

5  
19 AM 67  
[ ]

**ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY**  
Scientific, Technical and Research Commission

**OUA/STRC**

**REPORT OF THE MEETING TO REVIEW**  
**THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDY OF SAFGRAD NETWORKS**

**19-20 NOVEMBER, 1992,**

**OUAGADOUGOU - BURKINA FASO**

630.7  
SAF

Bibliothèque OUA/SAFGRAD  
01 BP 1783 Ouagadougou 01  
Tel 30 30 71/31 15-198  
Burkina Faso

Semi-Arid Food Grain Research And Development

(SAFGRAD)

Coordination Office  
01 BP 1783 Ouaga 01  
Burkina Faso.

212

630.7  
SAF - 5A

1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960

1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970

**REPORT OF THE MEETING TO REVIEW  
THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDY OF SAFGRAD  
NETWORKS**

**19-20 NOVEMBER, 1992, OUAGADOUGOU, BURKINA FASO.**

Bibliothèque UA/SAFGRAD  
01 BP. 1783 Ouagadougou 01  
Tél. 30 - 60 - 71/31 - 15 - 98  
Burkina Faso

**I. OPENING SESSION.**

The meeting was attended by representatives of USAID, the International Agricultural Research Centres (IARCs), the Organization of African Unity (OAU), INSAH/CILSS, National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS), SAFGRAD Coordination Office (SCO) and the consultants who undertook the impact assessment study of SAFGRAD.

It was opened by the Chairman for the session and Vice-Chairman of the Oversight Committee (OC), Mr. Hector Mercer-Quarshie, who welcomed the participants on behalf of the Council of National Directors of Agricultural Research and of the OC. He underscored the importance of the outcome of the meeting to the continuing support of SAFGRAD by its traditional donor, USAID.

The International Coordinator of SAFGRAD, Dr. Joseph Menyonga also welcomed the participants to the meeting and expressed his happiness with the presence of USAID officials from Washington D.C. He explained the difficulties that NARS encountered with the collection of the required data for the impact study, particularly as the data collection coincided with the planting season. He thanked NARS scientists and other officials for their effort.

The USAID Mission Representative in Burkina Faso, Mr. Thomas Luche, emphasized the seriousness with which the USAID viewed the

meeting and called the participants' attention to the presence at the meeting of two USAID officials from Washington, D.C. These were: Dr. Jeff Hill, Agricultural Research Advisor, Africa Bureau, who has specific responsibility for SAFGRAD affairs and Dr. Jeff Lee, a Country Development Officer.

In his opening remarks, Dr. Hill explained the compelling need for the meeting which was to marshal convincing arguments to attract investments for research in agriculture. He disclosed that USAID investments in agricultural research which stood at 34% of investments in agriculture in 1985, dwindled to 14% in 1991. He emphasized USAID's interest in the development of technologies which could be adopted by producers, thereby registering a visible impact on development.

In his own remarks, Dr. Lee re-emphasized the responsibility which the meeting had for generating the necessary information to be forwarded to decision makers to convince them that the support which USAID had given SAFGRAD had been worthwhile and had made a difference in the lives of the people of Africa. He assured participants that the team from USAID/Washington had come with an open mind and was hoping to learn new experiences from SAFGRAD on how to make agricultural research in Africa more effective.

Dr. Joseph Fajemisin, who represented IITA, expressed IITA's gratitude to USAID for financial support to SAFGRAD for all these years and assured the meeting of IITA's readiness to continue to backstop the NARS, should there be a SAFGRAD III.

Mr. Celestin Belem, Director of the Institute of Agricultural Research (INERA) of Burkina Faso, welcomed the idea of the impact study. He was sure that the study would prove that SAFGRAD has had a positive effect on increased food self-sufficiency in semi-arid parts of Africa. He then welcomed all participants to Burkina Faso and wished the meeting fruitful deliberations.

Address by the Representative of the OAU Secretary General.

The Secretary General of the OAU, His Excellency Salim Ahmed Salim, was unavoidably absent at the meeting, despite his burning desire to personally address the meeting. His written address was read on his behalf by his Scientific Adviser, Professor C.A. Johnson.

