

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE EIGHTIETH MEETING
OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

TAC SECRETARIAT
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

June 2001

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE EIGHTIETH MEETING
OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Table of Contents

	Page
SUMMARY	v
Opening Session	v
SG/CDMT Report on System Structure and Governance	v
Trends in Science – Implications for the CGIAR	vi
Report from Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies (SCOPAS)	vi
Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)	vi
Report from Standing Committee on External Reviews (SCOER)	vi
The 2002 CGIAR Research Agenda and Initial Proposals for 2004	vii
Future Meetings	vii
Other Business	vii
 RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS	 1
Opening Session (Agenda Item 1)	1
SG/CDMT Report on System Structure and Governance (Agenda Item 2)	2
<i>TAC Comments on “Designing and Managing Change in the CGIAR”</i>	2
Trends in Science – Implications for the CGIAR (Agenda Item 3)	6
Report from Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies (SCOPAS) (Agenda Item 4)	12
Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) (Agenda Item 5)	16
Report from Standing Committee on External Reviews (SCOER) (Agenda Item 6)	18
The 2002 CGIAR Research Agenda and Initial Proposals for 2004 (Agenda Item 7)	22
Future Meetings (Agenda Item 8)	22
Other Business (Agenda Item 9)	22

ANNEXES

Annex 1: List of Participants

Annex 2: Agenda

Annex 3: List of Documents

**CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

TAC 80

ICARDA, Aleppo, Syria – 26 – 30 March 2001

REPORT OF THE MEETING

SUMMARY

Opening Session

The meeting was opened by TAC Chair, Dr. Emil Q. Javier, who welcomed the TAC Members attending, and noted in particular the presence of Dr. Robert Havener, Vice-Chair of the Centre Board Chairs' Committee and currently ICARDA Board Chair, and Dr. Hank Fitzhugh, Chair of the Centre Directors' Committee; the CGIAR Director; Centre Directors General and Board Chairs; observers from Egypt, France Germany, Italy, and United States; and staff of the Centres, CGIAR and TAC Secretariats. Participants were also welcomed by the Director General of ICARDA, Dr. Adel El-Beltagy. The report of TAC 79 was adopted without amendments.

The Chair noted the following matters arising from TAC 79: regional planning exercises implemented by various regional organizations and facilitated by GFAR since ICW'00, recent Centre activities following up the recommendations of the Systemwide Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies, and the Penang and CIAT meetings on INRM. The involvement of TAC Members and TAC Secretariat staff in certain of these activities was acknowledged. These activities would figure in TAC 80's consideration of Agenda Items 3 and 4. The provisional agenda for TAC 80 was adopted without amendment.

The CGIAR Director, Dr. Francisco J. B. Reifschneider, reported on major developments in the System since ICW'00. His presentation highlighted recent CGIAR scientific achievements, changes in Co-sponsor representation, initiatives to strengthen cooperation with CGIAR Members, progress of the Steering Group/Change Design and Management Team on System structure and governance, the status of financing for the 2001 Research Agenda and projections for 2002, and planning for MTM'01, Durban, South Africa.

SG/CDMT Report on System Structure and Governance

The TAC Chair briefed the Members on the outcome of the SG/CDMT meetings of 7-8 December 2000, Washington, D.C., and 6-7 February 2001, The Hague. The Committee then discussed the SG/CDMT interim report of March 2001 on CGIAR structure and governance. TAC prepared comments on the report which would be shared with the CGIAR Chair.

Trends in Science – Implications for the CGIAR

The Committee devoted this session to brainstorming on emerging trends in science and their implications for the efficiency and effectiveness of the CGIAR in making progress toward its strategic objectives. The discussion treated advances in selected disciplines relevant to the CGIAR's mission with a view to identifying opportunities for interdisciplinary ways of addressing issues that might warrant a programmatic approach. TAC explored trends in the biophysical and social sciences as well as in policy and institutional analysis. This exercise was a first step in developing consensus within the CGIAR on an optimal science strategy to address emerging issues through improved disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches.

Report from Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies (SCOPAS)

The Chair of SCOPAS presented the report on the Standing Committee's activities with particular attention to planning for CGIAR priorities and strategies, regional research planning and priority-setting, progress of TAC and the CGIAR Centres and partners in poverty mapping, and the TAC-commissioned IFPRI poverty and technology study. TAC discussed these and related matters in the context of the CGIAR's new strategy. The Committee generally endorsed SCOPAS' on-going activities and workplan and provided guidance to the Standing Committee on future directions of its work.

Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)

The Chair of SPIA presented the report on the Standing Panel's activities highlighting the results of studies completed or nearing completion. A draft SPIA paper on the impact of the CGIAR in sub-Saharan Africa was also tabled for discussion with a view to finalizing it for MTM'01. TAC was briefed on the status of impact assessments of CGIAR activities on germplasm improvement, poverty, environment, and scientific capacity strengthening of NARS, among others. The agenda of the next meeting of SPIA, 9-10 May, Washington DC was shared with TAC for comment. The Committee discussed a number of methodological issues pertaining to the studies reported on and also made suggestions to refine the focus of the sub-Saharan Africa paper.

