance in Oleiferous Brassicae: A Review.

Oilcrops Newsletter No 8.

Oilcrops: Steering Committee II. Proceedings of second meeting, Egerton, Kenya, Jan 1991.

Oilcrops: China Joint Workshop. Proceedings of the Sesame, Sunflower, Other Oilcrop Sub-Networks and Steering Committee, Shanghai annd Beijing, June-July 1991.

Oilcrops: Brassica Sub-Network. Proceedings of the fourth workshop, Saskatoon, July 1991.

Discussions on a nigerseed monograph had been held by the Adviser, and manuscripts were also in the pipeline, but it was unclear to the evaluator whether publishing was already underway. The situation on the possible sesame and sunflower mongraphs was also unclear.

Objective d): Training

Outputs/targets

There will be emphasis on developing oilseed-technician training. Training in one or more countries at a time, training of trainers, as well as training in a single crop will be considered. Participants in a training course in Hyderabad recommended a longer duration with more time for practical field training. This will be considered for the next training course.

Achievements

During Phase III, several training courses were conducted. These were:

Research techniques for sesame and safflower, India, 1987.
Brassica breeding and agronomy, India, 1989.
Brassica quality training, China, 1990.
Brassica protection training, India, 1990.

A further course on sesame breeding and agronomy was expected to be taught in India in September 1991, but at the time of the Unit visit was delayed due to clearance difficulties in India.

The evaluator has no specific data on the number or gender of trainees, nor on their countries of origin. Questionnaire respondents were generally extremely positive about the training courses in which they participated. Approximately 90% indicated that what they had learnt was directly applicable to their area of expertise, and had been applied to their research program. Most still indicated that the course(s) could have been made more appropriate to their needs. Respondents included breeders (54%), agronomists (38%), pathologists (21%) and entomologists (13%).

Objective e): New Network Forms and Activities

Outputs/targets

A steering committee will be set up to work with the adviser in guiding network activities. Specific terms of reference for the committee will be established at the next workshop, but would likely include the recommendation of national program support allocation, training, workshop location and network focus.

Collaborative research projects will be considered. Topics for collaborative research should be an important priority to several members, and more effectively pursued through a collaborative approach. The elimination of white rust in Brassica oilseeds in the region is one possible collaborative project.

A separate Brassica Network or subnetwork will be considered during the three-day meeting in Sweden in May 1987. The meeting will consider: 1) the desirability of dividing the network, 2) links with other organizations such as Cruciferae Newsletter, in disseminating information in the new network, and 3) necessary donor and national program support.

Attempts will be made to collaborate, or join with, similar activities in other organizations:

1. Discussions will be held between IDRC and FAO in May 1987 to establish collaboration with FAO initiatives, including their sesame and safflower newsletters, FAO collaborative oilseed trials (sunflower, sesame and safflower) and FAO oilseed workshops.

2. Contact will be made with the International Sunflower Association and International Rapeseed Association to see if any network activities can be merged with, or administered by, these organizations.

Achievements

Steering Committee

A Steering Committee (SC) was constituted subsequent to decisions made at the Brassica meeting in Sweden, May 1987, and the Fourth Network Workshop, Kenya, 1988, to form four separate sub-networks. The Chair and co-Chair of each sub-network were defined to be the members of the SC. The first draft of a constitution for the Network was discussed at the General SC Meeting held in India, January 1989. The second draft was issued at the end of the same meeting, for review by member countries (Appendix 7).

Network sub-committees were to have specific planning and monitoring functions, under the guidance of the whole Steering Committee. This implied that committee members would be able to move freely between member countries, and that funds would be available to them to cover both travel costs and

locally-identified research activities. Neither of these conditions was realized, some scientists (especially the Indian ones) being unable to get travel clearances, and IDRC budget restrictions reducing monies available for both SC costs and national program support. The SC also lacked the mechanisms for local administration of such costs.

The SC constitution was still in draft form at the Egerton meeting of January 1991. Lack of funding has nullified the SC's mandate, as the majority of its members are able to meet only when supported to attend a workshop. There is more of a tendency to view the sub-networks as separate entities, a reality imposed by the Chair of the SC not having any resources for any other form of coordination.

Interestingly, questionnaire respondents indicated that the establishment of an SC had improved the management of the Network by its members. However, 90% indicated that the SC could do more to strengthen the Network, the majority of which would require funding. Where the question was answered, there was a definite belief that the Network (or sub-networks) could become self-sustaining under SC direction. Generally, respondents indicated that the SC provided input at the time of meetings only.

Collaborative Projects

While there was a definite interest among Network members for collaborative projects, none materialized (again, it is noted from questionnaire responses that some collaboration was perceived to have occurred, though from the Adviser's viewpoint this was not a consequence of formal agreement). The Adviser gives as the main reason for this political constraints between the countries interested in collaborating. Several projects appear to have reached different levels of planning before these constraints caused their indefinite postponement:

1. White rust resistance in Brassica

2. Niger breeding (between India and Ethiopia)

3. Orobanche resistance (Nepal, Ethiopia and Egypt).

In the cases where the evaluator was involved in individual project evaluations in both Nepal and Ethiopia, it was unclear whether a genuine interest existed in establishing such collaborative projects. Certainly the former was not in any position to take a lead role in any Orobanche work, not even having carried out the project-related activities in this area. In the case of Ethiopia and a joint niger project with India, much of the Ethiopian interest was in obtaining Indian niger germplasm. This was not possible given Indian restrictions on germplasm release, but perhaps did not require the planning of a more elaborate linkage. Programming between China and India on Brassica has not, to the evaluator's knowledge, resulted in any formal collaboration beyond germplasm exchange.

It is possible, in the context of the Network, that collaborative projects (which implies that research activities will be conducted by at least

two members, in collaboration) was a concept ahead of its time. Germplasm exchange, and the provision of technical assistance by more advanced national programs could probably have provided as much as weaker national programs were able to absorb. In the case of stronger programs, if such collaboration were demand-driven, it might have come about. An empowered Steering Committee might also have been a key element in achieving such collaboration.

Sub-Networks

As has already been indicated above, the decision was made to sub-divide the Network into four sub-networks. The sub-division reflected the members' strong crop-orientation, though there is clearly some geographic specificity to some of the crops (especially Brassicas). Much of the Network's workshop and training resources have gone into the Brassica sub-network, which has held three training courses and four workshops compared to a single course and two workshops (one joint) for the other crops.

Questionnaire respondents believe that the current crop-orientation is the most appropriate form for the sub-networks, being more relevant to country needs, and providing more in-depth focus on specific crops. Specific recommendations to upgrade the brassica sub-network to a full network, to combine sunflower and other oilcrops, to combine niger with sesame, and to assign more responsibility to each sub-network Chairperson have been made. It should be noted that the majority of members and respondents are breeders and agronomists, and that the recommendations made reflect only their specific crop-oriented interests. This is a forum too narrow to develop broad, alternative network forms.

Information Dissemination

The linkage between the Oil Crops Network and other agencies involved in information dissemination in this area is still tenuous. An agreement between the FAO and IDRC to amalgamate the FAO's Sesame and Safflower Newsletter and the IDRC Oil Crops Newsletter has not been implemented, principally because of FAO's lack of funds. In order to prevent duplication of purpose, the Adviser has forwarded sesame/safflower articles to FAO, and groundnut articles to ICRISAT for publication in the International Arachis Newsletter. Brassica researchers are encouraged to submit their articles to the Eucarpia Cruciferae Newsletter. However, the 1991 Oil Crops Newsletter still contained articles on Brassicas, groundnut, and sesame, and it has not been confirmed by the Adviser that articles forwarded to the different publishers have finally appeared in the indicated newsletters.

Other Donor Commmitment

During Phase III, there was little success in linkage with other donors in supporting the Network in the future. In general, other donors or agencies have programs that are more specific in the crop or geographic context (e.g. IBPGR's Brassica and Sunflower networks, FAO's European Sunflower Network), or which have less of a developing-country focus (again IBPGR and FAO, and the International Sunflower Association). IBPGR's Networks have less of an

oilseed, and more of a fodder focus. There is little interest beyond the IDRC Network in linseed and niger.

IDRC's original idea to establish an International Oilseeds Research Unit (IORU) found no other donor willing to commit to some support, and IDRC's own budget restrictions effectively caused indefinite postponement of the idea.

4. Questionnaire Findings

OUTPUTS

Consultancy services

1. Did the network provide consultancy services to your program or project?

   (n=13), 54% indicated yes.

2. Who provided these services? (Please tick)

   a) Network adviser 46%
   b) Other consultants 38%

3. What have been the three main topics that these services addressed?

   Network adviser

   Breeding techniques
   Achievements of on-farm trials
   Breeding goals

   Consultants

   Rural processing
   Production and marketing
   Research priorities and strategies

4. Were these services provided when needed?

   (n=7), 100% indicated yes.

5. Have these services contributed specifically to a stronger program at your institution? (Please tick)

   (n=7)

   a) More effective research 100%
   b) Other 0%

Germplasm exchange

6. Have you received germplasm from, or contributed germplasm to, the network?

(n=14), 100% indicated yes.

7. Describe briefly material sent or recieved

Considered separately

8. Did an appropriate mechanism for exchange exist prior to the existence of the network?

(n=14), 43% indicated yes.

9. Did you commonly exchange germplasm before your membership of the network?

(n=13), 69% indicated yes.

10. What has been the main method by which you have received or sent germplasm?

(n=13)

a)	By means of the network adviser	62%
b)	Directly through own channels	54%
c)	Other	0%

11. Did any germplasm you received arrive in a poor state, or not germinate on seeding?

(n=12), 25% indicated yes.

12. Do you believe that sending material via the network coordinator is the best mechanism?

(n=14), 93% indicated yes.

13. Do you believe that more efficient and appropriate mechanisms for your purpose exist?

(n=11), 45% indicated yes.

Information exchanges

14. The network employs several methods for the exchange of information. What method has been the best for your needs?

(n=13)

a) Network newsletter 77%
b) Scientific exchange 23%
c) Attending workshops 92%
d) Attending training sessions 8%
e) Other 8%

15. Of what specific value has the newletter been to you? For example, has it:

(n=14)

a) 29% Provided you with key information essential to the progress of your program?
b) 71% Kept you abreast generally with activities of other members?
c) 36% Provided a means of publication which did not otherwise exist?
d) 14% Provided other benefits?

16. Does your institution recognize the newsletter as a formal publication?

(n=14), 86% indicated yes.

17. Have you contributed to the newsletter?

(n=14), 64% indicated yes.

18. Have you been part of a scientific exchange? If so, please describe briefly your activities during the exchange. Also describe the principal benefit to your program of this exchange.

(n=14), 36% indicated yes. No descriptions.

19. What network workshops have you attended?

(n=13), most respondents have attended more than two workshops.

20. What benefit have these workshops provided?

(n=13)

a) 85% Access to specific ideas which have been incorporated in your program?
b) 62% Presentation by you of information which you know to have been adopted by other programs?
c) 23% Other?

Training

21. Have you received training through the network?

The responses in this section combine responses from both the network and training questionnaires. Of the former (n=12), 25% of respondents indicated that they had received training. The total number of training respondents was 24.

If so, please answer the following questions:

22. What was the nature of the training you received?

(n=23)

13% Brassica technology course
26% Brassica plant protection course
39% Brassica breeding and agronomy course
22% Study tours or exchange visits

23. What was your principal oilseeds focus prior to this course?

54%	Breeding
38%	Agronomy
21%	Pathology
13%	Entomology
0%	Other

24. What did you learn at the course?

Responses reflect course titles (Q22 above).

25. Was what you learnt directly applicable to your area of expertise?

(n=23), 91% indicated yes.

26. Have you applied anything you learnt at the course to your research program?

(n=24), 88% indicated yes.

27. Are you still working on the same research topics as you were at the time of the course?

(n=24), 92% indicated yes.

28. Could the course have been made more appropriate to your needs?

(n=24), 79% indicated yes.

29. Were you consulted in the development of course content?

(n=24), 58% indicated yes.

New network forms

Since its inception, the network has tried to respond to members needs, and to find other ways of achieving its purpose efficiently. Such approaches and activities include:

A Steering Committee
Collaborative research projects
Establishment of crop sub-networks
Collaboration with other organizations or networks

30. Do you believe that, on the whole, these changes have improved the value of the network to you as a member?

(n=11), 100% indicated yes.

Steering Committee

31. Has the establishment of a Steering Committee improved the management of the network by its members?

(n=12), 96% indicated yes.

32. Could the Steering Committee do more to strengthen the network?

(n=11), 86% indicated yes.

Approve constitution.
Visit member countries to sort out problems and needs.
Organize collaborative programs.
Consultation service to member countries.

33. Has the Steering Committee been given the resources necessary to do its job?

(n=7), 29% indicated yes.

34. If the resources were adequate, do you believe that the network (sub-networks) could become self-sustaining under Steering Committee direction?

(n=9), 100% indicated yes.

35. Have the Chair and Co-Chair of your sub-network been able to respond to your needs, in terms of what you believe the network should be accomplishing for you?

(n=10), 40% indicated yes.

Silent members of Sub-network.
No funds.
Difficulties in communication (correspondence).
Input at time of meetings only.
Literature not sent as agreed.

Collaborative projects

36. Have you been involved in, or initiated, any collaborative research projects?

(n=9), 22% involved in collaborative projects.

Breeding for pest and disease resistance.
Regional trials.
Broomrape research.
Aphid biology.
Storage pest control.
Selection indices for high yield in sesame.

37. In order of decreasing priority, please list up to three areas in which you believe further collaborative projects could help your program.

(n=9)

Development of improved varieties.
Acquisition and transfer of technology.
Breeding for pest and disease resistance.
Oil and protein quality and uses.
Germplasm exchange.
Broomrape problems.
Central lab in region to serve member countries.
Postharvest technology.

38. If you were involved in a collaborative project, were resources available to you through the network on a timely and adequate basis?

(n=2), both indicated no.

Sub-networks

39. To which sub-network(s) do you belong?

(n=11) 55% Brassica
36% Sunflower
27% Sesame

Some dual memberships

45% Other

40. What has been the main benefit of belonging to a sub-network, rather than to an all-oilcrops network, as it was before?

(n=11)

More crop-specific.
More efficient, time saving.
None.

41. Do you believe that the present subdivision of the network into four crop-based sub-networks is the most appropriate form? Please give your reasons for or against this structure.

(n=11), 100% indicated yes.

More relevant to country needs.
More in-depth focus on specific crops.
No mix-up in program implementation and evaluation.

42. What improvements to the current structure should be made?

(n=9)

Upgrade sub-network to full network (brassica).
Specific goals and programs should be set.
Better system of monitoring members' accomplishments.
Collaborative research should be funded.
Combine Sunflower and Other oilcrops.
Combine Niger with Sesame.
More responsibility to Sub-network Chairperson.

43. Has there been significant collaboration with other organizations or networks through your sub-network?

(n=9), 56% indicated yes.

Some technical assistance, funds, germplasm (FAO, IBPGR).

44. Do you believe that other opportunities for such collaboration exist? If so, what are they, and with whom?

(n=6), 83% indicated yes.