The Secretary General noted the present trends in many African countries towards democratization but added that democracy cannot be sustained, anywhere, including Africa, without a solid and sustainable economic base. This is why the OAU adopted as early as 1980 the Lagos Plan of Action, the immediate objective of which is food self-sufficiency and security in Africa. One of the long-term objectives of the Lagos Plan of Action is the establishment of an African Economic Community. The treaty establishing the African Economic Community was signed by Heads of State and Government of the OAU at their Abuja (Nigeria) summit since 1991. It is expected that the Community will be fully functioning by the year 2000.

The Secretary General noted that one of the initial efforts in economic cooperation among African countries was the establishment of JP 26 in 1968 by the OAU with the financial assistance of USAID. As a result of the overwhelming success of JP 26, the Council of Ministers of the OAU, during its 27th Ordinary Session held in Port-Louis (Mauritius) in 1976, adopted Resolution CM/Res. 505 (XXVII), thereby creating the SAFGRAD Joint Project 31 in order to tackle the devastating effects of the drought experienced by Africa in the 1970s. This decision was endorsed by the Summit of the Heads of State and Government in Libreville, Gabon in 1977. The successes of SAFGRAD during the past 15 years depended greatly on the steady financial support of its major donor, the USAID. During this period of fruitful collaboration, SAFGRAD Project underwent two successive phases (Phases I and II), each of which culminated in a favoura-

ble external review instituted by USAID.

Subsequent to the 1991 external review, USAID commissioned a three-man team of consultants. The present meeting was convened to consider the major conclusion of the consultants and to scrutinize the various possible options for the future of SAFGRAD.

Having gratefully acknowledged the contribution's of USAID towards the success of SAFGRAD, the Secretary General outlined the contributions of OAU and its member states towards the successful execution of the SAFGRAD Project. These included provisions of suitable diplomatic umbrella to the Coordination Office and its staff which facilitate the smooth and unimpeded flow of germplasm, information, equipment and personnel among participating countries. This has strengthened effective collaboration between NARS and the IARCs. In addition, when the need became imperative, the OAU did not hesitate to increase its initial financial contribution by nearly 300%, not only as evidence of the importance it attaches to SAFGRAD, but as an expression of the satisfaction of its member states with the activities of SAFGRAD.

Indeed, OAU's commitment to SAFGRAD was climaxed by the adoption of Resolution CM/Res. 1417 (LVI) of the 56th Ordinary Session of the Council of Ministers of OAU held in Dakar in June 1992. The resolution, inter alia, acknowledged with gratitude the conclusive results obtained during SAFGRAD Phase II; congratulated USAID for its continuous financial support to this Project; expressed its gratitude to the Burkina Faso Government for providing logistic support to SAFGRAD; requested all partners to make every effort to ensure continuity of SAFGRAD; and, finally, requested the Secretary General to make available to the Project funds required by the Coordination Office to continue its activities during the 1993/1994 fiscal year. Professor Johnson informed the meeting that the Secretary General has already taken action to implement the last item of the above resolution; the

*budget prepared for this purpose is on the agenda of the Advisory Committee on Administrative Budget and Financial Matters, currently holding its 57th Ordinary Session in Addis Ababa.*

*In his concluding remarks, the Secretary General observed that during SAFGRAD I, OAU put emphasis on the establishment of the coordination structures. During Phase II, while supporting the establishment of networks, the OAU insisted that the Coordination Office should play a vital role in the establishment and coordination of the various networks. However, during SAFGRAD Phase III the OAU would like emphasis to be placed on the sustainability of the results achieved in the previous years and phases so that they are perpetuated in order to attain, without delay, food self-sufficiency and security in Africa. He ended by expressing his wish that the meeting would mark the beginning of the strengthening of the collaboration which has existed among the partners, namely the OAU, USAID, the IARCs and the NARS.*

## II. REPORTS BY THE CONSULTANTS.

### 1. Analysis of the Performance of Research Institutions - presented by the Team Leader, Dr. Taye Bezuneh.

#### 1.1. Synopsis.

*In his report, Dr. Taye pointed out that SAFGRAD was established as a research development agency of the Organization of African Unity in order to mobilize research and institutional resources of its member countries, IARCs and donors to enhance the production and productivity of food grains in the semi-arid regions of sub-Saharan Africa. The project focus has been to tackle food production problems such as drought, pests, diseases, soil-water in order to ensure food self-sufficiency and food security in the sub-region.*

*The report emphasized that technologies developed during SAFGRAD I were the basis to networking activities under SAFGRAD*

Phase II. The USAID long-term support resulted in a number of technical and institution building achievements by SAFGRAD. Based on the findings of the final evaluation of SAFGRAD II, the purpose of the impact assessment was to determine the efficiency and performance of networks in the development and adaptation of agricultural technologies.

