

**SINTESI VALUTAZIONE ISTITUTI 2014**  
**Dipartimento Scienze Bio-Agroalimentari (DiSBA)**

**Istituto: Scienze delle Produzioni Alimentari - (ISPA)**

Struttura	Voto Panel 2014	Giudizio	Rank 2014	Rank 2009
Scienze delle Produzioni Alimentari	93	very good	1	5
Biometeorologia	82	good	2	6
Bioscienze e Biorisorse	82	good	2	8
Scienze dell'Alimentazione	76	good	4	1
Protezione Sostenibile delle Piante	75	good	5	3
Valorizzazione del Legno e delle Specie Arboree	74	good	6	9
Sistema Produzione Animale In Ambiente Mediterraneo	65	good	7	4
Biologia e Biotecnologia Agraria	56	average	8	2
Diritto Agrario Internazionale Comparato	46	Low quality Valutato da Panel DSU	9	10
Sistemi Agricoli e Forestali del Mediterraneo	38	poor	10	7
<b>MEDIA PANEL</b>	<b>68,70</b>			

\* Per IBBR il riferimento è IGv; Per IPSP il riferimento è IVV

<b>Voto Panel</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Giudizio</b>	<b>very good</b>

**Panel Recommendations**

ISPA, as a whole, is a very good institute, but more efforts in terms of integration among the different units are needed. Although ISPA is actively involved in research with other CNR institutes, there are not connections with ISA, especially in the field of food proteomics and metabolomics. Profiles of ISPA and ISA are rather similar in the food chemistry, but emphasis is different. They seem to explore different areas without much contact and communication between the two. It is desirable a synergy between the two institutes to develop an infrastructure for food analysis. In a view of achieving a higher scientific integration in food research the two institutes could also be merged in the future. They have complementary activities and facilities and we foresee an added value in terms of infrastructures (e.g. proteomics and metabolomics platforms) and knowledge.

The unit of Torino appears small and not integrated with the other groups of ISPA, its activity is mainly focused on animal proteomics and this units could be merged with ISPAAM in order to strength the capacity of CNR in the field of animal science.

**Istituto:** Biometeorologia - (BIMET)

Voto Panel	82
Giudizio	good

**Panel Recommendations**

BIMET is, as a whole, a good institute, it has a specific identity within the CNR and the institute is well organized and focused on its mission. No specific weaknesses are evident.  
A significant number of researchers are fully dedicated to transfer activities and could be better reconfigured as technologists.

**Istituto:** Bioscienze e Biorisorse - (IBBR)

Voto Panel	82
Giudizio	good

**Panel Recommendations**

IBBR is, overall, a good institute, but the panel believes that some reorganization is required to reduce the broad spectrum of activity and to improve scientific efficiency.  
The panel thinks that the IBBR units working on trees (Firenze, Perugia and Palermo) could be merged with IVALSÀ and ISAFoM Perugia in order to have a international recognized institute working on tree genetics, biology and technology. Furthermore, this solution will also reduce the redundancy of CNR institutes working on olive trees.  
A better exploitation of the germplasm bank should be a priority. This resource is unique in Italy and given the importance of germplasm it could represent a great opportunity for the development of scientific cooperations at national and international level. The panel suggests to consider the germplasm bank as an independent infrastructure with dedicated personnel and autonomous budget.

Istituto: Scienze dell'Alimentazione - (ISA)

Voto Panel	76
Giudizio	good

**Panel Recommendations**

ISA is, as a whole, a good institute. The director should make an effort to strengthen the image of the institute at national and international level. The research presented, and evident from publications, is broad but there are areas not well covered, such as food safety (with the exception of some work on gluten-free food), or absent, i.e. nutrigenomics.

Profiles of ISA and ISPA are rather similar in the food chemistry, but emphasis is different. They seem to explore different areas without much contact and communication between the two. It is desirable a synergy between the two Institutes to develop an infrastructure for food science. In a view of achieving a higher scientific integration in food research the two institutes could also be merged in the future. They have complementary activities and facilities and we foresee an added value in terms of infrastructures (e.g. proteomics and metabolomics platforms) and knowledge.

There is a general need to promote a high quality formation activity (including activity at international level).

Istituto: MEDIA PANEL - 0

Voto Panel	75,44444444
Giudizio	

**Panel Recommendations**

**Istituto:** Protezione Sostenibile delle Piante - (IPSP)

<b>Voto Panel</b>	75
<b>Giudizio</b>	good

**Panel Recommendations**

The IPSP, as a whole, is a good institute and the fusion of IVV and IPP is meaningful. There is lack scientific integration among the research activities carried out in the different units and more work should be done to promote the integration and take advantage of existing complementarities. The two units in Torino and the two units in Bari should be physically merged, respectively.