Regional trials.
Collaboration with US, Romanian institutions.

PURPOSE

45. Do the following describe one or more of the ways in which the network has strengthened your National Oilcrop Research Program (NORP)? If so, please tick those which apply, and rank them in order of importance.

(n=10)

60% Improved research quality
(methods, programming, reporting, publishing)

30% Increasing resources to oilcrop research
(staff, programs, disciplines)

80% Development, dissemination and adoption of technology
(varieties, processing, etc)

50% Wider technological coverage of oilcrop systems
(from production to consumption)

20% Other (describe)

Collaborative programs.

46. Will your NORP benefit in the near future in one of the areas above as a result of network membership?

(n=10), 100% indicated yes.

Broader vision of status of oilcrops in-country.

47. Does membership in the network allow you to achieve the objectives of your NORP more efficiently and effectively?

(n=10), 100% indicated yes.

Funds for research.
Germplasm exchange.
Contact with other scientists.

48. In which sub-continent are you located?

(n=11), 64% Asia, 36% Africa

49. Which geographic region do you believe offered, or offers, greatest potential for linkage to your program, to achieve, for example, gains in the areas listed in Question 45 above ?

(n=11), very mixed response.

50. For the needs of your program, does a crop-orientation (e.g. brassica) or a geographic orientation (e.g. E & S Africa) have more value? Please define.

(n=9), 89% crop-orientation, 11% geographic-orientation.

51. Do you believe that such an orientation differs from what you have now?

(n=9), 11% indicated 'different'.

52. Do you believe that your NORP could have benefitted more if the resources made available to you through the network had been delivered directly to your program? As a very rough estimate, on average each member has absorbed in Phase III CAD22,000 of network goods and services.

(n=8), 100% indicated no.

53. If yes, please describe why you believe the network was not an effective means of resource delivery.

Not relevant.

54. Is there one area or service in particular on which the network could focus to strengthen your NORP further?

(n=3), 100% yes.

Training.
Assistance for seed production, postharvest processes, byproduct utilization.

55. In your NORP please describe how many of your staff are male or female

Responses too wide for tabulation. Very few female staff.

GOAL

56. Has your membership in the network helped your NORP improve the welfare of small oilcrop producers and their communities? You may wish to review your response to Question 45, and then indicate how this improvement has come about:

(n=9)

22%	Improved nutritional status
11%	Increased employment
33%	Increased income
0%	Other welfare measures (describe)
33%	Yes, but no data
11%	Not sure

22% Not yet

(Please be sure that you have supporting evidence from surveys, secondary data, etc., before responding in first four cases)

57. As a step leading to expectation of benefit at the rural level, has the network helped your NORP produce new varieties or technologies that have been adopted by farmers or processors? Please describe, or give names:

(n=4)

100% Varieties
50% Technologies
0% Other

58. Does your program customarily follow-up on-farm adoption of new varieties or technologies?

(n=9), 78% indicated yes.

59. Would it be useful to your program for the network to focus on support in determining and measuring on-farm benefits?

(n=8), 75% indicated yes.

COORDINATING UNIT

60. As a member of the network, have you had direct correspondence with the Coordinating Unit (CU)?

(n=12), 100% indicated yes.

61. If so, have you received a response as quickly as you would have expected?

(n=12), 92% indicated yes.

62. For what reasons have you contacted the CU?

(n=12)

8% Consultant services
83% Germplasm exchange
33% Submissions to newsletter
58% Training matters
42% Steering Committee matters
17% Collaborative projects
75% Workshops
8% Other network issues

63. Do you believe that the CU has been essential to efficient and effective management of the network?

(n=13), 92% indicated yes.

64. Do you believe that the resources provided by IDRC for the CU could be more efficiently used by the network for other purposes?

(n=10), 50% indicated yes.

65. Do you believe that input by network members could replace the services currently provided by the CU?

(n=12), 42% indicated yes.

66. Would you, as a network member, be willing to dedicate some of your time to running the network/sub-network?

(n=11), 82% indicated yes. Seven respondents indicated that they would dedicate on average 13% of their time.

67. Was the location of the CU, attached to the National Oilseeds Program in Ethiopia, the best location for it?

(n=10), 40% indicated yes.

68. Has the location of the CU in Ethiopia: (Please tick)

(n=6)

17%	Restricted its effectiveness?
67%	Made communication difficult?
50%	Made germplasm exchange difficult?
0%	Other

69. Would you expect such conditions to change were it to be located elsewhere?

(n=9), 89% indicated yes.

70. If you believe a CU is essential to continued effective management of the network, where should the CU be located? Please give reasons for your choice.

(n=9), very mixed response.

India/China/ Asia, main response.
Kenya, Egypt, Ethiopia, Pakistan alternative single responses.

71. Have you had any communication with the IDRC New Delhi office on network matters?

(n=12), 25% indicated yes.

72. From your perspective, has the IDRC New Delhi office been significant in network coordination?

(n=12), 17% indicated yes, though one respondent differed from Q71.

73. Are there further services, not currently provided, which a CU or other management body should provide to members? Please describe.

(n=8), 63% indicated yes, though apart from single comment below, none indicated anything other than services currently provided.

> Establish centres of excellence on drought, salinity/alkalinity, oil quality and disease resistance.

74. Is there a regional agency which might, as you understand it, provide services to the network similar to those provided by the CU?

(n=11), 1 respondent indicated yes, the possibility of a regional agency in Beijing.

75. If the network continues to have a coordinator, or adviser, should this person work under the direction of the Steering Committee chairperson?

(n=12), 46% indicated yes.

76. Approximately how many times has the Network Adviser, based in Ethiopia, visited your project?

(n=9), an average of 2.1 times.

77. Approximately how many times have IDRC Program Officers from the East Africa Regional Office, or other IDRC Offices, visited your project on network business?

(n=10), an average of 1.8 times.

PRODUCTION TO CONSUMPTION SYSTEMS RESEARCH

78. Which of the following areas does your NORP address?

(n=10)

100%	Varietal improvement
80%	Agronomy
80%	Farming system, incl. constraints to oilcrop production
70%	Extension and technology transfer
10%	Farm-level oil extraction, incl. constraints to such processing
10%	Farm-level consumption of oil and cake
0%	Oilcrop marketing, trading, incl. information systems
0%	Local/national/regional demand for vegetable oils & protein cake

Industrialization
30% Oilcrop sector policy development
30% Others (not generally specified)

79. Through the network you may have heard of the Production to Consumption Systems Research (PCSR) approach to identifying and solving constraints in oilcrops production, marketing and consumption. As a result of presentations you may have heard, or discussions in which you may have participated, is your understanding of PCSR:

(n=11)
18% good?
18% generally good, though unsure of some aspects?
36% not very clear?
9% don't really understand?
18% have not heard of PCSR?

80. If you answered 1 or 2 above, do you believe the PCSR approach has something to offer your NORP?

(n=4), 100% indicated yes.

81. If yes, would you wish for further information on, or support for, PCSR through the network?

(n=6), 100% indicated yes.

82. What is your own field of expertise within the oilcrops sector?

(n=12), all breeders or agronomists.

83. Which field (e.g. as listed in Question 78 above, or other) do you believe to be the most limiting in your country, in terms of improving returns or other benefits to the small producer?

(n=6), 67% Varietal improvement
50% Agronomy
0% Farming system, incl. constraints to oilcrop production
67% Extension and technology transfer
17% Farm-level oil extraction, incl. constraints to such processing
0% Farm-level consumption of oil and cake
17% Oilcrop marketing, trading, incl. information systems
17% Local/national/regional demand for vegetable oils & protein cake
17% Industrialization
0% Oilcrop sector policy development

84. Does your NORP have persons working in this area?

(n=9), 67% indicated having persons working in area of greatest constraint.

FUNDING

Recognizing that IDRC has to put its funds where they may best be used:

85. Do you view the network to be of sufficient value that, were it necessary, you would solicit funds from your own Govt to ensure its survival?

(n=9), 56% indicated yes.

86. Do you think your Govt or NORP would be willing to provide such funds?

(n=9), 33% indicated yes.

87. Do you think that there are specific network areas or issues where IDRC should target its financial resources, or should funding be provided for the network in general?

(n=10)

Collaborative research projects principal response.

88. If you were able to place a financial value on all the goods and services received by your program through the network, what would this amount to?

(n=2), US$6,500 average.

89. Do you regard the network as your principal, or only a minor, source of information and resources for your NORP?

(n=10)

70%	Principal
30%	Minor

90. Have you received other donor support for your NORP?

(n=10), 60% indicated yes.

91. Are you aware of any funding sources that might be interested in, or used for, support of the network?

(n=9), 33% indicated yes.

Australia (brassica).
EEC (sunflower).
FAO, JAICA, ICARDA.

92. If your program maintains links with other agencies/donors/mechanisms on oilcrops, how do these links compare generally to those fostered through the network?

(n=7)

14% More useful
57% Similar in usefulness
29% Less useful

93. What is the principal value of these linkages to you?

(n=7)

57% Financial resources
29% Human resources
86% Training programs
71% Publications
14% Other

Evidence of some confusion in responses. Some respondents interpreted question as focused on Network, not other linkages.

94. Are there some potential linkages that you believe the network should pursue to increase its efficiency and effectiveness?

(n=7), 86% indicated yes.

Non-network organizations.
Regional trials.
Linkages with EEC/Romanian organizations.

Discussion of Questionnaire Findings

The evaluation findings are presented in point form under the questionnaire format. Some points to note are the following:

1. While 14 network responses were received, respondents did not necessarily complete the whole questionnaire. As a result, some responses have more weight than others. This is indicated throughout by noting the number of responses to each question (n=x).

2. The training questionnaire is not reported separately. The results are combined with the training section of the network questionnaire. The number of respondents here reflects the total number of training responses.

3. The network responses reflect a mixture of national program scientists with and without IDRC projects, and other respondents (e.g. Canadian participating scientists). The majority of responses comes from LDCs.

4. Where a response to a question cannot be easily interpreted from a simple yes or no, some qualitative material is included. Again this is presented in point form.

5. In general, respondents found most questions simple to answer, though some confusion was evident in responses to the final section on funding. There was some contrast to information obtained directly from the Adviser. Some of this contrast is attributed to possible misunderstanding in interpreting the questions.

General Conclusions from the Questionnaire

1. The universe of respondents is not sufficiently large to draw firm conclusions about some evaluation issues. Lack of response may itself be an indicator of the members' perception of the importance of the Network.

2. The Network has served principally the breeders of National Oilseeds Research Programs. Impact on the outputs of such NORPs is therefore principally restricted to the development of new varieties. Few NORPs were cognizant of the development effects of their new varieties. Only 25% of respondents indicated that network inputs had contributed to released varieties, some indicating that new varieties are still in the pipeline.

3. While respondents considered information exchange, training, workshop attendance, etc., to be major benefits, it is not possible to partition the consequence of these activities on research quality in the NORPs.

4. Respondents generally believe that the Network was not given the resources necessary for it to become self-sustaining during the Phase in question. While a formal structure was created, it was on paper only. Steering Committee members were only seen to be pro-active at workshops and other meetings, when funds were provided for them to attend.

5. The current crop-orientation is the format that members wish to retain (Note 2 above). Country needs were generally felt to be better served through this orientation. Geographic concerns did not appear to be a constraint in meeting individual project/program needs. Some changes suggested were the upgrading of the Brassica sub-network to a full network, and the combination of the other sub-networks into one or two, rather than the three that currently exist.

6. Germplasm exchange remains a priority within the network.

7. Members rated workshops above the newsletter in terms of information exchange. However, the newsletter is recognized as a formal publication by 83% of respondents. Most members had contributed to the newsletter. Most members had attended more than one workshop. The principal benefit from the workshops has been the provision of ideas for strengthening programs.

8. Training respondents were very positive about the courses they had attended. The applicability of content, and actual application subsequent to the courses, were both positive in about 90% of cases. A high proportion, however, still indicated that course content could have been made more appropriate to need.

9. Collaborative projects have not been many. Where they were undertaken, resources were not available when needed. Collaborative projects are seen still to be important by Network members. (It should be noted that this response differs from that of the Network Adviser, who indicates that no collaborative projects were undertaken).

10. Improved research quality was seen to be the main way in which the Network has strengthened the NORPs. It cannot be determined whether this has actually led to downstream effects, such as more rapid generation and release of varieties. However, most respondents considered that Network membership contributed to a more effective achievement of NORP objectives. No respondent indicated that greater benefit could have been achieved by direct delivery of equivalent resources rather than through the Network. While it was generally considered that the Network could do more to strengthen the NORPs, it was not clearly indicated what action should be taken. Some respondents felt that a useful area would be that of support for determining and measuring on-farm benefits to new technology.

11. The Coordinating Unit has been seen generally to have been essential to management of the Network, though about half of the respondents also indicated that the resources dedicated to the CU could have been better used elsewhere. Less than half felt that network members could replace CU services, though most indicated some willingness to devote time to running the Network. Respondents were positive about the services provided by the Adviser.

12. The location of the CU in Ethiopia is seen generally to have restricted its effectiveness. Most felt an alternative location would improve the level of service. There was no single ideal location proposed, though an Asian location was felt to be superior to an African one (most respondents were Asian).

13. Projects/programs have received an average of about two visits from both the Network Adviser and the IDRC Program Officer responsible for the Network.

14. The majority of respondents were unclear on PCSR. There was not strong evidence that respondents thought that PCSR could contribute significantly to their NORPs. All respondents were either breeders or agronomists. Varietal improvement and agronomy remained the areas believed to be most limiting, though extension and technology transfer were also mentioned.

15. Most Governments would not provide funds to the network, even though respondents think the Network worthwhile.

16. Members were not generally innovative when considering alternative funding sources.

5. Synthesis

In an evaluation, the purpose is to separate how different inputs or elements each have contributed to a partial realization of Network purpose and goal, such that the sum and interaction of these contributions can be seen in the final result.

The Network is founded on the premise that the biggest gains in oilcrop production at the small-farm level will come through advances in breeding, and that the best strategy for rapid advances in breeding is the use of exotic germplasm in breeding programs. The principal input has been the provision of an Adviser, who has delivered various services, each of which should have supported some element of each national program.

It is not possible to review the impact of the Network on each project. The aggregate view, expressed by the questionnaire respondents, is that the Network has been a positive element in the development of the national programs. Members believe that the Network has contributed to stronger NORPs, though few were able to enunciate how this strengthening could be measured at the small-farm level. This suggests that there is still a need for linking strength in a NORP to benefits at the farm-level. Do researchers equate improved institutional capacity to delivery of benefits to rural producers? It is not particularly evident, either from the questionnaire results, or from individual project evaluations that they do. Varietal release is often the perceived horizon.

Where there is supporting information from individual project evaluations, it is clear that germplasm exchange is the area considered most important in network impact, followed by benefits that accrue from workshops and training courses. Information exchange through the Network newsletter is seen as important, but less so than that achieved at workshops. This does not differentiate, however, between the number of persons reached by the newsletter compared to the number that have attended workshops.

As the Network was run by IDRC, and the majority of activities planned and coordinated by the Adviser, there is little apparent sense of ownership of the Network by its members, though the development of such a sense of ownership may have been constrained by the lack of funds for the members to plan and budget for their own activities.