The scope of the assessment involved measurement of impact at four levels of research and development activities. The strategy and methodology were designed in such a way that technical and economic data were collected through collaborative efforts of NARS institutes' network entities, the national researchers and coordinators.

The report highlighted efforts in institution building resulting from networking over the last decade. The analysis showed that network impact was evident initially at regional level. This included analysis of research and agricultural development problems, policy issues, monitoring of the implementation of research activities, technical management and direction of network programmes through NARS institutions. The assessment also showed that research process at regional level has established mechanisms for identifying constraints, research priorities and networking strategies. It was pointed out that the SAFGRAD network model involving the three partners (NARS, OAU and IARCs) has been effective in the enhancement of national research capacity. While providing consolidated information (through annexes) on the performance of the network entities, the report emphasized the fact that NARS played a major role in the activities of SAFGRAD which, in turn, had facilitated the strengthening of the relationship between IARCs and the NARS as well as the mutually beneficial interactions among the NARS themselves.

The report further elaborated on the strategic shift of SAFGRAD II which created SAFGRAD crop commodity-based networks with the following advantages: First, it had made possible the categorization of the NARS into strong and weak ones, thus



enabling the weak NARS to be technically back-stopped by the strong ones. Secondly, networking avoided duplication of efforts and, finally, African scientists interacted with one another and exchanged information through seminars, workshops and monitoring tours organized by SAFGRAD.

As an example of the development of national institutional base, the Ethiopian national agricultural research system was discussed. Specifically, the report highlighted the development of agricultural research organization, scientific and technical manpower development, and the transfer of technologies to farmers in Ethiopia. The report advocated the establishment of a system that would ensure that researchers receive adequate feedback from farmers, while also suggesting that farmers be involved in research planning.

#### ... .. 1.2. Discussion. ... ..

One issue discussed by the participants was the feasibility of involving farmers in research planning. Some participants from NARS gave examples of their own experiences in receiving feedback information from farmers. These include researcher-farmer interactions, feed-back from extension services, farmers' field days, training and visit system of extension, etc.

It was suggested that the final report of the impact assessment should respond to the following questions: (i) What progress has been made in establishing an enabling environment for research and development? (ii) What have been the staffing and funding levels over the years? (iii) What mechanisms have been established to strengthen planning and evaluation? (iv) What steps have been taken to increase the number of partners involved in networking? (v) What has SAFGRAD done to strengthen research collaboration among NARS?

The above issues were noted and some clarification was

provided. Several of the other issues were treated in the subsequent report by the Research Analyst and through comments by network coordinators and NARS scientists.

2. Analysis of the Process of Generation, Adaptation and Dissemination of Technological Innovations - presented by Dr. Alan C. Schroeder, Research Analyst.

2.1. Synopsis.

Participants were briefed on the various types of data forms which were sent out to NARS for information on germplasm flow and adaptation of technological innovations. It was reported that some data inputs were also received from the Network Coordinators. The state of affairs of technology generation and development during SAFGRAD Phase I (1982-1986) as well as during the networking period in Phase II (1987-1991), were discussed.

For the three commodities, namely cowpea, maize and sorghum, it was observed that percentage of germplasm nominated by the NARS in the regional trials improved tremendously during SAFGRAD Phase II. One interesting observation was the increase in percentage recovery rate of regional trials sent out to NARS during Phase II, indicating network efficiency. Using data from Burkina Faso, Ghana and Ethiopia on research output on the three commodities, it was inferred that there was much greater output (in terms of number of crosses initiated and progenies advanced) during Phase II than in Phase I. Similarly, attempts to effect technology transfer to farmers (using on-farm tests) improved tremendously during SAFGRAD II, as did the number of varieties released.