**Istituto:** Valorizzazione del Legno e delle Specie Arboree - (IVALSA)

<b>Voto Panel</b>	74
<b>Giudizio</b>	good

**Panel Recommendations**

IVALSA is, as a whole, a good institute, nevertheless the panel thinks that the IVALSA should be more focused on wood and forest science, some projects listed in the report are out of the main research activities and appear as the results of generic fund raising approach not focussed on the IVALSA core business (e.g. project n. 10 and 11 of the report).  
Given the uniqueness of its mission, IVALSA could acts as focal point for the research on trees. The panel thinks that the IBER units working on trees (Firenze, Perugia and Palermo) could be merged with IVALSA and ISAFOM Perugia in order to have an internationally recognized institute working on tree genetics, biology and technology. Furthermore, this solution will also reduce the redundancy of CNR institutes working on olive trees.  
A significant number of researchers are fully dedicated to transfer activities and could be better reconfigured as technologists.

**Istituto:** Sistema Produzione Animale In Ambiente Mediterraneo - (ISPAAM)

<b>Voto Panel</b>	65
<b>Giudizio</b>	good

**Panel Recommendations**

ISPAAM is, as a whole, a good institute, but shows lack of depth due to the limited number of researchers spread over a large number of topics. The report lists eight research topics for 24 scientists overall. A few of the staff are contributing to the high profile.

The major issue to be addressed is the insufficient link between research carried out in Napoli and Sassari, an effort should be done to integrate the research on forage with that on with animal production.

In a view of building a strong CNR institute on animal science the unit of Lodi from IBBA and the unit of Torino from ISPA should be merged to ISPAAM. Merging activities at these sites could provide a large critical mass to be competitive. In putting these research units together would also give the opportunity to link the ISPAAM proteomics platform with the Lodi genomics platform, giving a powerful research infrastructure. This would be novel and an important objective, and provide an opportunity for increased international impact.

**Istituto:** Biologia e Biotecnologia Agraria - (IBBA)

<b>Voto Panel</b>	56
<b>Giudizio</b>	average

**Panel Recommendations**

IBBA is, as a whole, an average institute, and some improvements should be done to achieve the expectations.

There is a lack of scientific integration among the research activities carried out in the different units and more work should be done to promote the integration and take advantage of existing complementarities.

The research Unit of Rome is well below the expectation in terms of publication capacity and impact. We suggest to merge this unit into a larger structure with the possibility of establishing interactions and synergies. An integration within an institute from another organization (University, CRA, ENEA) active in plant genetics in the area of Rome is highly recommended.

The units in Lodi holds a significant expertise in genomics and bioinformatics, mainly dedicated to animal science. In a view of building a strong CNR institute in animal science this unit could be merged to ISPAAM where a strong platform dedicated to animal proteomics exist.

**Istituto:** Diritto Agrario Internazionale Comparato - (IDAIC)

<b>Voto Panel</b>	46
<b>Giudizio</b>	Low quality Valutato da Panel DSU

**Panel Recommendations**

The difficulties affecting both the functional and the structural features of the IDAIC are unlikely to be surmounted in the future. The question consists rather in how to save the prestigious background of the Institute, as demonstrated *inter alia* from its important library, and in how to take advantage of the skills of the researcher, within a wider environment. At this respect, it is recommended that, for the immediate, the IDAIC's staff should devote whichever effort in developing joint projects and collaboration with the CNR's Institutes whose tasks are connected with agriculture, in the perspective of a productive merging with the latter.

**Istituto:** Sistemi Agricoli e Forestali del Mediterraneo - (ISAFoM)

<b>Voto Panel</b>	38
<b>Giudizio</b>	poor

**Panel Recommendations**

ISAFoM, as a whole, has a poor performance. ISAFoM has too many research areas with few scientists in each one and this is reflected in a minimal scientific leadership capacity. ISAFoM appears extremely heterogeneous; there is no scientific integration among the research activities carried out in the different sites. Some projects are out of the main research activities and appear as the result of generic fund raising approach outside of the already too broad ISAFoM mission.

The panel believes that the mission of ISAFoM overlaps with (or is very close to) the mission of several other institutes (BIMET, IVALSA, IBBR), therefore a consequent reorganization should be considered. The ISAFoM unit in Perugia should be merged together with IBBR units working on trees (Firenze, Perugia and Palermo) and IVALSA giving rise to an international recognized institute working on tree genetics and biology. Furthermore, this solution will also reduce the redundancy of CNR institutes working on olive trees. The integration of the ISAFoM unit of Cosenza in the new tree institute could also be reviewed. The activity connected to monitoring the emission of greenhouse gasses and pollutants could be integrated with BIMET, while the scientists working on crops could be joined to IBBR. Alternatively, the ISAFoM mission should be drastically refocused and scientific management greatly improved. There is a general need to promote a high quality formation activity (including activity at international level).