In reviewing the activities and outputs of the Adviser, it is clear that the Adviser has seen himself more as a facilitator in a broad sense than as someone who expected to provide concise and directed support to each project or national program within the Network. While it is clear from his terms of reference that he was not expected to direct researchers in national projects, the same TORs suggest that there was a broad strategy to follow, and that both Ethiopia in particular and Africa in general were to be principal foci of his efforts (the latter point is reinforced in communication from the Network Consultant). The Adviser has focused his activities significantly more toward Asia and North Africa than Southern Africa, and as a result, a higher proportion of the Network's resources have gone into Brassicas than any other crop, to the detriment of oilcrop development in Africa. In general terms,

however, through the Adviser's efforts, the Network has grown into a significant force in oilcrop research and development in Asia and Africa, and has contributed to the region's breeding programs.

Had the Adviser taken care to identify both the use of germplasm distributed to members in the development and release of new varieties, and how other inputs were serving specific elements of national programs, it would have been possible to make direct links between objectives and achievements. It has been possible to do this in only a few cases, and then only because the evaluator had specific knowledge of some of the programs in question. Monitoring during the course of implementation, and the collection of a specified set of information, is the only way to ensure that such linkages can be established and meaningful evaluation conducted. This set of information does not exist.

It is not possible to determine the impact of the Network on the welfare of the small oilcrop producers and their communities in the region. The Network operates through the breeding activities of national programs. As the latter may themselves not be very effective in reaching the ultimate client, benefits that accrue indirectly from the Network are impossible to measure. Even benefits from germplasm exchange and varietal development could not be attributed directly to the Network without specific knowledge of the other processes that influence broad dissemination. In at least one project, exogenous forces may have been more effective in the movement of material across borders than the institutional channels of the Network. From the scope of activities supported by the Network, the time the Network has been operating, and the capacity of some of the national programs, it is reasonable to assume that there has been some benefit to the oilcrop producer from the Network, but, at this point, it is unquantified, and probably unquantifiable.

For the future, there are several issues that must be addressed. From these, a series of recommendations is developed.

1. In the light of economic realities in many member countries, where do the constraints lie for the small farmer if he or she wishes to produce oilcrops? Is it (still) the case that major advances in small-farm income, and therefore welfare, are dependent on varietal upgrading, or is marketing, pricing, or some other factor more critical? Perhaps the most appropriate form of this question is: Is enough known about the small-farm systems in these countries to know where to put the resources?

2. Do national programs have effective varietal dissemination mechanisms so that efforts in plant breeding are not wasted in inefficient testing, multiplication and dissemination?

3. With the greater difficulty that now exists in travel for Indian scientists, is a strategy of knowledge transfer between Asia and Africa still an effective one?

4. If resources are limited, and Africa is to be the main focus of future efforts, how can the Network be restructured to respond more to the needs of this region.

5. What should an Adviser's Unit do under a new structure/focus, where should it be based, and what should it contain in terms of expertise?

Experience from VOPS (Kenya), and the initial VOPS findings in Nepal, suggests that much more needs to be known about these systems before allocating resources to a small segment of them. Of particular importance is an understanding of constraints as they are perceived by the farmer, which requires specific attention to activities such as Rapid Rural Appraisal. Many countries make macro-economic decisions which have a major impact on the viability of oilcrops within small-farming systems, yet ironically, decisions made to reduce shortages of oil in domestic markets may be the ultimate cause of a decline in domestically produced oil. Is varietal development (a long-term process generally) an appropriate strategy for a national program if the national policies for the provision of oils and fats repress domestic production?

6. General Recommendations

1. It is the belief of the evaluator that the Oilcrops Network, if resources are available for it to continue, should shift from its principal focus on breeding to one which focuses more closely on PCSR, and which especially addresses the linkages between the oilseeds sub-sectors (from production through to utilization), and the policies that governments develop. A national oilcrops program, by definition, should be more than a breeding program.

2. A separate series of case studies on seed production mechanisms, coordinated by the evaluator, and reviewing the experience of several IDRC breeding projects, found that informal dissemination mechanisms were often as significant in varietal dissemination as formal ones. This could be interpreted as a lack of capacity of formal mechanisms to multiply and make available new varieties when and where required by the producers. If a program is not responsive to producers, or does not involve them in testing activities, it is likely that the process of varietal development and release will be inefficient, and perhaps inappropriate. The recommendations made as a result of that review are applicable to the programs within the Network, and should perhaps be built into any monitoring of national programs undertaken by the Network.

3. From the gains being made by national programs in Asia, especially India and China, there is continued potential for knowledge and capacity transfer to Africa. If this is to be a continued thrust in a new Network, it should be the subject of a specific study, to determine both the areas within PCSR that should be addressed in this way, and the potential sources of expertise. Past problems in accessing scientists

from these countries should be reviewed to determine whether they will still pose significant constraints to future Network operation.

4. This evaluation indicates that the Network did not address African, and especially Southern and Eastern African, problems and needs to the degree that was originally intended. Any change, or a return to the original intent, will require a conscious shift of resources away from Asia. Interest in PCSR is developing in this region, and presents an opportunity to broaden the scope of the Network in oilcrops systems and a probable increase in potential impact.

The discussion on the future of the Network that has taken place within IDRC is significantly more extensive than the scope of this evaluation, and the contribution that the evaluation can make is perhaps only to bring out some important points that would improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of any future network. This has largely been done above. Clearly, once the focus of the Network changes, it is beyond the mandate of this evaluation to make recommendations unless they are of a generic nature. There are perhaps three areas that could so be considered:

1. Responsiveness to members. A network must be owned by its members if it is to be sustainable. The Oilcrops Network was initiated by IDRC, and largely controlled by IDRC. The Network was largely a series of actions by the Adviser. Network development was strongly influenced by directions felt to be important to IDRC. IDRC funding constrained independent actions by the members, and, to some extent, prevented more effective networking between countries. Phase III was expected to lead into the establishment of an International Oilcrops Unit, which would have centralized activities further.

It is IDRC's interest to improve the value of the Network to African members. It is suggested here that this will require a significant reduction in Asian representation on the Steering Committee, and a concerted effort to define the future scope of the Network. The PCSR approach is not familiar to most Network members, and is again an orientation that IDRC believes to be of importance. Understanding is developing slowly, and it will require an expansion of the Network well beyond the breeding circle to bring it to address such systems. Thus there will still be much of a supply-orientation to the Network, rather than it being driven by the demands of members. The issue of sustainability is not one that is likely to be solved in the near future.

2. Advisory input. Advisory input should focus much more on the identified needs of member programs. If 'program' in the future relates more closely to PCSR, the relative needs of the different components of each program should determine the orientation given to advisory services. The Phase III emphasis was on the delivery of generalized services, such as germplasm exchange, workshops and training courses. National programs with broader disciplinary depth within a PCSR framework will probably benefit more from problem-specific consultancies, and individual training attachments. These were not

pursued vigorously in Phase III. A future adviser should function in a managerial role, identifying the resources required for specific interventions, and ensuring that assignments are completed. Responsibilities for specific activities, such as germplasm exchange, or newsletter publication, should be contracted out to member institutions, or other regional bodies.

3. Monitoring. IDRC should ensure active monitoring of any future network. This could be contracted out to a regional consultant with experience in monitoring and evaluation. The monitoring framework, including indicators, should be established at the outset of the next phase, to ensure that information gathering and report writing addresses the pertinent issues. The monitor would operate independently of any adviser in determining whether the network is responding to members' needs. IDRC does not have the capacity for effective monitoring using in-house resources. Monitoring costs will be a significant budget item in any future network. Occasional evaluation should also be built into the network's plan, and the monitor should establish the information base upon which evaluation will depend.

Other specific recommendations include:

1. A future Network should place more emphasis on collaborative research between national programs or projects relative to resources invested in workshops and training. Workshops and training could be centred on the purpose and content of such research.

2. A Steering Committee needs to be given the resources to function if it is to be effective. IDRC should consider direct support to the SC Chairperson (perhaps a 50% intern scientist position) to catalyze his or her commitment.

3. A Network expecting ultimate benefit from its activities for a rural clientele should support its members in defining and using methods for determining this benefit.

4. If a Coordinating or Adviser's Unit is still seen as necessary for a future Network, it should continue to be attached to a national program.

5. A PCSR-based Network should make wider use of consultancy services rather than expect a single adviser to provide the input necessary. Any resident adviser should be seen more as a manager of Network resources.

APPENDIX 1

IDRC Project Summary

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE
CENTRE DE RECHERCHES POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT INTERNATIONAL

CANADA

PROJECT SUMMARY/RÉSUMÉ DE PROJET

File/Dossier: 3-P-87-0025

Prepared By/Préparé par: K. Riley

Project Title / Titre du projet: OILSEEDS NETWORK (ETHIOPIA) III

Division / Division: Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences

Activity/Sub-Activity / Secteur/sous-secteur: Crop and Animal Production Systems/Oilseeds

Recipient Institution (Name and Location) / Bénéficiaire (nom de l'organisme et endroit): Institute of Agricultural Research, Addis Ababa

Research Institution (Name and Location) / Institution de recherche (nom et endroit): Institute of Agricultural Research, Addis Ababa

Project Leader (Name and Location) / Chargé de projet (nom et endroit):

Funding: Amount (CAD) Duration (Months) / Subvention: montant (CAD) durée (mois): $391,200 - 24 months

Other Phases: (Amount, Duration) / Autres phases: (montant, durée): Phase I - $324,100 36 months; Phase II - $472,600 36 months

Recipient Contribution / Contribution du bénéficiaire: $5,500

Other Participating Agencies / Autres organismes participants:

Abstract/Abrégé

In South Asia and Africa, oilseeds which include sesame, groundnuts, safflower, rapeseed, linseed, niger seed and sunflower, are mostly grown on rainfed levels by the poorest farmers. Improvement of these crops can increase the available energy in diets in a region where this nutrient is most limiting, and provide an important cash crop to farmers.

The third phase of this project, which is based at the Institute of Agricultural Research in Ethiopia, continues support for a network aimed at strengthening national oilseed programs in the region, and linking together oilseed scientists to enable them to carry out more effective research.

The network is composed of the national programs themselves; including the 12 oilseed projects in the region which have received or are receiving IDRC support, as well as the national oilseed programs which are not otherwise supported by IDRC.

Approvals / Approbations

Program Director / Directeur de programme: RECOMMENDED April 28, 1987

The President or Vice-President / Le Président ou Vice-président: Recommended at PRC MAY 13 1987 on .....

The Executive Committee / Le Comité de direction: GRANT APPROVED on JUN 18 1987

The Board of Governors / Le Conseil des gouverneurs:

APPRAISAL SECTION

OUTPUT AND OBJECTIVES

1. This proposed third phase of the Oilseeds Network project is to continue the development of the oilseeds network started in the first two phases. The network links national oilseed programs in South Asia and Africa so that participants can benefit from each other's research and experience. This approach is especially relevant for oil crops which generally have very weak international research support. Stronger national research programs have been shown to be an effective way of generating technology appropriate to local conditions. Improved oil crop varieties and technology can have a marked effect in improving nutritional status, and providing the poorest farmers with a reliable rainfed cash crop. The network project involves 12 national oilseed improvement projects receiving IDRC support in the South Asian - Eastern African Region.

2. The two-year Phase III will allow a careful assessment to be made of this network, and the most appropriate form and level of support for the future.

EVALUATION OF PHASES I AND II

3. During Phase I, the network was established in Ethiopia, the advisor established contact with participants, and the first workshop was held, bringing together participants for the first time. Expectations for this first phase was largely met.

4. The network base in Ethiopia was established as part of a national, rather than an international or regional institution. This arrangement has helped the advisor integrate more closely into the national oilseed research program in Ethiopia but has created two persistent problems:

i) the difficulty in hiring good network staff at Ethiopian government salaries; and

ii) the network advisor himself has not been able to exchange germ plasm, rather, the small amount of germ plasm exchanged has had to go through the normal national channels. Negotiations are now under way with the Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR) and the Ethiopian Government to overcome these problems.

5. Phase II saw a great increase in information flowing around the network through newsletters, travel of scientists, workshops, and more aggressive interaction of the participants in the network. Both problems mentioned in Phase I continued into Phase II.

6. Several of the oil crops have no strong research base anywhere in the world to serve as a source of improved variety or technology for these crops. Although there has been marked improvement in the standard of research carried out on these crops in several national programs in the network, there is a definite need to create a "centre of excellence" for these crops, which could provide stronger support to the network programs.

SCIENTIFIC MERIT

7. The primary focus continues to be the strengthening of the research capability of national programs. This project constantly seeks to improve the scientific relevance of this research. The success of the network approach in strengthening national programs has been well demonstrated. A good example is the Asian Farming Systems Network.

RISKS

8. There is a high probability that the network approach will pay off by enabling national programs to produce better technology that has an impact on increasing oilseed production, consumption, and returns to farmers.

INSTITUTIONAL APPRAISAL

9. IAR has been the recipient of several other IDRC projects (Highland Oil Crops, Lowland Oil Crops and Farming Systems). These projects have been generally well carried out. Reports have been well prepared and on time. The IAR has been forced to follow stringent government regulations on local salary levels, including those of the locally hired network staff. In this situation, IDRC policies prohibit any topping up. This has seriously limited the performance of these network staff.

NEED FOR EXPATRIATE ADVISOR

10. The advisor is required to co-ordinate the activities of the network, to provide leadership for new initiatives, and to provide guidance to the national programs in the network. Much of the routine administration of the network is handled by the advisor, thus relieving some of the pressure on the PO. The advisor, in addition to his duties as network co-ordinator, makes time available to provide direct assistance to the Ethiopian national program. The continuation of the advisor's position is essential to the success of the network, especially during this period of its evolution.

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

11. The oilseeds network has come a long way since its inception in 1981. Its main achievement has been the successful organization of information exchange among scientists in Eastern Africa and Southern Asia through workshops, the newsletter, reprint service, visits of the advisor and consultants etc. There is now a greater awareness of the problems, opportunities, and methods for oil crop improvement and many national programs have certainly benefitted from this. The network has also conducted a training course which was highly appreciated by the participants, and further training activities will be organized in the future. In spite of these successes, little progress has been made in developing collaborative research activities, and the exchange of germ plasm has been extremely limited. These will be the subject of much greater attention in Phase III, and the future of the network beyond this phase will depend, to a considerable extent, on success in these areas. One of the first actions to be taken will be the establishment of a Network Steering Committee which, hopefully, will foster a greater identification with the network and its aims, among the participants.

12. A major weakness of the network is the lack of a solid research base. For some oil crops the stronger Indian programs have much to offer the weaker network members, but ways of effectively tapping this strength still have to be developed. Most national programs lack sufficient scientific strength to mount a substantial effort alone and it is very important that ways be found to augment these efforts. Several lines are being explored such as the creation of a sub-network on Brassicas linked to the more advanced research in China, Europe, and Canada, and closer association with other international activities, e.g., on sunflower, may be possible.