2.2. Discussion.

The attention of the speaker was drawn to the erroneous impression created by the report that NARS did not participate during Phase I in the nomination of varieties/technologies

evaluated in the regional trials. In fact, NARS were invited to make nominations but these nominations declined gradually over the duration of SAFGRAD I. It was further pointed out by various speakers that the exchange of materials directly among NARS, facilitated by SAFGRAD, had not been elaborated upon in the presentation. Similarly, there were other trials, such as Nationally Coordinated Variety Trials, which were the direct results of SAFGRAD regional trials but which had not been highlighted by the speaker.

It was pointed out that the above issues will receive attention in the final report, noting that time did not permit their elaboration in the report presented at the meeting. The need to elaborate other issues, such as increased motivation of researchers and the adoption of technologies which might result in sustainability rather than in increased productivity was emphasized. It was suggested that the assessment team should also consider the achievements attained through training of national scientists/technicians and the visits by experienced NARS researchers to other national programmes.

An aspect in the interpretation of available data indicated that there had been an increase in technology adoption by farmers at the expense of technology development during Phase II. It was agreed that the contrary was actually the case from the point of view of technology development by NARS themselves; their activity in this respect increased greatly during Phase II. During the same phase, there was further strengthening of linkage between researchers and the ultimate users of technologies, the farmers. Phase I, it was emphasized, was characterized mainly by technology generation by IARCs.

Various speakers then drew the attention of the meeting to the fact that the success of SAFGRAD should be shared by the various NARS, especially, as the limited financial support provided by SAFGRAD was supplementary to NARS budgets. It was also pointed out that the apparent change in attitude of NARS

from being mere users of innovations generated by IARCs during Phase I, to being producers of technologies in Phase II could be partly attributed to better trained scientific personnel in various NARS. Furthermore, it was agreed that any impact assessment of SAFGRAD II should be viewed against the background of its relatively short period of existence. It would, therefore, be fairer and more meaningful to assess SAFGRAD II based on the original indicators/targets set for it in the project document.

Participants of the meeting were reminded that USAID supports the strengthening of NARS and their interaction with IARCs. However, it should be realized that donor funds are limited and are being competitively sought for by others. Thus, it is becoming more and more difficult to obtain such funds. To attract funds for agricultural research, it is imperative to demonstrate its impact in terms of increased agricultural productivity. While agreeing with this view, participants noted that the generation of technology and its adoption require a long period of gestation. Apart from the point that limited resources were made available to NARS during SAFGRAD II, it was agreed that, from every indication, SAFGRAD had achieved a lot from the technology developed and adopted. NARS participants, therefore, implored the USAID to continue support to SAFGRAD. With respect to technology development, the attention of donors was drawn to the semi-arid nature of the SAFGRAD mandate area which is characterized by erratic amounts and distributions of rainfall. Thus research results obtained in one year may not hold during the following year, necessitating a longer research period.

3. The Economic Analysis of the Process of Adoption of Technical Innovations and Their Impact: A Case Study of Eight SAFGRAD Countries - presented by Dr. J. Scott, Agricultural Economist.

3.1. Synopsis.

This part of the assessment dealt with measuring and interpreting the extent of adoption of new agricultural technologies at the level of the producer and the resulting impact of that technology on production, productivity and income, as well as, indirectly, on rural and overall economic development. The economic analysis covers the period of 1982-92 in order to take into consideration: (i) the spillover effects of the activities of SAFGRAD I into SAFGRAD II; and (ii) the fact that the usual gestation period between onset of variety development and adoption of varieties by farmers varies between 9 and 15 years. Dr. Scott indicated that the economic analysis refers to eight of the SAFGRAD member countries, namely Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, Ghana, Nigeria, Cameroon, Kenya and Ethiopia. He noted that a set of 13 tables was specifically designed to obtain information indicative of impact at the producer's level. He pointed out three major measurement problems of the data obtained, namely (i) data incompleteness, (ii) data inconsistencies, and (iii) lack of, or questionable, data validity. He also noted nine major outstanding factors affecting technology adoption.

A partial overview of the findings indicated that in Burkina Faso the production and productivity (as given by yields) increased over the study period for all of the four crops (maize, sorghum, millet and cowpea). A similar trend was obtained in Ghana in respect of cowpea, maize and sorghum.