Report from Standing Committee on External Reviews (SCOER)

The Chair of SCOER presented the report on the Standing Committee's activities highlighting progress in planning, organizing, and/or implementing the EPMRs of IITA, CIP, ISNAR, and ICRISAT as well as in planning and implementing external reviews of the Systemwide Livestock Programme (SLP), the Systemwide Programme on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM), Alternatives to Slash-and-Burn (ASB), and a stripe study of capacity strengthening within the CGIAR. TAC took decisions to facilitate implementation of these reviews. It also considered and endorsed a SCOER plan to update and formalize TAC's roster of scientists and specialists for use in reviews, evaluations, and other TAC functions. The Committee discussed and provided guidance on a SCOER/SPIA proposal for improving the current system of reviews within the CGIAR.

The 2002 CGIAR Research Agenda and Initial Proposals for 2004

TAC reviewed the Medium-Term Plans of the 16 CGIAR Centres taking into account the scientific priorities and foci of Centres' research portfolios, linkages and partnerships with other institutions, and responsiveness to the CGIAR's new strategy. All MTPs were found to be broadly consistent with Group-endorsed Plans. Significant restructuring of project portfolios by four Centres was seen as responsive to the CGIAR's new strategic directions. At the System level, TAC noted significant positive trends in the areas of functional genomics, INRM, poverty impact assessment, and cooperation with regional organizations, among others. TAC certified the 2002 CGIAR Research Agenda based on the Centres' proposals and prepared a report summarizing its views and recommendations for consideration by the Group at MTM'01.

Future Meetings

TAC reconfirmed dates and venues for the following meetings:

TAC 81	CIFOR, Bogor	24–28 September 2001
TAC 82	CIP, Lima	18–22 March 2002
TAC 83	FAO, Rome	23–27 September 2002
TAC 84	WARDA, Bouaké	24–28 March 2003

Other Business

The Committee heard a presentation by IWMI Director General, Dr. Frank Rijsberman, on the dissolution of IBSRAM, and the adoption by IWMI of IBSRAM's activities relevant to IWMI's agenda. It discussed the proposal and prepared a note on it which would be shared with the CGIAR Chair and the Centre. TAC was also briefed by Dr. Rijsberman on progress of the Systemwide Initiative on Malaria and Agriculture (SWIM II). Dr. Hank Fitzhugh briefed TAC on the Systemwide Initiative on HIV/AIDS and agriculture while Dr. Usha Barwale Zehr informed TAC on the outcome of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee meeting.

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Opening Session (Agenda Item 1)

1. The meeting was opened by TAC Chair, Dr. Emil Q. Javier, who welcomed the TAC Members attending, and noted in particular the presence of Dr. Robert Havener, Vice-Chair of the Centre Board Chairs' Committee and currently ICARDA Board Chair, and Dr. Hank Fitzhugh, Chair of the Centre Directors' Committee; the CGIAR Director; Centre Directors General and Board Chairs; observers from Egypt, France, Germany, Italy, and United States; and staff of the Centres, CGIAR and TAC Secretariats. Participants were also welcomed by the Director General of ICARDA, Dr. Adel El-Beltagy. The report of TAC 79 was adopted without amendments.
2. The Chair noted the following matters arising from TAC 79: regional planning exercises implemented by various regional organizations and facilitated by GFAR since ICW'00, recent Centre activities following up the recommendations of the Systemwide Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies, and the Penang and CIAT meetings on INRM. The involvement of TAC Members and TAC Secretariat staff in certain of these activities was acknowledged. These activities would figure in TAC 80's consideration of Agenda Items 3 and 4. The provisional agenda for TAC 80 was adopted without amendment.
3. The CGIAR Director, Dr. Francisco J. B. Reifschneider, reported on major developments in the System since ICW'00. His presentation highlighted developments in the areas of CGIAR scientific achievements, governance, membership, change design and management, finance, and future plans. In terms of scientific developments, Dr. Reifschneider noted that the World Food Prize had been awarded to CIMMYT scientists E. Villegas and S. Vasal for their work in the development of Quality Protein Maize; WARDA had won the King Baudouin Award for developing NERICA rice; and seven top science academies had lauded the role of the CGIAR's research in alleviating poverty and hunger. On governance, the World Bank had resumed chairmanship of the CGIAR Finance Committee and was being represented by Co-sponsor Robert L. Thompson, UNEP had withdrawn as a Co-sponsor, and the CGIAR Director had been selected by the CGIAR Chair. A CGIAR leading group secretariat had been set up in Beijing to serve as a new focal point for China-CGIAR collaboration and the embryo of a "CGIAR Friends in Japan" had been established. The Change Design Management Team (CDMT) and Steering Group (SG) had been created and had held meetings on 7-8 December 2000, Washington, D.C., and 6-7 February 2001, The Hague. An SG/CDMT interim report on CGIAR structure and governance had been circulated to stakeholders for comment in March with a view to finalizing it at a 10-11 April meeting in Washington. The report would be presented for discussion and decision at MTM'01. In the area of finance, the Centres had reported actual funding of \$340 million in 2000 and estimated funding of \$364 million for 2001, seven percent higher than the Financing Plan. CGIAR investments for 2002 had been proposed at \$390 million, reflecting a modest rate of growth. Initiatives were underway in the areas of resource mobilization, human resource development, proprietary technologies, and development of a common communications strategy. Dr. Reifschneider closed by detailing the agenda for MTM'01 in Durban, South Africa.