13. The establishment of a research unit for annual oil crops is another approach which is being considered. Such a unit would bring together a small multidisciplinary team of scientists to focus on one or two commodities (e.g., sesame and niger), resulting in an increased probability of achieving significant advances. Interest has been expressed by several donors in this initiative and alternative locations, umbrella organizations, etc., are being explored.

14. In spite of the recent large drop in world vegetable oil prices, and the prospects that prices will fall even further as the new oil plantations in South-East Asia begin production, there is still a strong justification for continued IDRC support for oil crop research in Eastern Africa and South Asia. Even at substantially reduced prices, the importation of vegetable oils will continue to be a major drain on foreign exchange for many countries, unless indigenous production is increased. Although the full effects of low world vegetable oil prices in local markets in Africa and Asia are largely unknown, it is probable that many farmers, given the choice, would wish to at least produce enough oil for their own consumption. However, further research in this area is needed, and will receive IDRC attention. Perhaps a major result of any vegetable oil glut, however, is likely to be a tightening up of support from other donor agencies and activities such as the proposed establishment of a multi-donor oil crop research unit will have to be pursued very cautiously.

PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

15. The oilseeds research network is one of the few networks operating outside an International Agricultural Research Centre. Phases I and II contributed greatly to the strengthening of national programs and the definition of research priorities. Several participants have released improved varieties and the constraints to exchange of germplasm appear to be breaking down. The increased participation of China, Sweden and Canada will further strengthen the network's capability.

I strongly recommend continued Centre support for this network.

Hubert G. Zandstra
Director
Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences

PROPOSAL

BACKGROUND

1. In Africa and South Asia, oilseeds are largely grown by poorer farmers under rainfed conditions. These crops provide a concentrated source of dietary energy, and a valuable cash crop when sold. While many countries in the region use a considerable proportion of their foreign exchange reserves to import vegetable oil, per capita consumption of oil remains alarmingly low. Increased oilseed production should result in improved nutrition and a better income for small farmers, and healthier national economies in these countries.

2. The research base needed to support increased production of oilseeds is not strong in the region. With the exception of groundnut at ICRISAT, and soybeans at IITA and AVRDC, none of the International Agricultural Research Centres are carrying out research to improve oil crops. Sunflower, and rapeseed have strong research carried out in the developed world (both western and eastern), but little research in the developing world. Sesame, safflower, linseed, nigerseed and castor do not have strong research programs anywhere in the world.

3. During the past decade, IDRC has funded oilseed improvement projects in India, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Pakistan, Mozambique, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Sudan, Egypt and China. There has been a concentration of projects in South Asia and East Africa, where there was strong need for improved oilseed technology, and where many species of oilseed crops have their centres of origin and greatest diversity, and hence provide the opportunity for greatest improvement. While many of these projects, especially in India, have already demonstrated a positive impact, the development of an oilseed network could maximize the positive impact to the region as a whole.

4. IDRC support for the Oilcrops Network project started in 1981. The project aimed at developing stronger oilseed research in national programs by: (a) linking oilseed programs researchers in India and elsewhere in South Asia with those in Africa; (b) exchanging germ plasm between the continents to their mutual advantage; (c) providing relevant information to national oil crop improvement programs; and, (d) developing relevant training.

5. A network advisor, attached to the oil crops program in Ethiopia, was employed to fulfill the basic functions of the network. The advisor was to establish a strong network base within the national program in Ethiopia, regularly visit countries in the region to provide support, suggestions and encouragement to national scientists for developing stronger oilseed research programs, facilitate mutual visits of scientists, organize workshops, relevant training courses and information exchange, and facilitate the exchange of germ plasm needed in developing improved varieties of oilseeds.

Achievements in Phase I (1981-84)

6. During Phase I, the network was established as a functional reality.

- The network advisor was based in an office at Holetta Research Station, near Addia Ababa with a secretary and a research assistant recruited.

- An oil crops library was started with relevant literature search, books and journals to support oil crop scientists.

- All projects in the region were visited by the advisor where research was reviewed, and discussed with the scientists.

- In Ethiopia, the advisor worked closely in supporting the highland oilseeds project, and helped develop the lowland oilseed project. The advisor served on the national oil crops team as plant breeder, working with national program staff.

- A series of oilseed germ plasm-collecting expeditions were made from 1982-1984, jointly with the Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR) and Plant Genetic Resource Centre/Ethiopia. The number of local oilseed collections was tripled and now stands at nearly 4000 covering nine oilseed crops.

- Canadian oilseed scientists, Drs. Downey and Dedio visited Egyptian and Ethiopian oilseed projects as consultants.

- In September 1983, the first oilseed workshop was held in Cairo, bringing together the participants in the network for the first time. A great deal of technical information was exchanged. Major recommendations were:

  i) that the oilseed network be strengthened by including countries in the region without IDRC projects;

  ii) a yearly newsletter be started;

  iii) more technical oilseed training was needed;

  iv) bilateral germ plasm exchange to be emphasized;

  v) more access to relevant published information was needed; and,

  vi) regular workshops and monitoring visits to be part of the network.

7) The network, during the first phase, was not able to facilitate the expected exchange of germ plasm. Scientists were eager to exchange material, but there was a reluctance to part with possible valuable resources at the national level. Nevertheless, many oilseed projects requested, and received useful germ plasm from Canada, USA, and European countries. In addition, sesame lines from Ethiopia were sent to Tanzania, and segregating sesame material from Sudan sent to India and Sri Lanka.

Phase II Achievements

8. The emphasis in Phase II shifted from establishing to servicing the network.

- In Ethiopia, the close involvement in the nation oilseed program was maintained

with regular visits by the advisor to oilseed experimental sites, and his attendance at oilseed review and planning meetings. A university level statistics course was taught by the advisor.

- The advisor visited oilseeds programs in the region - both IDRC-supported and non IDRC-supported - where he provided technical advice and encouraged scientists to participate in the network.

- The oilseeds newsletter has been given enthusiastic support by contributors and readers. Three annual issues have been published. Over 600 copies of the third newsletter were distributed to oil crop workers.

- In addition to visits during workshops, the Indian sesame breeder visited projects in Ethiopia and Sudan, and the Indian safflower breeder visited safflower research in USA, Spain and Mexico. Dr. Doggett, a consultant, advised on oilseed research in Nepal, Egypt, and Ethiopia.

- A co-operative Agriculture Canada/Oilseeds Network project on oilseed anther culture, with Indian and Ethiopian technicians working in Canada, is making rapid progress in developing a technique that will make breeding these crops much faster.

- Upon the recommendation of the advisor, national program support grants were made to Somalia to assist in collecting sesame germ plasm and to Kenya for holding a national oilseed workshop.

- There have been attempts to increase germ plasm exchange. A meeting was arranged in April 1985 between the Director of the Plant Genetic Resource Centre in Ethiopia, and his counterpart from the National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources in Delhi. A reciprocal meeting in Ethiopia took place in October 1986. During these visits attempts were made to reach an understanding on germ plasm exchange. Recently, India has sent Brassica seeds to Ethiopia, and Ethiopia is prepared to reciprocate.

- Two more oil crop workshops were held. In February 1985, the Second Oil Crops Workshop in Hyderabad, brought together sesame and safflower scientists from the region. Visits to the Indian Sesame and Safflower projects followed the workshop. The Third Oil Crops Workshop in October 1986 was held in Addis Ababa and brought together rapeseed and nigerseed scientists, with a field visit to the highland oilseed research in Ethiopia. Proceedings of all three workshops have been produced, and used by the oilseed scientists in the region, as well as by those in other regions. There has been a steady improvement in the quality and focus of the presentation and ineraction at successive workshops.

9) At the third oil crops meeting, a number of possible changes were discussed that would increase the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the network. These included:

i) consideration is to be given to developing a separate Brassica Network which

would include Canada, China, and Sweden as additional members. A meeting of Brassica scientists from the concerned countries will be held in Sweden in May 1987, to consider this;

ii) a steering committee is to be established at the next Oilseeds Network Workshop. The steering committee would make decisions about future network activities including workshops, training, and national program support;

iii) improved mechanisms for germ plasm exchange are needed. A collaborative nursery is to be set up and organized by the network advisor. Each country would contribute three released varieties and six germ plasm lines of each crop; and,

iv) more collaborative research activities on such problems as the elimination of white rust in Brassica crops are needed.

10. The first two phases have established an oilseeds network, and brought about number of solid achievements which have benefitted national oilseed programs. Careful thought is now being given to the most appropriate forms of future oil crops support. During a two-year Phase III, several issues can be evaluated:

the most effective mechanisms for germ plasm exchange;

the details of a possible separate Brassica network;

integration with other international organizations supporting research on oilseeds including FAO, the International Sunflower Association, the Cruciferae newsletter, and the International Sunflower Association; and,

the location, function, and donor support needed for an oilseeds research unit which can actively generate and disseminate improved oilseed genetic material and technology to national oilseed programs.

OBJECTIVES

General Objective:

11. To strengthen the oilseed research carried out in South Asia and Eastern Africa by establishing effective, practical liaison between the national oilseed programs.

Specific Objectives:

12. a) To continue support that will increase the effectiveness of national oil crops programs in the region;

b) To establish the most effective mechanisms for the exchange of oil crop germ plasm in the network;

c) To continue the flow of needed information to national oilseed programs;

d) To provide middle-level technical training on oilseeds; and

e) To evaluate the feasibility of new network forms in increasing network effectiveness and efficiency.

ANTICIPATED RESULTS AND BENEFICIARIES

13. The output of the project will be more effective interaction among network countries resulting in stronger national oilseed programs. The small farmers and consumers will be the final beneficiaries of improved oilseed technology developed and disseminated by the national programs.

METHODOLOGY

Objective a): National Program Support

14. The advisor will continue to devote 30-40% of his time to working with the Ethiopian oil crops program. Greater emphasis will be on supporting the lowland oil crops and sunflower programs.

The advisor will review annual technical reports from projects, and visit programs regularly to keep in touch with and discuss oil crop improvement programs with national oil crops scientists.

More emphasis will be on interaction with programs in Africa which do not have IDRC support.

In collaboration with the IDRC program officer, the advisor will pursue possible further IDRC support for national programs in Africa. Where necessary, National Program Support funds will be allocated from the project.

National scientists will be encouraged to visit each others' projects. The use of consultants from the network region will be considered.

Objective b): Germ plasm Exchange

15. The dialogue between Indian and Ethiopian officials begun in Phase II, will be followed up by the advisor to ensure that bilateral exchange continues between these two countries.

Other network countries with fewer constraints to exchanging germ plasm, will be encouraged to exchange on a bilateral basis.

The collaborative nursery, as recommended at the third workshop, will be instituted, using Ethiopia as a base for receiving the seed samples and distribution of the nursery.

The feasibility of three-way germ plasm exchange, with a third country such as Canada involved to ensure that mutual and fair exchange occurs, will be pursued.

Objective c) Information

16. The network advisor will ensure that the flow of relevant information continues. This includes:

compiling the annual oil crops newsletter;

making sure that national programs receive oilseeds abstracts, computer profiles, and searches when needed;

organizing a workshop at 1-2 year intervals. The next workshop is scheduled for 1987 in Nairobi, Kenya when linseed, sunflower, and sesame will be features; and,

reviewing books and journals received by the network for relevant articles for distribution. Only those journals which regularly contain useful articles will continue to be received; and,

compilation of a multi-authored monograph on nigerseed, possibly followed by sesame or safflower monographs organised by the network advisor.

Objective d): Training

17. There will be emphasis on developing oilseed technician training. Training in one or more countries at a time, training of trainers as well as training in a single crop will be considered. Participants in the recently concluded training in Hyderabad recommended a longer duration with more time for practical field training. This will be considered for the next training course.

Objective e): New Network Forms and Activities

18. Several new approaches and activities were recommended at the third oilseeds workshop.

A steering committee will be set up during the next workshop to work with the advisor in guiding network activities. Specific terms of reference for the committee will be established at the workshop, but would likely include the recommendation of national program support allocation, training, workshop location and network focus.

Collaborative research projects will be considered. Topics for collaborative research should be an important priority to several members,

and more effectively pursued through a collaborative approach. The elimination of white rust in Brassica oilseeds in the region is one possible collaborative project.

A separate Brassica Network or subnetwork will be considered during the three-day meeting in Sweden in May 1987, to be attended by Brassica scientists from Nepal, India, China, Pakistan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Egypt, Canada and Sweden. The meeting will consider: 1) the desirability of dividing the network, 2) links with other organizations such as Cruciferae Newsletter, in disseminating information in the new network, and 3) necessary donor and national program support.

Attempts will be made to collaborate, or join with, similar activities in other organizations.

i) Discussions will be held between IDRC and FAO in May 1987, to establish collaboration with FAO initiatives, including their sesame and safflower newsletters, FAO collaborative oilseed trials (sunflower, sesame and safflower) and FAO oilseed workshops.

ii) Contact will be made with the International Sunflower Association and International Rapeseed Association to see if any network activities can be merged with, or administered by, these organizations.

INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

19. The Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR) is a semi-autonomous institute responsible for the co-ordination and execution of agricultural research in Ethiopia. The IAR is responsible for administering the salaries and allowances of the locally-hired network staff. The oil crops advisor administers much of the centre-administered portion of the budget, and through interaction with network members, initiates and supports network activities.

20. Close collaboration has been established with national institutions in the network member countries. These are either government or university-based oil crop research programs.

	IDRC CONTRIBUTION			IAR'S CONTRIBUTION		
	Year 1	Year 2	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Total
	In Canadian Dollars (CAD)			In Canadian Dollars (CAD)		
) BE ADMINISTERED BY THE IAR						
ılaries and Allowances						
:search Assistant	4,800	5,400	10,200	---	---	---
:cretary	4,800	5,400	10,200	---	---	---
'fice Helper	1,900	2,100	4,000	---	---	---
:neral Assistant/Driver	2,300	2,500	4,800	---	---	---
'fice Space (Rent)	---	---	---	1,000	1,000	2,000
lministration Overheads	---	---	---	1,000	1,000	2,000
mmunication Services	---	---	---	700	800	1,500
)TAL RECIPIENT-ADMINISTERED PORTION	13,800	15,400	29,200	2,700	2,800	5,500

	Year 1	Year 2	Total
TO BE ADMINISTERED BY IDRC		(In Canadian Dollars)	
Salaries and Allowances			
Network Advisor	41,000	85,000	126,000
Research Expenses			
Vehicle Fuel/Maintenance	4,000	4,000	8,000
Support Services			
Communication	1,000	1,000	2,000
Office Supplies/Maintenance	3,500	3,500	7,000
Workshops	25,000	20,000	45,000
Network Advisor Travel	26,000	28,000	54,000
Books and Journals	2,000	2,000	4,000
National Program Support	15,000	15,000	30,000
Consultancy	10,000	10,000	20,000
Newsletter	5,000	5,000	10,000
Equipment			
Computer/Word Processor	6,000	---	6,000
Training			
Short Course	---	25,000	25,000
Network Staff Training	---	1,000	1,000
Contingency	---	24,000	24,000
TOTAL IDRC-ADMINISTERED PORTION	138,500	223,500	362,000
TOTAL GRANT	152,300	238,900	391,200

BUDGET NOTES

RECIPIENT-ADMINISTERED PORTION

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES

Calculated at 10% yearly increases above 1986-87 levels. Includes per diems insurance and superannuation payments where applicable.