The major conclusions of the study were as follows: (i) Improved technologies, for the commodities in question, were reaching the producers, at various rates of adoption. (ii) The

relative net performance of the main commodities compared to their competitors, varied substantially from country to country. (iii) Agricultural GDP has grown moderately for all of the countries in the sub-sample, indicating that a significant portion of that growth is due to advances in production and productivity. (iv) Future agricultural research endeavours should dedicate more resources and efforts towards strengthening the crucial link between the development and adaptation of technology at the level of the research station and its adoption at the level of the producer.

### 3.2. Discussion.

During the discussion the Scientific Adviser to the OAU Secretary General, Professor C.A. Johnson, pointed out that the period of assessment (1982-1992) included 5 years (1982-1987) not covered by SAFGRAD II which lasted only from 1987-1992. He also wondered if the three countries (considered in the case study) were representative of the 26 member countries of SAFGRAD. He observed that the apparent advantage of competitive crops in Ghana and Ethiopia was due to food habit of the people, especially in Ghana where yam and groundnut are preferred over SAFGRAD mandated crops; thus to increase the rate of adoption of SAFGRAD mandated crops would entail changing the food habit of the population. The situation in Ethiopia was complicated by political problems in addition to the fact that tef is normally preferred over maize and sorghum.

There were several other reservations about some basic assumptions used in the analysis, for example, it is not easy to separate the impact of SAFGRAD from that of other projects and activities in various countries. Not only is there nothing that can be strictly referred to as "SAFGRAD variety", but also the observed increases in production are attributable to adoption of a "package" of technologies, including improved varieties. Also, some of the so-called local varieties are actually improved varieties that have been in use for a long time. Varietal purity

is also doubtful in a country like Ghana where farmers produce mostly open-pollinated varieties.

One participant thought that there were contradictions between the data presented by Dr. Scott and those presented earlier by Dr. Schroeder. However, it was agreed that contrary to this observation, the data presented by both consultants actually complemented each other. Moreover, Dr. Scott reminded the meeting that while Dr. Schroeder examined the processes of variety development up to the release stage, he (Scott) studied what happened at the production level. He added that the two studies indicated that impact had been made.

It was noted that SAFGRAD should be understood as a resultant of the collaborative efforts of NARS, IARCs, the SCO, and the donor. The consultant was also reminded that productivity is not measured solely on the basis of crop yield without consideration of production costs.

The consultant was asked to consider the various interventions when preparing the final draft of the report. This portion of the report was expected to provide information on how best to measure impact in quantifiable terms. From the results of the analysis, it would be possible to determine whether or not SAFGRAD was moving in the right direction with respect to technology generation, adaptation, dissemination and adoption in the participating countries.

Finally, the meeting noted the problems encountered in quantification of the impact of those varieties that are produced in small but significant quantities at a critical period such as extra-early "green" maize produced during the "hunger period".

### III. TECHNOLOGIES IN THE PIPE LINE.

This topic was presented by the four SAFGRAD Network Coordinators.

## 1. Cowpea Network.

The Cowpea Network Coordinator informed the meeting that the Network is actively involved in developing varieties that needed minimum or no insecticide spray. Thus, over the years, the number of chemical sprays had been reduced from seven to two. Efforts are being concentrated on producing good cowpea yields without insecticide sprays. The search for resistance to the major insect pests against which there is no little or no resistance (e.g., thrips, Maruca, pod borers and pod sucking bugs) is continuing both at IITA headquarters in Ibadan (Nigeria) and in lead NARS. IITA is collaborating with universities in the USA and Italy in their effort to transfer genes for resistance from wild relatives of cowpea into commercial varieties through the use of wide crosses and biotechnology.

It was also pointed out that research was in progress to develop improved agronomic practices that would ensure sustainability such as crop rotation and alley cropping using leguminous hedgerows. Other technologies in the pipeline include development of varieties with wide adaptation for high yields, adaptation to transition zones, resistance to Striga and Alectra and adaptation to intercropping.

## 2. Maize Network.

The Maize Network Coordinator informed the meeting that the Network is actively working on the following:

- Breeding for Striga tolerant varieties.
- Breeding for early, drought tolerant varieties.
- Promoting the adoption of technologies made available by the network.

He reported that materials with moderate resistance to Striga hermonthica have been identified and that an effective screening method was developed by IITA. Ghana and Cameroon



*national programmes are working on the development of new Striga tolerant varieties. In addition, work is in progress to develop cultural practices for Striga control as well as on biological control of Striga.*

*The Network Coordinator indicated that work in the above areas would be consolidated, provided financial support to SAFGRAD was assured. He emphasized the fact that SAFGRAD had continued to be the only organization that has focused research on the development of maize technology for Sudan and Sudano-Sahelian zones.*

*The Network has been actively developing varieties that combine early maturity (90-95 days) with drought tolerance and reasonably good yields since 1984. Some of such varieties have been made available to national programmes. However, there is need to incorporate higher levels of tolerance and adaptation to drought stress in the released varieties so as to make them more attractive to farmers.*

*In order to promote the adoption of technologies made available by the Network, the following activities were proposed for execution:*

- Research for improved cultural practices for early and extra-early varieties.*
- Study of effects of government agricultural policies.*
- Breeding for resistance to stem borers.*

*3. West and Central Africa Sorghum Network.*

*The Network Coordinator informed the meeting that the Burkina Faso national programme had identified 44 local varieties with resistance to leaf, stem and grain infections. He also reported that the Niger national programme was actively working*

on long smut while Mali has identified nine varieties resistant to head bugs under artificial inoculation. He also revealed that some significant results were obtained in Nigeria on wheat-sorghum composite flour and that Cameroon has selected 14 promising lines tolerant to Striga.

He reported that research has been initiated to develop improved agronomic and IMP (Integrated Pest Management) packages. Work in the above areas will be consolidated during the next phase of SAFGRAD.

#### 4. East African Sorghum and Millet Network.

The EARSAM Network Coordinator apologized for the absence of any EARSAM Network Steering Committee representative at the meeting. His invitation to attend the meeting was not received in time. It was therefore not possible to arrange for travel formalities for a NARS scientist to participate in the meeting.

The Coordinator indicated that several improved varieties (at various stages of development) were in the pipe line and being evaluated in national and EARSAM multilocational trials. In addition, a sorghum hybrid in Sudan and several varieties in Tanzania are undergoing pre-release trials.

The Network is studying a production technology for sorghum Striga control. In this regard, two Striga-tolerant varieties are being evaluated in combination with herbicides in on-farm trials in Sudan. The plan is to conduct similar trials in Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania since Striga is a major constraint to sorghum production in these countries.

Other technologies in the pipeline include development of sorghum varieties with combined resistance to Striga, drought, insect pests and diseases as well as varieties adapted to the wet and humid ecologies of Eastern Africa. Work is also going on to develop cold-tolerant varieties for the cool highland environ-

ment.

The EARSAM network also has a number of pearl millet composites in the pipeline as well as high-yielding finger millet varieties with resistance to head blast disease.

#### 5. Discussion.

During the discussion that followed the presentations, it was observed that a large number of technologies with good potentials for impact were in the pipeline. Participants were not certain if biological scientists should spend their time measuring impact. It was however agreed that the individual biological scientist developing new technologies should be accountable for funds given to him/her. It was suggested that biological scientists should devote part of their time to extension agents and farmers, initially, to demonstrate the performance of technologies and to receive feedback at field level while diffusing their technologies to farmers. Participants agreed that biological scientists should be aware of farmers' socio-economic conditions in developing new technologies which they must test both on-station and on-farm, including multi-locational trials. While the actual process of ensuring that farmers adopt technologies is the responsibility of the extension services, some of whose staff could be biological scientists, the clients themselves should also be involved in the initial processes of technology development and adaptation.

#### IV. FUTURE NETWORK LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT - Proposal by NARS

In introducing the issues, NARS representatives outlined the present network management and leadership structures which had been described earlier. More importantly, they expressed their total satisfaction with the effectiveness and efficiency of the financial management structure of the SAFGRAD Coordination Office. After a lengthy debate on these issues, the NARS then proposed that the present network management and leadership

structures be maintained but with the following modifications:

- a) Network coordinators should be based under the umbrella of OAU through its regional offices or in any advanced national programme (with respect to the crop in question) with suitable facilities.
- b) OAU should gradually assume responsibility for salaries of network coordinators by the year 2000.
- c) Network coordinators should be recruited by SCO from among qualified NARS scientists actively involved in research on respective crops.
- d) Networks will continue to receive backstopping from IARCs.
- e) It was suggested that network funds for NARS research support and related activities be channelled through the SCO.