1. Research Assistant - Includes up to 100 days travel per year at local per diem rates. The research assistant is to work closely with the network advisor and take charge of preparing information and seed materials for network participants.

2. Secretary - A senior secretary/administrator position is budgeted.

3. Office Helper - A high school graduate is to help with photocopying, collati reports, filing references, and packaging seed for network distribution.

4. General Assistant/Driver - Includes up to 130 days per diem at local per diem rates.

IDRC-ADMINISTERED PORTION

Salaries and Allowances

5. Network Advisor - Salary and allowances include standard IDRC allowances including home leave. The salary of the advisor covering the period July 1 to December 31, 1987 is being covered under Phase II (83-0125).

Research Expenses

6. Vehicle Fuel Maintenance - Budgeted at 30,000 km per year at .13 CAD per km.

Support Services

7. Communication - Includes stamps, telegrams and long distance telephone calls.

8. Office Supplies/Maintenance - Paper, service for photocopier, typewriter and word processor.

9. Workshops - Includes a large workshop in Year 1 in Kenya, and a smaller, more specialized workshop in Year 2.

10. Network Advisor Travel - Yearly travel to participating network countries, very occasional trips to meetings outside the network region may be required.

11. Books and Journal - Cost of books and subscriptions to important journals required by oilseed workers.

12. National Program Support - Small grants can be made for oilseed research (or related activities) in national programs which are not already receiving IDRC support. These funds will be allocated by the network advisor, following consultation with the relevant PO responsible for the particular country. The funds are intended to cover such activities as minor research supplies, casual labour and other operating expenses, germ plasm exchange and travel to enable these programs to more fully participate in network activities.

13. Consultancy - Up to 25 days per year are budgeted for Dr. Hugh Doggett to serve as a consultant to the network project. Terms of reference are provided in Annex 1.

14. Newsletter - Costs of publishing a yearly newsletter from Addis Ababa, or India are included.

Equipment

15. Word Processor/Computer - An IBM XT or equivalent with letter quality printer, software for word processing and multilocation trial analysis (MSTAT) includes uninterruptable power supply paper and ribbon printer. Needed for producing newsletters, reports and analysing network data.

Training

16. Short course - With duration of one month, or more with emphasis on the practical aspects of oilseeds research and production as a follow-up to the course in India in 1986. Other donors will be asked to fund additional participants. Details will be decided at the next workshop meeting.

17. Network Staff Training - Funds are provided for training of the research assistant/secretary at a regional office or in a participating project.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE
CENTRE DE RECHERCHES POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT INTERNATIONAL

CANADA

DATA SHEET/FEUILLE DE DONNÉES

File
Dossier 3-P-87-0025

Phase III

Project Title
Titre du project OILSEEDS NETWORK (ETHIOPIA)

Phase I 3-P-80-0132
Phase II 3-P-83-0175

Division
Division Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences

Number of Grantees
Nombre de bénéficiaires One

Program Officer
Agent de programme K.W. Riley

Area
Région South Asia and East Africa

Alternate Program Officer
Agent de programme intérimaire

Country(ies)
Pays Ethiopia

Regional Office Administered
Administré par le bureau régional SARO

Regional Office
Bureau régional EARO

TYPE OF INSTITUTION/TYPE D'INSTITUTION

Public ☐ Publique

Private ☐ Privée

National ☒ Nationale

Regional ☐ Régionale

International ☐ Internationale

(CAP) Centre-Administered Portion
(PAC) Partie administrée par le Centre $362,000

(RAP) Recipient-Administered Portion
(PAB) Partie administrée par le bénéficiaire $ 29,200

Recipient Contribution (Cash Only)
Contribution du bénéficiaire (en espèces seulement) $ 5,500

Other Contributions (Cash Only)
Autres contributions (en espèces seulement)

BUDGET BREAKDOWN/VENTILATION DU BUDGET
(CANADIAN $ CANADIENS)

Capital Equipment Biens d'équipement	6,000
Conference Conférences	45,000
Consultants Consultants	20,000
Contingency Imprévus	24,000
Publication Publications	14,000
Research Expenses Frais de recherche	38,000
Salaries Traitements	155,200
Support Services Services de soutien	9,000
Training Formation	26,000
Travel Déplacements	54,000
Total Budget Total du budget	$ 391,200

BUDGET PROVISIONS FOR TRAINING/FONDS AFFECTÉS À LA FORMATION

TYPE OF TRAINING TYPE DE FORMATION	NUMBER OF TRAINEES NOMBRE DE STAGIAIRES	DURATION (MONTHS) DURÉE (MOIS)	AMOUNT MONTANT
1. Ph.D. Degree Doctorat			
2. Masters Degree Maîtrise			
3. Diploma Diplôme			
4. Short Courses Cours de courte durée	10-15	1	25,000
5. Postdoctoral Training Formation post-doctorale			
6. Student Field Work Travaux sur le terrain			
7. Other Training Autre type de formation	1	1	1,000
Totals Totaux			$ 26,000

SCHEDULE OF REPORTS AND PAYMENTS
CALENDRIER DES RAPPORTS ET DES VERSEMENTS

3-P-87-0025

EXCHANGE RATE 1 CAD = 1.55 Ethiopian Birr (ETB)
TAUX DE CHANGE

COMMENCEMENT DATE July 1, 1987
DÉBUT DES TRAVAUX

MONTHS AFTER COMMENCEMENT / MOIS ÉCOULÉS	TECHNICAL REPORT / RAPPORT TECHNIQUE	FINANCIAL REPORT / ÉTAT FINANCIER	AMOUNTS PAID / MONTANTS VERSÉS
INITIAL PAYMENT / PREMIER VERSEMENT			$ 13,800
12		X	13,100
24		X	2,300
TOTAL PAYMENTS / TOTAL DES VERSEMENTS			$ 29,200

RECIPIENT INSTITUTION (Position of Contact, Complete Address)
BÉNÉFICIAIRE (Titre du responsable, adresse complète)

General Manager
Institute of Agricultural Research
P.O. Box 2003
Addis Ababa
ETHIOPIA

Telephone, Telex, Cable
téléphone, télex, câble

Telex: 21548 IAR ET
Telegram: MEMIRU, Addis Ababa

RESEARCH INSTITUTION (Position of Contact, Complete Address)
INSTITUTION DE RECHERCHE (Titre du responsable, adresse complète)

General Manager
Institute of Agricultural Research
P.O. Box 2003
Addis Ababa
ETHIOPIA

Telephone, Telex, Cable
téléphone, télex, câble

Telex: 21548 IAR ET
Telegram: MEMIRU, Addis Ababa

PROJECT LEADER (Name, Title, Complete Address) PROJECT ADVISOR
CHARGÉ DE PROJET (Nom, titre, adresse complète)

Dr. Abbas Omran
Holetta Research Station
Box 2003, Addis Ababa
ETHIOPIA

Telephone, Telex, Cable
téléphone, télex, câble

Telex: 21548 IAR ET
Telegram: MEMIRU, Addis Ababa

FUNDING CATEGORY
CATÉGORIE DE SUBVENTION

External Grant / Externe ☐
Centre-Partnership Grant / À frais communs ☒
Centre-Administered Grant / Administrée par le Centre ☐

200-008 (REV. 11-84)

	IDRC CONTRIBUTION			IAR CONTRIBUTION		
	Year 1	Year 2	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Total
	In Ethiopian Birr			In Ethiopian Birr		
TO BE ADMINISTERED BY IAR						
Salaries and Allowances						
Research Assistant	7,500	8,300	15,800	---	---	---
Secretary	7,500	8,300	15,800	---	---	---
Office Helper	3,000	3,300	6,300	---	---	---
General Assistant/Driver	3,500	3,800	7,300	---	---	---
Office Space (Rent)	---	---	---	1,550	1,550	3,100
Administration Overheads	---	---	---	1,550	1,550	3,100
Communication Services	---	---	---	1,100	1,300	2,400
TOTAL IAR-ADMINISTERED	21,500	23,700	45,200	4,200	4,400	8,600

APPENDIX 2

Evaluation Questionnaire

OILSEEDS NETWORK EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

The Oilseeds Network has been operating in the service of its member projects for several years. During this period it has fulfilled different functions, all intended to support the oilseeds research programmes of the member countries. IDRC is currently considering the extension of this Network into the future, and would like to ensure that the Network, in its future form, both serve members needs and use its resources efficiently.

During January 1991, the Network's Steering Committee met in Kenya. One of the Agenda items was that of an evaluation of the Network. As a result of decisions taken there, it was decided that the Network should be evaluated during 1991. The Steering Committee defined the major issues that should be addressed during the evaluation. These are included in this questionnaire.

This questionnaire includes all the issues considered pertinent to the past and future operation of the Network. It is hoped that all respondents value the Network enough to answer this questionnaire. The answers will be the main source of information for decisions taken on the future form and course of the Network.

Network Objectives

The last Phase of the Network was Phase III. The objectives of this Phase were specified as follows:

A. General

To strengthen the oilseed research carried out in South Asia and Eastern Africa by establishing effective, practical liaison between the national oilseed programs.

B. Specific

To continue support that will increase the effectiveness of national oilcrops programs in the region.

To establish the most effective mechanisms for the exchange of oilcrop germ plasm in the network.

To continue the flow of needed information to national oilseed programs.

To provide middle-level technical training on oilseeds.

To evaluate the feasibility of new network forms in increasing network effectiveness and efficiency.

C. Other

Certain other issues were also considered pertinent to Phase III, and targets for evaluation. These include:

> Integration with other international organizations including FAO, the International Sunflower Association, and the Cruciferae newsletter.
>
> The location , function, and donor support needed for an oilseeds research unit which can actively generate and disseminate improved oilseed genetic material and technology to national oilseed programs.

The evaluation is based on this set of objectives, and seeks to determine the extent to which the Network has achieved it. The questions are listed in order of specific objectives first, and general objectives subsequently, to help respondents focus on the underlying issues.

Responses

Respondents are asked to be succinct in their responses. Where insufficient room is provided for a response, please attach a sheet of paper with the full response, and the number of the question indicated.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to Thomas Development Associates, Ltd. It would be appreciated if responses could be in the return mail by June 15.

OUTPUTS

Consultancy services

1. Did the network provide consultancy services to your program or project?

   Yes _____ No ____

2. Who provided these services? (Please tick)

   a) Network adviser
   b) Other consultants

3. What have been the three main topics that these services addressed?

   _____
   _____
   _____

4. Were these services provided when needed?

   Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not?_____

5. Have these services contributed specifically to a stronger program at your institution? (Please tick)

   a) More effective research
   b) Other (define)

   _____

Germplasm exchange

6. Have you received germplasm from, or contributed germplasm to, the network?

   Yes _____ No ____

7. Describe briefly material sent or recieved

   _____
   _____

8. Did an appropriate mechanism for exchange exist prior to the existence of the network?

   Yes _____ No ____

9. Did you commonly exchange germplasm before your membership of the network?

   Yes _____ No ____

10. What has been the main method by which you have received or sent germplasm? (Please tick)

    a) By means of the network adviser
    b) Directly through own channels
    c) Other (describe)

---

11. Did any germplasm you received arrive in a poor state, or not germinate on seeding?

    Yes _____ No ____

12. Do you believe that sending material via the network coordinator is the best mechanism?

    Yes _____ No ____

13. Do you believe that more efficient and appropriate mechanisms for your purpose exist?

    Yes _____ No ____

Information exchanges

14. The network employs several methods for the exchange of information. What method has been the best for your needs? (Please tick)

    a) Network newsletter
    b) Scientific exchange
    c) Attending workshops
    d) Attending training sessions
    e) Other

15. Of what specific value has the newletter been to you? For example, has it (please tick):

    a) Provided you with key information essential to the progress of your program?
    b) Kept you abreast generally with activities of other members?
    c) Provided a means of publication which did not otherwise exist?
    d) Provided other benefits? (Please describe)

---

16. Does your institution recognize the newsletter as a formal publication?

    Yes _____ No ____

17. Have you contributed to the newsletter? Please specify.

Yes _____ No ____

---

18. Have you been part of a scientific exchange? If so, please describe briefly your activities during the exchange. Also describe the principal benefit to your program of this exchange.

Yes _____ No ____

---

19. What network workshops have you attended?

---

20. What benefit have these workshops provided? (Please tick)

a) Access to specific ideas which have been incorporated in your program?
b) Presentation by you of information which you know to have been adopted by other programs?
c) Other? (Describe)

Training

21. Have you received training through the network?

Yes _____ No ____

If so, please answer the following questions:

22. What was the nature of the training you received?

---

23. What was your principal oilseeds focus prior to this course? (Please tick)

a) Breeding
b) Agronomy
c) Pathology

d) Entomology
e) Other (describe)

---

24. What did you learn at the course?

---

25. Was what you learnt directly applicable to your area of expertise?

Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not?_____
---

26. Have you applied anything you learnt at the course to your research program?

Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not?_____
---

27. Are you still working on the same research topics as you were at the time of the course?

Yes _____ No ____

28. Could the course have been made more appropriate to your needs?

Yes _____ No ____ If yes, how? _____
---

29. Were you consulted in the development of course content?

Yes _____ No ____

New network forms

Since its inception, the network has tried to respond to members needs, and to find other ways of achieving its purpose efficiently. Such approaches and activities include:

A Steering Committee
Collaborative research projects
Establishment of crop sub-networks
Collaboration with other organizations or networks

30. Do you believe that, on the whole, these changes have improved the value of the network to you as a member?

Yes _____ No ____

Steering Committee

31. Has the establishment of a Steering Committee improved the management of the network by its members?

Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not?_____
_____

32. Could the Steering Committee do more to strengthen the network?

Yes _____ No ____ If so, what? _____
_____

33. Has the Steering Committee been given the resources necessary to do its job?

Yes _____ No ____

34. If the resources were adequate, do you believe that the network (sub-networks) could become self-sustaining under Steering Committee direction?

Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not?_____
_____

35. Have the Chair and Co-Chair of your sub-network been able to respond to your needs, in terms of what you believe the network should be accomplishing for you?

Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not?_____
_____

Collaborative projects

36. Have you been involved in, or initiated, any collaborative research projects? If so, in a couple of lines please describe each one. For each one, also indicate the added benefit you believe that this collaborative project has brought to your research program.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

37. In order of decreasing priority, please list up to three areas in which you believe further collaborative projects could help your program.

_____
_____
_____

38. If you were involved in a collaborative project, were resources available to you through the network on a timely and adequate basis?

Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not?_____
_____

Sub-networks

39. To which sub-network(s) do you belong?

_____
_____

40. What has been the main benefit of belonging to a sub-network, rather than to an all-oilcrops network, as it was before?

_____
_____

41. Do you believe that the present subdivision of the network into four crop-based sub-networks is the most appropriate form? Please give your reasons for or against this structure.

Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not _____
_____
_____

42. What improvements to the current structure should be made?

_____
_____
_____

43. Has there been significant collaboration with other organizations or networks through your sub-network?

Yes _____ No ____ If yes, what form has this collaboration taken?

_____
_____

44. Do you believe that other opportunities for such collaboration exist? If so, what are they, and with whom?

_____
_____
_____

PURPOSE

45. Do the following describe one or more of the ways in which the network has strengthened your National Oilcrop Research Program (NORP)? If so, please tick those which apply, and rank them in order of importance.

Increasing resources to oilcrop research
(staff, programs, disciplines)

Wider technological coverage of oilcrop systems
(from production to consumption)

Improved research quality
(methods, programming, reporting, publishing)

Development, dissemination and adoption of technology
(varieties, processing, etc)

Other (describe)

---

46. Will your NORP benefit in the near future in one of the areas above as a result of network membership?

Yes _____ No ____ If yes, how? _____
---

47. Does membership in the network allow you to achieve the objectives of your NORP more efficiently and effectively?

Yes _____ No ____ If yes, why? _____
---

48. In which sub-continent are you located?

---

49. Which geographic region do you believe offered, or offers, greatest potential for linkage to your program, to achieve, for example, gains in the areas listed in Question 45 above ?

---

50. For the needs of your program, does a crop-orientation (e.g. brassica) or a geographic orientation (e.g. E & S Africa) have more value? Please define.

---

51. Do you believe that such an orientation differs from what you have now?

Yes _____ No ____

52. Do you believe that your NORP could have benefitted more if the resources made available to you through the network had been delivered directly to your program? As a very rough estimate, on average each member has absorbed in Phase III CAD22,000 of network goods and services.

Yes _____ No ____

53. If yes, please describe why you believe the network was not an effective means of resource delivery.

---

54. Is there one area or service in particular on which the network could focus to strengthen your NORP further?

---

55. In your NORP please describe how many of your staff are male or female

	Professional	Support
Male		
Female		

GOAL

56. Has your membership in the network helped your NORP improve the welfare of small oilcrop producers and their communities? You may wish to review your response to Question 45, and then indicate how this improvement has come about, e.g.: (please tick)

Improved nutritional status
Increased employment
Increased income
Other welfare measures (describe)
Yes, but no data
Not sure
Not yet

(Please be sure that you have supporting evidence from surveys, secondary data, etc., before responding in first four cases)

57. As a step leading to expectation of benefit at the rural level, has the network helped your NORP produce new varieties or technologies that have been adopted by farmers or processors? Please describe, or give names:

Varieties _____
Technologies _____

Other _____

_____

58. Does your program customarily follow-up on-farm adoption of new varieties or technologies?

Yes _____ No ____ If yes, how? _____

_____

59. Would it be useful to your program for the network to focus on support in determining and measuring on-farm benefits?

Yes _____ No ____

COORDINATING UNIT

60. As a member of the network, have you had direct correspondence with the Coordinating Unit (CU)?

Yes _____ No ____

61. If so, have you received a response as quickly as you would have expected?

Yes _____ No ____

62. For what reasons have you contacted the CU? (Please tick)

Consultant services
Germplasm exchange
Submissions to newsletter
Training matters
Steering Committee matters
Collaborative projects
Workshops
Other network issues (specify)

63. Do you believe that the CU has been essential to efficient and effective management of the network?

Yes _____ No ____

64. Do you believe that the resources provided by IDRC for the CU could be more efficiently used by the network for other purposes?

Yes _____ No ____

65. Do you believe that input by network members could replace the services currently provided by the CU?

Yes _____ No ____

66. Would you, as a network member, be willing to dedicate some of your

time to running the network/sub-network?

Yes _____ No ____ If yes, what proportion of your time? (%, or days per year) _____

67. Was the location of the CU, attached to the National Oilseeds Program in Ethiopia, the best location for it?

Yes _____ No ____

68. Has the location of the CU in Ethiopia: (Please tick)

Restricted its effectiveness?
Made communication difficult?
Made germplasm exchange difficult?
Other _____

69. Would you expect such conditions to change were it to be located elsewhere?

Yes _____ No ____

70. If you believe a CU is essential to continued effective management of the network, where should the CU be located? Please give reasons for your choice.

_____
_____

71. Have you had any communication with the IDRC New Delhi office on network matters?

Yes _____ No ____

72. From your perspective, has the IDRC New Delhi office been significant in network coordination?

Yes _____ No ____

73. Are there further services, not currently provided, which a CU or other management body should provide to members? Please describe.

Yes _____ No ____

_____
_____

74. Is there a regional agency which might, as you understand it, provide services to the network similar to those provided by the CU?

Yes _____ No ____ If Yes, which? _____

75. If the network continues to have a coordinator, or adviser, should this person work under the direction of the Steering Committee chairperson?

Yes _____ No ____

76. Approximately how many times has the Network Adviser, based in Ethiopia, visited your project?

---

77. Approximately how many times have IDRC Program Officers from the East Africa Regional Office, or other IDRC Offices, visited your project on network business?

PRODUCTION TO CONSUMPTION SYSTEMS RESEARCH

78. Which of the following areas does your NORP address? (Please tick)

Varietal improvement
Agronomy
Farming system, incl. constraints to oilcrop production
Extension and technology transfer
Farm-level oil extraction, incl. constraints to such processing
Farm-level consumption of oil and cake
Oilcrop marketing, trading, incl. information systems
Local/national/regional demand for vegetable oils & protein cake
Industrialization
Oilcrop sector policy development
Others (specify) _____

---

79. Through the network you may have heard of the Production to Consumption Systems Research (PCSR) approach to identifying and solving constraints in oilcrops production, marketing and consumption. As a result of presentations you may have heard, or discussions in which you may have participated, is your understanding of PCSR: (Please tick)

1. good?
2. generally good, though unsure of some aspects?
3. not very clear?
4. don't really understand?
5. have not heard of PCSR?

80. If you answered 1 or 2 above, do you believe the PCSR approach has something to offer your NORP?

Yes _____ No ____ If yes, why? _____

---

81. If yes, would you wish for further information on, or support for, PCSR through the network?

Yes _____ No ____

82. What is your own field of expertise within the oilcrops sector?

---

83. Which field (e.g. as listed in Question 78 above, or other) do you believe to be the most limiting in your country, in terms of improving returns or other benefits to the small producer?

---

84. Does your NORP have persons working in this area?

Yes _____ No ____

FUNDING

Recognizing that IDRC has to put its funds where they may best be used:

85. Do you view the network to be of sufficient value that, were it necessary, you would solicit funds from your own Govt to ensure its survival?

Yes _____ No ____

86. Do you think your Govt or NORP would be willing to provide such funds?

Yes _____ No ____ If no, why not?_____
---

87. Do you think that there are specific network areas or issues where IDRC should target its financial resources, or should funding be provided for the network in general?

---

88. If you were able to place a financial value on all the goods and services received by your program through the network, what would this amount to?

US$ _____

89. Do you regard the network as your principal, or only a minor, source of information and resources for your NORP? (Please tick)

Principal
Minor

90. Have you received other donor support for your NORP?

Yes _____ No ____

91. Are you aware of any funding sources that might be interested in, or used for, support of the network?

Yes _____ No ____ If yes, which? _____

92. If your program maintains links with other agencies/donors/mechanisms on oilcrops, how do these links compare generally to those fostered through the network? (Please tick)

More useful
Similar in usefulness
Less useful

93. What is the principal value of these linkages to you? (Please tick)

Financial resources
Human resources
Training programs
Publications
Other (specify)_____
_____

94. Are there some potential linkages that you believe the network should pursue to increase its efficiency and effectiveness?

Yes _____ No ____

If so, what are they? _____
_____

How could they be encouraged? _____
_____

Thank you for answering this questionnaire. Please place it in the envelope provided, and return by mail to Thomas Development Associates, Ltd.

APPENDIX 3

Network Adviser Terms of Reference

WITNESS that the Centre and the Advisor hereby mutually agree that the Centre contracts for the services of the Advisor in consideration of the terms and conditions herein contained, which are hereby agreed to by the Advisor:

Project: Oilseed Network (Ethiopia)

1. General Terms

a) The oilseeds network comprises all IDRC-funded national projects on one or a few oilseed crops of importance to the economies of countries in Africa and South Asia. The researchers are national scientists, and the projects are led by national scientists.

b) The function of the network advisor is to assist the researchers in carring out their projects more effectively, through the provision of advice, information, ideas and help over obtaining germplasm.

c) The network advisor has no authority over the researchers in the national projects, and must not attempt to direct.

d) The advisor must keep himself up-to-date and fully informed on the current crop improvement and basic farming methodologies being used on crops, especially on the crops of the network, throughout the world. He must be familiar with the principal achievements and results, and with recent developments.

2. Particular Terms

1) The Advisor must be able to advise on the best way to develop testing sites.

2) The Advisor must be able to suggest and design suitable methodologies for testing promising material, illustrated by references to work done elsewhere.

3) The Advisor must be able to advise on sound selection procedures, constantly emphasising the importance of the genotype interaction with the environment.

4) The Advisor must be able to advise on suitable procedures for advancing promising selections and genetic stocks, and on the best methods for improvement.

5) The Advisor must be able to suggest sound methods for growing the crops.

6) The Advisor must always draw attention to the activities of the local farmers, and urge the researchers to consult and involve the local farmers in the research whenever and wherever possible.

7) The Advisor will be expected to know from where germplasm stocks can be obtained, the person to be contacted, and regulations and quarantine procedures. (Making the actual germplasm requests is the responsibility of the project scientists, through their national governments).

8) The Advisor will encourage and attempt to facilitate the exchange of germplasm between the projects in the network.

9) While in Ethiopia, The Advisor will be expected to help with practical germplasm collection, and to be involved with scientists of the Ethiopian programmes in doing this.

10) The Advisor must be acquainted with effective ways of storing germplasm.

11) The Advisor must visit each project of the network at least once in every year, and during such visits to the individual projects, The Advisor will discuss with the researchers and comment on the following:

    a) the priorities in each programme, and help the project leader to define them and arrange them in sequence; and

    b) the need for consultancies and visits of specialists to the projects, and will review these with the programme officer responsible for the project involved.

12) The Advisor will suggest exchange visits between researchers in the network projects, and will help to arrange those that are acceptable.

13) The Advisor will arrange with the IDRC Library for computer printouts of research information on the projects to be available for the projects.

14) The Advisor will arrange for photocopies of important reference to be obtained from Centre Headquarters.

15) The Advisor will study the Annual Reports prepared by the project leaders, and comment on them in writing, discussing them at the earliest opportunity.

16) The Advisor will keep in frequent touch with the leader of every network project by correspondence.

17) The Advisor will prepare an annual newsletter, including the following information:

a) Summaries of the project annual reports;

b) Technical reports of recent advances in the oilcrops work in the network projects and in the world;

c) Lists of addresses of scientists working on specific oil crops; and

d) Lists of useful germplasm lines available for exchange, and their locations.

18) The Advisor will arrange workshops annually, no more than 2 or 3 crops being dealt with at each workshop.

19) While in Ethiopia, for at least 30 per cent to 40 per cent of this time, the Advisor will help in developing the research programmes in the Ethiopia oilseeds projects, devoting at least two thirds of his time to the lowland oilseed crops project. He will help develop efficient testing and selection methodologies, in evaluating material in the field, and in analysing and presenting results. He will help in formulating and presenting the projects during the annual preview and review meetings.

20) The Advisor will maintain close liaison with the respective IDRC programme officers responsible for the network projects at all times, especially over workshop arrangements, financial and staff matters.

21) Notwithstanding the fact that the network is an IDRC network, contacts should be made with all oilseeds activities in the region, and other projects should be invited and encouraged to join the network. Close liaison with the programme officers in the regions will be essential in finalizing any arrangements of this kind.

22) The Advisor will undertake such other tasks as the Director of the Division of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences of the Centre may from time to time direct.

APPENDIX 4

Advisor Interventions Matrix

Activity	1989 Reports 1	2	3	4	8	1990 Reports 2	3	4	7
1 Develop testing sites									
2 Testing methodology									
3 Selection procedures									
4 Agronomic practices									
5 Local farming links									
6 Germplasm sources									
7 Gplasm exch. facilitation				*					
8 Gplasm coll. in Ethiopia									
9 Project visit									
10 Arrange exchange visits									
11 Arr. IDRC library printouts									
12 Comment on Annual Reports									
13 Correspond with all Project Leaders									
14 Prepare Annual Newsletter									
15 Arr. Annual Workshops	*		*					*	
16 Ethiopia Project									
17 IDRC Liaison		*				*	*		*
18 Regional oilseed activities						*	*		*
19 Other tasks									
Other tasks detected in trip reports									
20 Arrange courses									
21 International liaison				*	*				

Adviser Interventions Matrix
(derived from TORs and IDRC Ottawa-filed travel reports)

Activity	1984 Reports 1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	1985 1	2	3	5	6	7	1986 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Develop testing sites			*			*			*		*				*						*	*					
2 Testing methodology			*	*		*			*												*	*					
3 Selection procedures						*								*													
4 Agronomic practices			*								*										*						
5 Local farming links																					*						
6 Germplasm sources																					*						
7 Gplasm exch. facilitation									*				*														
8 Gplasm coll. in Ethiopia																											
9 Project visit																											
10 Arrange exchange visits						*																				*	
11 Arr. IDRC library printouts																											
12 Comment on Annual Reports																											
13 Correspond with all Project Leaders																											
14 Prepare Annual Newsletter																											
15 Arr. Annual Workshops				*	*																						
16 Ethiopia Project												*															
17 IDRC Liaison	*			*	*		*				*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*			*	*			*	*
18 Regional oilseed activities	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*	*				*
19 Other tasks																											
Other tasks detected in trip reports																											
20 Arrange courses																											
21 International liaison																											

Activity	1987 Reports 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	1988 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Develop testing sites	*																													
2 Testing methodology	*																													
3 Selection procedures																														
4 Agronomic practices																														
5 Local farming links																					*					*				
6 Germplasm sources																														
7 Gplasm exch. facilitation										*																				
8 Gplasm coll. in Ethiopia																														
9 Project visit																														
10 Arrange exchange visits																														
11 Arr. IDRC library printouts																														
12 Comment on Annual Reports																														
13 Correspond with all Project Leaders																														
14 Prepare Annual Newsletter																														
15 Arr. Annual Workshops								*						*																*
16 Ethiopia Project																														
17 IDRC Liaison					*		*							*							*								
18 Regional oilseed activities		*	*					*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*
19 Other tasks																														
Other tasks detected in trip reports																														
20 Arrange courses	*				*																									
21 International liaison						*	*						*												*	*				