The general consensus was for network coordinators to be located in advanced NARS institutions, within the OAU framework, in collaboration with the IARCs.

#### V. FUTURE LINKAGES AND PARTNERSHIPS IN NETWORKING.

The pace and nature of deliberation on the above subject were set by early interventions by the USAID/Washington, D.C. representatives. The meeting was informed that any regional collaborative research network that expects to receive funds from the USAID Africa Bureau will be required to engage in technology development, training and information exchange (including research administration and financial management), priority setting and programming, monitoring and evaluation of impacts and performance in ways that increase the productivity of research

efforts among participating NARS. Evaluation and selection criteria for research networks to be supported under this undertaking include activities which:

- a) treat research themes that have potential for improving the production, processing, marketing and/or policy framework of commodities leading to significant impact on income from production and value added activities;
- b) have elements and conditions to facilitate spillover of benefits without untimely delays among participating countries;
- c) are designed to increase the productivity of national programmes rather than substitute for them;
- d) provide for equitable national participation and commitment to priority setting by all member countries;
- e) have adequate national or bilateral level support to fund local costs of country specific activities; and
- f) foster techniques which facilitate the dissemination of knowledge such as on-farm research coordinated with public and private extension.

Having stated the above, the USAID/Washington, D.C. officials reiterated the necessity for Africa to rely first and foremost on its own resources before soliciting for external assistance. They then reaffirmed that USAID's financial support to SAFGRAD Phase II would terminate on December 31, 1992. However, USAID would be willing to consider requests for funds for network support jointly from the IARCs and OAU.

*In order to have some time for the preparation and submission of funding proposals for the different Networks, a no-cost extension of SAFGRAD II might be considered by USAID. But before that, it would be preferable if the joint preproposals by the OAU and respective IARCs are submitted to USAID/Washington by December 31, 1992. The USAID funding would be mostly for programme activities. Consequently, proposals, which should be for a minimum period of 3 years, should avoid provisions for overheads.*

ANNEX 1. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Representative of OAU General Secretariat.

Professor C.A. L. Johnson - Scientific Adviser to the Secretary General of the OAU, Office of the Secretary General, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

2. Representatives of the USAID.

(i) Dr. Jeffrey M. Hill, Agricultural Research Adviser, USAID/Africa Bureau, Washington, D.C., USA.

(ii) Dr. Jeffrey R. Lee, Country Development Officer, USAID/Washington DC, USA.

(iii) Dr. Paul Crawford, Regional Agricultural Development Officer, USAID, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire.

(iv) Dr. Tadesse Kibreab, Agricultural Research Technical Adviser, USAID/Mali, Bamako, Mali.

(v) Dr. John J. Mitchell, Project Officer Agricultural Research, USAID/Niger, Niamey, Niger.

(vi) Mrs. Sally Sharp, Programme Officer, USAID/-Burkina Faso, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

(vii) Dr. Thomas C. Luche, USAID Mission Representative, Burkina Faso, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

(viii) Dr. Rudolph F. Vigil, Agricultural Development Officer, USAID/Burkina Faso, Ouagadougou.

3. Representatives of IITA.

(i) Mr. Emmanuel F. Deganus, Coordinator Special Projects, International Cooperation Programme, IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria.

(ii) Dr. Ken Dashiell, Leader, Grain Legume Improvement Programme, and Ag. Director, Crop Improvement Division, IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria.

(iii) Dr. Joseph M. Fajemisin, Head, IITA Côte d'Ivoire Station, IITA, Bouake, Côte d'Ivoire.

4. Representative of INSAH/CILSS.

- (i) Mr. Netoyo Laomaïbo, Directeur du Département de la Recherche sur le Milieu et l'Agriculture, INSAH/CILSS, Bamako, Mali.