APPENDIX 5

Adviser Trip Reports and Purpose

Network Adviser Travel Reports/Purpose

No	Date	Country	Purpose
1/84	24-31/3	Malawi	To attend Regional Groundnut Workshop
2/84	1-7/7 & 20-23/7	Egypt	To visit Oilseeds Project 3-P-81-0117.
3/84	8-12/7	Egypt	To discuss and re-write the Ph II proposal of the Sudan Oilseeds Project.
5/84	11-12/10	India	To visit sesame project 82-0062; To discuss arrangements of a field visit for the 2nd oilcrops workshop participants.
6/84	15-16/10	India	To arrange for 2nd oilcrops workshop
7/84	18-22/10	Sri Lanka	To work on thesis data of IDRC-supported student; To visit oilseed project 82-0105
8/84	10-14/12	Egypt	To discuss winter oilseed crops; To finalize nomination for oilcrops workshop.
9/84	16-23/12	Italy	To attend FAO Sesame and Safflower Expert Consultation meeting.
1/85	15/2	India	To visit mustard project (3-P-82-0059) at Haryanan Agric. University, Hissar.
2/85	10-15/3	Argentina	To attend 11th International Sunflower Conf.
3/85	2-9/7	Egypt	To visit oilcrops project 3-P-80-0102; To meet with Dr ON Morris of Agr Canada to discuss the proposed microbial control project with the National Research Centre.
5/85	17-23/9	Ethiopia	To visit, evaluate and advise Lowland and Highland Oilcrops Projects, and to attend the opening session of the Farming Systems Workshop.
6/85	23/9-2/10	Sudan	To visit Oilseeds Project (3-P-84-0137).
7/85	23-30/12	Egypt	To discuss third phase proposal.
1/86	17-19/1	India	To visit Mustard Project 3-P-82-0059.
2/86	20-22/1	India	Visit Rapeseed Project (3-P-82-0060).
3/86	23-25/1	India	Visit the sunflower project (3-P-82-0061)

4/86	26-29/1	India	Visit sesame project 3-P-82-0062
5/86	1-14/2	Zimbabwe	Attend 2nd Regional ICRISAT-IDRC Workshop on Groundnut Research and Improvement in S Africa.
6/86	18-25/2	Tanzania	Visit Tanzania Agr Research Organization; Visit Sokoine Univ of Agr (3-P-85-0019).
7/86	9-13/3	Somalia	Visit Agricultural Research Institute and Research Stations to investigate oilcrops situation and research needs in Somalia.
8/86	4-10/4	Egypt	Visit oilseed project 3-P-81-0117 to work on Ph III proposal.
9/86	24-26/4	Ethiopia	To attend the 18th National Crop Improvement Conference at Nazareth.
10/86	10-12/7	Sweden	To visit rapeseed research at the Swedish University of Agr Sciences.
11/86	15-18/7	USA	To attend APRES Workshop.
12/86	20/7-6/8	Canada	Visit IDRC, Agr Canada and Universities to be acquainted with oilseeds research and scientists for future reference in the oilcrops network.
13/86	14-26/11	Kenya	To visit oilcrops activities.
1/87	27/01-14/02	India	To participate in organizing and instructing the ICAR/IDRC sesame/safflower short course.
2/87	16-17/02	India	To visit safflower project after termination and keep the project under the umbrella of the oilcrops Network.
3/87	18-19/02	India	To visit rapeseed project after termination and keep under the umbrella of the oilcrops network.
4/87	21/02	India	To discuss germplasm exchange.
5/87	06-08/05	Sweden	To organize a special Brassica meeting at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala.
6/87	11-15/05	Poland	To attend the 7th International Rapeseed Congress.
7/87	18/05	Italy	To discuss cooperation between FAO, IBPGR and the Oilcrops Network.

8/87	08-10/07	Kenya	To attend the 1st National Oilcrop Workshop held at Egerton University College, Njoro.
9/87	13-16/07	Tanzania	To visit sunflower research and production fields.
10/87	26-31/08	Somalia	To visit national oilseed programs.
11/87	02-07/09	Sudan	To visit oilseed project - Agric. Res. Corporation. To visit Sudan-Canada Simsim Project.
12/87	09-12/09	Egypt	To visit the summer crops (1st year, Ph III, 3-P-86-0092) mainly sunflower, and to discuss the winter program of rapeseed.
13/87	14-18/09	Austria	To attend FAO/IAEA expert consultation on sesame research.
14/87	01-05/11	Kenya	To arrange for 4th Oilcrops Network Workshop.
15/87	24-26/12	India	Visit sesame project 3-P-82-0062; visit sesame research scholars 3-P-87-0070; visit on-farm sesame research 3-P-87-0135.
16/87	28-29/12	India	To visit safflower project 3-P-82-0061.
17/87	31/12-02/01	India	To visit mustard project 3-P-82-0060 and discuss Canada-India Collaborative Project and On-farm research proposed Project.
1/88	03-07/01	Nepal	Visit national oilseed development program (NODP) at Nawalpur, Sarlahi, and discuss the new project 3-P-87-0024.
2/88	08/01	India	To meet with officials of Indian Council for Agricultural Research (ICAR).
3/88	10-13/01	Pakistan	To get familiar with oilseeds research programs; to discuss the start and first year results of soybean project 3-P-86-0099.
4/88	18-25/02	Egypt	Visit Oilseed Project 3-P-86-0092.
5/88	14-18/03	Malawi	To participate in the 3rd Regional Groundnut Workshop for Southern Africa (ICRISAT Regional Improvement Program).
6/88	21-23/03	Zambia	To visit National Oilseed Development Program (NODP).

7/88	09-12/05	Kenya	To participate East and Southern Africa Network Coordinators' Review organized by IDRC.
8/88	30/06-17/07	China	To participate in Sino-Canadian spring rapeseed conference and symposium on rapeseed breeding.
9/88	25-29/07	Yugoslavia	To participate in the 12th International Sunflower Conference and discuss collaboration with Sunflower Associations.
10/88	17-21/10	Sudan	To visit oilseeds Sudan project (3-P-84-0137).
11/88	23-27/10	Egypt	To visit Oilcrops Project for reclaimed lands 86-0092.
12/88	28-29/10	Kenya	To attend the Vegetable Oil-Protein System Project Workshop.
13/88	10-14/11	India	To organize January meetings with SARO, ICAR and Pantnagar.
1/89	01-19/01	India	To organize and participate in: 2nd Brassica Sub-Network Meeting, Pantnagar; Other Oilcrops Sub-Network Meeting, Hyderabad; 2nd Intl Safflower Conference, Hyderabad; 1st Oilcrops Network Steering Committee, Hyderabad.
2/89	21-24/03	Kenya	To assist Mr Andrew Ker in preparing the supplement and extension of Network Phase III, 3-P-87-0025.
3/89	18-22, 30/07	Egypt	To prepare for the Sesame-Sunflower Sub-Networks Meeting to be held 9-15 September 1989.
4/89	24-29/07	Turkey	To attend the meeting of Genetics and Breeding Sub-Network of FAO Sunflower Network, Istanbul, 25-28 July, 1989.
5/89			
6/89			
7/89			
8/89	20-24/11	India	To participate in the 1st FAO/IAEA Coordination Meeting on Mutation Breeding of Oil Seed Crops, held at Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC).
[2/90	05-12/03	Zambia	To explore the possibility of an oilcrop production, processing, marketing and

			utilization systems study later this year and to investigate the possibility of other crop projects in the future.]
2/90	26/02-05/03	Kenya	To discuss oilcrops strategy and to visit the coast area where sesame is grown.
3/90	02-06/04	Kenya	To discuss with NM oilseeds strategy and Ph 4; To visit National Plant Breeding Station (NPBS) and VOPS Kenya.
4/90	15/04-08/05	China	To organize and participate in Brassica Subnetwork, Brassica quality training, Chinese Symposium and Sesame research.
7/90	12-16/12	Nepal	To monitor the progress of Oilseeds Nepal 3-P-87-0024.
[8/90	17-23/12	Bhutan	To visit oilseeds program and the rice-based farming systems project.]

APPENDIX 6

Network Consultant Terms of Reference

ANNEX I

Oilseeds Network Consultant

Terms of Reference

1. To advise the Associate Director (AD) on the overall policy and strategy of CAPS support for research on oilcrops worldwide.

2. To provide advice and guidance to the Associate Director, Program Officers (PO) and Network Advisor (NA) on the current oilseeds network project, and to recommend ways in which the network can be made more effective. This will involve regular correspondence as well as visits, particularly to attend network meetings.

3. To assist the POs and NA in their technical support and monitoring of IDRC oilcrops projects within the network, and thus help provide feedback and advice to the project leaders and scientists. This will involve visiting the projects concerned, and commenting on reports, proposals, etc.

4. To assist the NA in establishing and strengthening links with relevant oilseeds projects and programs which are not currently included in the network.

5. To assist the NA in preparing the newsletter and other publications as requested.

6. Other activities as may be required from time to time in pursuance of the oilcrops network objectives, and as requested by the NA, POs or AD.

APPENDIX 7

Network Draft Constitution

CONSTITUTION OF THE OIL CROPS NETWORK

(Second Draft)

Masood A. Rana and Abbas Omran

The first draft of the constitution was carefully and thoroughly discussed in the General Steering Committee Meeting held at Hyderabad, India from January 16-17, 1989. Each clause of the first draft was open to the house for suggestions /amendments. In this process the appropriate suggestions were incorporated and second draft was prepared at the end of the meeting which is now being circulated for information and critical review by the member countries.

This document will be presented in the coming meeting of the Whole-Network and will be enforced after approval of the house.

TITLE OF THE DOCUMENT

Constitution of the Oil Crops Network for East Africa and South ASia.

1. PURPOSE OF THE NETWORK

To improve/develop the annual oil crops especially those not covered by other international research organizations through better coordination and cooperation among the oil crop growing countries and strengthening their research program for the benefit of farmers.

2. OBJECTIVES

i) To assist member countries for the improvement/development of rapeseed-mustard, sesame, niger, sunflower, safflower and linseed.

ii) To enhance the general productivity and production of the mandate crops in different situations and systems.

3. APPROACH

i) To enhance the research capabilities through firsthand contacts, exchange of information and materials, dissemination of knowledge, organization/participation in meetings, workshops, seminars, publication of newsletters and trainings.

ii) Locate financial assistance and provide consultancy in the needed areas.

4. STRUCTURE

The Network will consist of the present four working units under the overall umbrella of whole-Network as below:

1) Subnetwork on brassica.
2) Subnetwork on sesame.
3) Subnetwork on sunflower.
4) Subnetwork on other oilcrops (linseed, safflower and niger).

Other oilcrops may be added in the future.

5. OPERATION

Each subnetwork will be managed through a Steering Committee. The Whole-Network will be operated through a General Steering Committee. The Steering Committees of each Sub-Network will formulate its work plan.

6. COMPOSITION OF STEERING COMMITTEES

i) Subnetwork

a) The Steering Committee of a Subnetwork will consist of 5 members, representing the two regions (E.Africa and S.Asia) in a ratio of 2:3, alternately.

b) Network Advisor will serve as Member Secretary.

c) Each Steering Committee will be headed by a Chairman and a Co-Chairman, one from each of the two regions.

d) One or two special invitees as recommended by the Steering Committee to fill in critical gaps.

ii) Whole-Network

a) Chairman and Co-Chairman of the four Sub-Networks.

b) Advisor of the Network and one or two representatives from the donor agencies.

7. ELIGIBILITY FOR THE MEMBERSHIP OF STEERING COMMITTEE

i) Scientists actively involved in the crop/crops in a research organization or donor supported projects will be eligible for the membership of the Steering Committee of Subnetworks, subject to the approval of the respective Government authorities.

ii) One country can contribute only one member to each of the Steering Committees.

8. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN, CO-CHAIRMAN AND OTHER STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

i) Each of the Sub-Network Steering Committees will elect its Chairman and Co-Chairman, one from each region.

ii) The Network Advisor/Secretary, after election, will inform the concerned Government/ authorities about the elected member and seek the assurance of the possible participation of the member, so elected, in the Network meetings and other activities.

iii) In the third meeting of each Subnetworks, two members shall forgo their membership voluntarily or by drawing lots. To fill the vacant places 2 new members will be elected. Either the Chairman or the Co-Chairman can continue for the next meeting.

iv) The new Steering Committee shall then elect Chairman/ Co-Chairman whoever was dropped in the process mentioned in clause 8(iii).

v) In the fourth meeting three members who continued from the beginning shall drop and in their places new members shall be elected.

vi) Subsequently, in every meeting of the Subnetwork either two or three members shall be elected or re-elected following the procedure mentioned above.

9. CONTACT PERSON

The Steering Committee member shall be the appropriate contact person. Wherever a member country is not represented in the Steering Committees the Network Advisor shall approach the respective Government authorities to nominate one scientist actively involved in the development and research of the mandate crops as the contact person.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF STEERING COMMITTEE AND CONTACT PERSON

i) Steering Committee

a) Chairman and Co-Chairman will be responsible to finalize the plan of work with the consultation of Sub-Network members, accompanied with a budget estimate.

b) Chairman shall monitor the progress of the approved technical program. He may delegate authority of part of monitoring to the Co-Chairman or any member of the Steering Committee or the Network Advisor whenever needed.

c) Prepare the final report indicating the achievements and progress and present it to the Sub-Network meeting.

d) Identify the critical constraints holding the implementation of technical work plan.

e) Screen the technical proposals on the matters of interest to the member countries and send them to the Netwrok Advisor for locating the financial help.

ii) Contact Person

The Contact Person will be responsible to provide and receive information on Network matters and country situation.

11. FREQUENCY OF THE MEETINGS

i) Subnetwork shall meet once every 18-24 months, while the Whole-Network once after 3 to 4 years.

ii) The Steering Committee of the Whole-Network shall meet once every year along with any of the Subnetwork meetings.

12. PROGRESS AND FOLLOW UP ACTION

Each subnetwork, in its meetings, shall review the progress and achievements for the period between the last meeting and ongoing meeting, and formulate the future action plan on the basis of immediate priorities.

13. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

i) Amendments in the constitution shall be made by the full body of the Whole-Network.

ii) A minimum of 75% votes of the total Whole-Network strength will be required to accept any amendment.

iii) When a need of change in the constitution is felt, it should be conveyed to the Network Advisor in writing who will circulate the proposed change to the members of Whole-Network for information and their input.

iv) The required change, then will be presented in the coming Whole-Network meeting for approval.

APPENDIX 8

IAR RAP Budget Ph III

Oilseeds Network (Ethiopia) Ph III

Recipient Administered Budget Birr

Statement as of 31 Dec 1990

	Yr I Budget	Yr I Expended	Yr II & III Budget	Yr II Expended	Yr III Expended	Balance (II & III
Salaries and Allowances						
Research Assistants	6,569	6,569	17,000	1,000	0	16,000
Secretary	7,735	7,735	17,000	7,280	7,215	2,505
Office Helper	3,912	3,912	9,000	5,040	5,895	(1,935)
General Ass./Driver	0	0	9,000	0	2,233	6,768
Totals	18,216	18,216	52,000	13,320	15,343	23,338

Source: IAR

APPENDIX 9

IDRC-Supported Oilcrops Projects

IDRC-SUPPORTED OILCROPS PROJECTS

File No.3P	Dates	Country	Crops	Title	Budget '(CAD)	Phase	Status
72-0142	75-80	Israel	Sesame	Sesame	92,700		Closed
75-0032	78-93	India	Rapeseed	Rapeseed	126,000	I	"
75-0097	78-83	India	Safflower	Safflower	100,800	II	"
75-0098	75-83	India	Sesame	Sesame Improvement	167,000	I	"
75-0114	78-83	India	Mustard	Mustard	270,000	I	"
78-0044	78-82	Egypt	Oilseeds	Oilseeds Improvement	223,000	I	"
79-0017	79-83	Mozambique	Groundnut	Groundnut Improvement	271,300	I	"
79-0104	82-86	Sri Lanka	Oilseeds	Oilseeds	246,200	I	"
79-0142	82-85	Tanzania	Pulses & Groundnuts	Pulses & Groundnuts	321,205	I	"
80-0102	80-85	Sudan	G'nut, Ses, Soy	Oilseeds	322,800	I	
80-0131	80-84	Ethiopia	Nig,Bra,Lin,Sun	Highland Oilcrops	375,300	I	"
80-0132	81-84	Ethiopia	Oilcrops	Oilcrops Network	332,611	I	"
81-0116	82-84	Malawi	Groundnuts	Groundnuts (ICRISAT)	590,000	I	"
81-0117	82-86	Egypt	Oilseeds	Oilseeds Improvement	317,400	II	"
82-0059	83-86	India	Mustard	Mustard	154,400	II	"
82-0060	83-86	India	Rapeseed	Rapeseed	153,600	II	"
82-0061	83-86	India	Safflower	Safflower	145,900	II	"
82-0062	83-86	India	Sesame	Sesame Improvement	149,800	II	"
82-0093	82-87	Mozambique	Groundnut	Groundnut Improvement	245,100	II	"
82-0096	82-87	Ethiopia	Ses, G'nut, Saf	Lowland Oilcrops	434,600	I	"
82-0144	83-87	China/Canada	Rapeseed	Rapeseed	602,900	I	"
83-0175	84-87	Ethiopia	Oilcrops	Oilcrops Network	515,800	II	"
84-0039	84-87	Ethiopia	Nig, Bra, Lin, Sun	Highland Oilcrops	337,500	II	"
84-0136	85-86	Malawi	Groundnuts	Groundnuts (ICRISAT)	752,400	II	"
84-0137	85-87	Sudan	G'nut, Ses, Soy	Oilseeds	309,740	II	"
84-1053	85-88	Canada	Ses, Niger	Anther Culture Ag. Canada/Network	119,100	I	"
85-0019	85-90	Tanzania	Pulses & Groundnuts	Pulses & Groundnuts	286,900	II	Active
85-1059	86-90	Egypt/Canada	Soybean, Groundnuts	Microbial Control	388,400	I	Active
86-0029	87-89	Pakistan	Rapeseed/Sun	For Reclaimed Lands	328,100	III	Closed
86-0099	87-90	Pakistan	Soybean	Soybean	316,000	I	Active
86-1045	88-91	China/Canada	Rapeseed	Rapeseed	554,300	II	"
87-0024	88-90	Nepal	Oilseeds	Oilseeds	413,700	I	"
87-0025	87-89	Ethiopia	Oilcrops	Oilcrops Network	577,811	III	"
87-0038	87-90	Mozambique	Groundnut	Groundnut Improvement	501,600	III	"
87-0039	87-90	Sri Lanka	Oilseeds	Oilseeds	202,400	II	"
87-0070	87-91	India	Sesame	Sesame Scholars	96,900	I	"
87-0135	88-92	India	Sesame	Onfarm Sesame Research	160,700	I	"
87-0255	88-91	Ethiopia	Oilcrops	Oilcrops	465,900	I	"
88-0021	88-93	Philippines	Sesame	Sesame for Rice Based FS	68,500	I	"
88-0027	88-89	Kenya	Veg. Oil	VOPS	234,100	I	Closed
88-0253	89-89	Kenya	Veg. Oil	VOPS	223,100		Active
88-1004	88-91	Canada/India	Brassica	Brassica	538,000		"

APPENDIX 10

Letters from Network Members

KASETSART UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY
BANGKHEN, BANGKOK 10903, THAILAND. TELEPHONE: (02) 579-3130

December 3, 1991

Dr. Neil Thomas
P.O. Box 58-R.R.1
Mallorytown, Ontario
KOE 1 RO
Canada.

Dear Dr. Thomas :

I'm sorry, I send you some suggestion on oilseeds network late. I do emphazie on sesame. I hope you will consider my suggestion.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Wasana Wongyai

Wasana Wongyai

c.c. Dr. Kenneth Riley.

KENYA AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
National Plant Breeding Research Centre,
P.O. Box Njoro, NJORO, Tel: 037/61120.

When replying please quote

Date. 11th October, 1991

Our Ref: KARI/CROP/OIL/5C/84

Your Ref: _____

Dr. Neil Thomas
P.O. Box 58 - R.R.I.
MALLORY TOWN, ONTARIO
KOE IRO
CANADA

REF: MEMORANDUM ON IDRC'S ROLE IN THE NETWORK DATED 15-8-91

I have received the above memorandum and would like to point out a few comments:

1. IDRC has in the past compiled names and contact addressess of oilcrop workers around the world and circulated it. I suggest that the specific crops these scientists work on are taken into considerattion. This will assist in identifying the right nominees for IDRC supported workshops, seminars, short courses etc. Thus, the information gained will no doubt be utilized in improving national programmes. Also scientists handling similar crops get to know each other personally.

2. Kenya has not benefited adequately in the area of training for scientists and their assistants. The situation is worse for the technical assistants (holding certificates in Agriculture) and technical officers (holding Diploma in Agriculture) This latter group have few if any chances of advancing academically. Please consider this in your modification programme. The following universities are suggested :-
   - Pantnagar (India)
   - Saskatchewan, Alberta & Manitoba.

3. On germplasm exchange, I suggest requests are made through the Network advisor/ Regional office who will then place the requests on our behald to the various governments and institutions. his will hasten the current procedure which is extremely also.

4. There is need to strengthen information exchange. This should be extended to all the network members.

5. A draft project proposal for mustard as an alternate oil crop for Kenya has been written (copy attached). I wish to appeal to IDRC for funding to enable this project to take off..

Yours faithfully

M.J. Mahasi
Oilseed Breeder
For: Director
NATIONAL PLANT BREEDING RESEARCH CENTRE
P.O. NJORO

The role of ON coorditor should be provide in the following areas :

1. Germplasm

ON coordinater provide the center for collecting the germplasm for distribution to participant countries. The center may come from the country which have facilities to collect the germplasm and ON support the funds for this activity.

2. Collaboration Research

ON should have the collaboration research with researcher in participant countries. ON provide the set of lines for Sesame International Adaptation Trial. The trial consist of 2-4 lines including improved materials and commercial varieties from each country. From this trial we will exchange information among participants and use of resources available for research at national level. ON can also use this trial for visiting and discussion among participants.

3. Sesame Breeding

Ih case of sesame breeding, ON should be provied the funds supporting breeding program of participant countries which have a potential research works. The objective of sesame breeding involes 1) to produce cultivars and genetic stocks of non-shattering capsules and/or uniform capsule ripening with high and stable yield. 2) to develop segregating populations to support ON countries and 3) specific objectives in the development of improved germplasm for different purpose such as resistance to diseasesand insects, tolerance to drought etc.

4. Training

To increase the awareness of oilseeds scientists about the potential of biotechnological tools in facilitating the crop improvement research. ON should support the research for training or held a traing course for oilseeds researchers in biotechnology such as aspects of DNA technology, RFLP, and isozymes in crop improvement.

CSIRO
AUSTRALIA

CSIRO
Division of Tropical Crops and Pastures

A Division of the Institute of Plant Production and Processing

Cunningham Laboratory, 306 Carmody Road, St Lucia, Qld 4067, Australia Ph (07) 377 0209 Telex AA42159 Fax (07) 371 3946

11 October 1991

Dr N Thomas
PO Box 58 - RR1
Mallorytown
Ontario KOE 1RO
CANADA

Dear Dr Thomas,

I am sorry to hear that IDRC has decided to close down its office in Ethiopia and that Dr Omran is returning back to Egypt but the good news is that he will still be associated with the Oilcrops Network.

My colleagues and I hope that the Newsletter will still be available in the future.

Yours sincerely,

D F Beech

Telex: 422203 ICRI IN or 4256366 ICRI IN
Phone: Hyderabad +91(842) 224016
Cable: CRISAT, Hyderabad

ICRISAT

E-mail: Dialcom 157:CGI505
Fax: +91(842) 241239
Airport: Hyderabad

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics

Patancheru, Andhra Pradesh 502 324, India

Ref.No.: A.60

23 September 1991

Dr. K.W. Riley
Program Advisor
IDRC/Hill Crops Improvement Program
P.O. Box 1336
Kathmandu, NEPAL

Dear Ken,

Oilseeds Network

I have received a copy of an IOM from Greg Spendjian about IDRC's Role in the Oilseeds Network. I just wanted to assure you that the AGLN will be glad to collaborate with your network particularly in conjunction with groundnut research activities in South Asia. Should you feel it would help in this process we will be glad to issue invitations to representative(s) of your network to attend the AGLN Review and Planning Meetings in participating countries. As you may know we have associated with the AGLN the Asian Grain Legumes On-farm Research (AGLOR) Project activities in Nepal and Sri Lanka working on groundnut. It would be good if you could discuss ways in which we might integrate our activities in at least these two countries. I will be grateful to have any thoughts you may have about collaborating.

Best regards,

Yours truly,

DONALD G. FARIS
Coordinator
Asian Grain Legumes Network

CC: Dr. Greg Spendjian, IDRC, Ottawa, Canada
Dr. Andrew Ker, IDRC, Nairobi, Kenya
Dr. Neil Thomas, IDRC, Ontario, Canada
Dr. Nicholas Mateo, IDRC, Singapore
Dr. Eglal Rached, IDRC, Cairo, Egypt

Dr. D.McDonald, Program Director (Legumes), ICRISAT

DGF/gs;

Dr. Reda Shabana

CAIRO UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Agriculture

Agronomy Department

Dr. Neil Thomas
P.O. Box 58 - R.R. 1
Mallorytown , Ontario
Canada

Date : 30 / 9 / 1991

Dear Dr. Thomas ,

In response to the letter send to me on August 15 / 1991, concerning the role of IDRC in the oil-crops network , I have the following observations : -

1- We all feel that Dr. Omran has made a very good effort to connect all the research worker,who showed interest in oil crops,in the activity of the Newsletter. We are all gratiful to him for that.

2- Most of us did not know how to get in the track or to interact with the oil-crops network when having an outstanding research work that needs support. I can assure you that none of the universities in Egypt has a contract work with the IDRC's,so far, although some distinguished works were presented through IDRC's Network (Please refer to the PROCEEDING OF THE JOINT SECOND WORKSHOP HELD IN CAIRO, EGYPT 9-12 SEPTEMBER 1989, page 163-167).
We do hope that this point will be taken into consideration in your evaluation.

3- It was also good from Dr. Omran to encourage germplasm substitution among interested researchers . However, most of us did not get use of this service due to lack of information about it. Thus, I am requesting from the new authorities of the IDRC Network in Oilcrops to distribute this information.

I hope you all the best in your mission.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. Reda Shabana
Shabana R.
Professor of Crop Breeding
Faculty of Agric. , Cairo University

Enclosure
cc: Dr. Kenneth Riley
Dr. Eglal Rashed

SECRETARIA DE AGRICULTURA Y RECURSOS HIDRAULICOS
INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE INVESTIGACIONES FORESTALES Y AGROPECUARIAS
CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIONES FORESTALES Y AGROPECUARIAS
DEL ESTADO DE SONORA
SARH

C A M P O E X P E R I M E N T A L V A L L E D E L Y A Q U I

Calle Norman E. Borlaug km 12
Tels. (641) 4 - 57 - 53; 4 - 57 - 00

Apartado Postal 515
85000 Cd. Obregón, Sonora, México

September 23, 1991

Dr. Neil Thomas
POB 58 RR 1
Mallorytown, Ontario
KOE 1RO CANADA

Dear Dr. Thomas:

IDRC and its Oilcrops Network have played a very important role on oilseed crops research and development at world level, not doing the job directly as the other international centers but supporting and specially communicating oilseed crops researchers and programs which results in very desirable exchange of information and materials on species and crops that at difference of the subsistancial basics, are not considered as complementary basics that are the alimentary oilseeds and so, very few if no forum exist to ocurre looking for techno-scientific assistance for our national oilcrops R & D projects. FAOUN do excelent job on it but with economic elite oilseeds as soybean, sunflower, cotton, canola, etc. not with say "social" oilcrops that are at developing countrics, as safflower, sesame, palms and sometimes industrial oilseeds as niger, colza, castorbean among other, althought FAO has strongly tried to cover these minor oilgrains. They do what they do very well but it is not enough to the giant oleaginous experimental needs there are at the globe.

I do not know the situation and next and future plans of IDRC Oilcrops Network but I would suggest you to consider the possibility to create a direct research international center for major and minor oilcrops improvement as the other 7 or 8 existent which are of big benefit to national institutes and producers. The big job would be how to raise so many little and disperse funds and efforts but somebody has imperatively to do it.

Excuse my erfusiveness but I am almost 60 and have been 35 years now working on oilseed crops and near retirement and I have never felt a consistent or proportional support as for cereals for instance or high value crops. Nobody take care of intermediate crops between subistance and high income crops. Both extremes can have excess of means sometiones, oilcrops never have the indispensable with much of responsability.

Please let me kow the evolution of the IDRC Netowork. I am very sure that oilcrops research are more selective and efficient as consequence than the mentioned big extreme ones and do more with less means as usual.

Sincerely yours:

Rodegario Quilantán

L. Quilantán Dr.
Nat. Exp. Oilcrops Netowrk INIFAP-SARH
(POB515) 85000 Obregón, Son. MEXICO
FX:(641)4-5914 & 6-8095

Copy to: Dr. Kenneth Riley c/o Hill Crops Improvement Program POB 1336
Katmandu, NEPAL

Maracay, 26 Nov. 1991

Dr. Neil Thomas
P.O. Box 58 - R.R. 1
Mallorytown, Ontario
KOE 1RO
Canada

Dear Dr. Thomas:

I am writing to you on suggestion of Mr.Greg.Spendijan of IDCR and in relation with possible modifications of the oil seed network (ON), where I was an occasional participant of some event but an assidue user and follower of its activities, especially of the publications on sesame, safflower and other oil crops.

I am confident that IDCR support to oilseeds research will not only continue but be strenghtened and extended to other regions, such as caribbean and tropical American countries, where support for research and technical assistance to growers is every day more requested and needed as local resources are becoming less and less available. This is my first suggestion.

The second one refers to the widening of the field covered by ON, so to include plantation crops such as coconut, oil palm and other less common but potentially important tropical oil plants. Plantation crops such as the above mentioned are the unique or principal source of income for many thousands of small farmers not only in Venezuela and in other tropical American countries but also in tropical countries of other continents (Africa and Asia).

Finally it seems to me that an effort of IDCR in the area of education, training, instruction and similars as well for farmers as for agronomists and in general for people

engaged in oil crops research and technical assistance for farmers should be also focused. I believe that much beneficial work can be performed in this field, mainly concerning modernisation of methods and practices.

Thank you very much for this opportunity of expressing personal views and comments for the future of the oilseeds network.

Sincerely yours,

Bruno Mazzani

Dr. B. Mazzani
CENIAP
Apartado 4653
Maracay, Venezuela