5. Representatives of SAFGRAD Coordination Office.

- (i) Dr. Joseph M. Menyonga, International Coordinator, OAU/STRC-SAFGRAD, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.
- (ii) Dr. Taye Bezuneh, Director of Research, OAU/STRC-SAFGRAD, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.
- (iii) Mr. Evenuye Adanlete, Accountant, OAU/STRC, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

6. Network Coordinators.

- (i) Dr. Samwiri Z. Mukuru, Coordinator, EARSAM Network, SAFGRAD/ICRISAT, Nairobi, Kenya.
- (ii) Dr. Nyanguila Muleba, Coordinator, SAFGRAD Cowpea Network, SAFGRAD/IITA, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.
- (iii) Dr. Melville D. Thomas, Coordinator, SAFGRAD Sorghum Network, ICRISAT, Bamako, Mali.
- (iv) Dr. B. Badu-Apraku, Coordinator, SAFGRAD Maize Network, SAFGRAD/IITA, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.
- (v) Dr. Edouard G. Bonkoungou, Regional Coordinator, ICRAF/SALWA, c/o OAU-STRC/SAFGRAD, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

7. Representatives of National Agricultural Research Systems.

- (i) Mr. Hector Mercer-Quarshie, Chief Research Officer/Station Manager, Nyankpala Agric. Experiment Station, Crops Research Institute, Nyankpala, Tamale, Ghana.
- (ii) Professor Alphonse M. Emechebe, Dean, Faculty of Agriculture, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- (iii) Professor Christian C. Nwasike, Sorghum Breeder, Institute for Agricultural Research, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.



- (iv) Dr. Charles The, Chairman of Maize Network Steering Committee and Maize Breeder, Yaounde, Cameroon.
- (v) Dr. Laurent Nounamo, Head of Research Service, Institute of Agricultural Research, Yaounde, Cameroon.
- (vi) Dr. Kollo A. Issoufou, Plant Pathologist, INRAN/CERRA, Kollo, Niamey, Niger.
- (vii) Dr. Hassane Hamma, Legume Pathologist, Institut National de Recherches Agronomiques du Niger, Maradi, Niger.
- (viii) Dr. Sansan Da, Coordonnateur des Recherches sur le Sorgho, le Mil et le Maïs au Burkina, INERA, Station de Farako-ba, Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso.
- (ix) Dr. (Mrs) Clementine Dabire, Entomologiste Niébé, Coordonnatrice des Recherches sur les Oléagineux Annuels et les Légumineuses à Graines au Burkina, INERA, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.
- (x) Dr. Ntji Coulibaly, Maize Agronomist, Institut d'Economie Rurale, Bamako, Mali.
- (xi) Dr. Celestin P. Belem, Directeur, Institut National d'Etudes et de Recherches Agricoles, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.
- (xii) Dr. Kwadio O. Marfo, Senior Food Legume Breeder, Crops Research Institute, CRI, Nyankpala, Tamale, Ghana.

8. External Consultants.

- (i) Dr. Alan C. Schroeder, AAAS Science and Diplomacy Fellow, USAID Africa Bureau, Washington DC, USA.
- (ii) Dr. Juan F. Scott, Senior Agricultural Economist, Nepean, Ontario, Canada.

ANNEXE 2. AGENDA.

The meeting adopted the following agenda, having made only slight modifications to the agenda proposed by the SCO:

1. Thursday, November 19, 1992.

- (i) Opening Ceremony: Remarks by:
  - Chairman of Oversight Committee.
  - The International Coordinator of SAF-GRAD.
  - USAID Representative.
  - Representatives of IITA and ICRISAT.
  - Representative, Government of Burkina Faso.
  - Representative, OAU General Secretariat.
- (ii) Analysis of the Performance of Research Institutions - Part of consultants' report.
- (iii) Analysis of the Process of Generation, Adaptation and Dissemination of Technological Innovations - Part of consultants' report.

2. Friday, November 20, 1992.

- (i) Economic Analysis of the Process of Adopting Technological Innovations and their Impact - Part of consultants' report.
- (ii) Technologies in the Pipe Line - Reports by Network Coordinators.
- (iii) Future Network Leadership and Management - Proposal by NARS.
- (iv) General Discussion: Future Linkages and Partnership in Networking.

**AFRICAN UNION UNION AFRICAINE**

**African Union Common Repository**

**<http://archives.au.int>**

---

Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (DREA)

African Union Specialized Technical Office on Research and Development

---

1992-11

# REPORT OF THE MEETING TO REVIEW THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDY OF SAFGRAD NETWORK

AU-SAFGRAD

AU-SAFGRAD

---

<http://archives.au.int/handle/123456789/5714>

*Downloaded from African Union Common Repository*