SG/CDMT Report on System Structure and Governance (Agenda Item 2)

4. The TAC Chair briefed the Members on the outcome of the SG/CDMT meetings of 7-8 December 2000, Washington, D.C., and 6-7 February 2001, The Hague. The Committee then discussed the SG/CDMT interim report of March 2001 on CGIAR structure and governance. TAC prepared the following comments on the report for purposes of transmittal to the CGIAR Chair:

TAC Comments on “Designing and Managing Change in the CGIAR”

5. *TAC congratulates the CDMT for developing a comprehensive approach to improving the structure and governance of the CGIAR. The Committee welcomes the opportunity to comment on this document as input to the Steering Group’s next consideration of it at its 10-11 April 2001 meeting, Washington, D.C. TAC discussed the CDMT’s interim paper at its 80th Session, 25-30 March 2001. Open sessions were attended by representatives of CGIAR members Egypt, France, Germany, Italy and United States as well as the Vice-Chair and Chair, respectively, of the CBC and CDC who shared their perspectives on the CDMT proposals. In formulating its own views, TAC benefited from this interaction. The comments which follow are solely those of the Committee.*

General Comments:

6. *TAC believes that the Team’s recommendations, placed in the context of the CGIAR’s new Vision and Strategy, offer promising approaches to realizing the System’s strategic objectives with improved efficiency and effectiveness. The new strategy calls in essence for an emphasis on poverty reduction and sustainable food security, bringing modern science to bear on the problems of the poor with a particular focus on sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, adoption of flexible institutional structures to respond more rapidly and efficiently to high priority problems, and a balance between the System’s global and regional research agendas through bottom-up priority setting. The CDMT’s call for greater programmatic integration and increased accountability at the System level are necessary conditions for operationalizing the CGIAR’s new strategy and, in this sense, are generally consistent with it. However, the Vision and Strategy’s approach to enhancing regional accountability is not sufficiently articulated.*

7. *Within this broad framework, the Committee offers the following specific comments on the CDMT’s recommendations.*

Specific Comments:

Recommendation 1 – Global Challenge Programmes (GCPs)

Strategic considerations

8. *The rationale for introducing GCPs resonates with the CGIAR’s strategy of improving programmatic integration at the System level. It may also obviate the need to merge or cluster Centres, except in special, justified cases, if effective collaborative mechanisms produce flexible*

“centres without walls” to supplement core programmes. The concept of GCPs also echoes the strategy’s call for task forces to enhance System performance. Properly structured and focused on issues of importance to the beneficiaries of CGIAR research, such programmes may facilitate integration of the System’s global and regional research agenda even as they link CGIAR research with other urgent global concerns.

Preconditions of success

9. *The success of the programmatic approach hinges on mobilizing resources additional to those currently supporting the “heartland” agenda as well as on governance mechanisms that minimize transactions costs. As now formulated, these features of GCPs risk eroding Centres’ core competencies and resources. It is therefore suggested that GCPs be introduced gradually and expanded at a pace commensurate with performance based on careful monitoring and evaluation. The CGIAR’s interests would best be served by ensuring the critical mass of scientific capacity needed to implement the core programmes upon which GCPs will draw to address related global challenges, thus permitting a gradual realignment of these programmes to GCP objectives. The scientific rationale for delivering over half of the CGIAR’s research agenda via a few GCPs within five years is not apparent. In developing the programmatic approach the CGIAR should take into account the lessons learned from Systemwide programmes.*

Programme selection/evaluation

10. *The science advisory body should have oversight of the competitive process for selection/evaluation of System-generated GCP proposals. This would involve, inter alia, the identification of potential programme themes and management of a peer review system for ex-ante assessment of the likely success and impact of proposed programmes on CGIAR objectives. Considerations of transparency, accountability, and efficiency would best be served by lodging these functions in a single independent scientific entity. Moreover, it is suggested that submission of concept proposals not be limited to CGIAR Centres as this may vitiate Recommendation 3 on use of GCPs to secure longer term financing.*

11. *The relevance and quality of Centre-specific programmes should also be subject to ex-ante evaluation. This function would be best performed through a Centre-managed process drawing upon a roster of scientific experts maintained by the System’s science advisory body which would certify ex-post that a reliable peer review process is in place and working.*

12. *As monitoring and ex-post assessment of GCPs’ performance and impact would involve appraisal of consortia rather than individual Centres, it would need to be conducted in partnership with investors and stakeholders within/outside of the CGIAR System. The science advisory body’s ex-ante assessment function in connection with development and selection of GCPs implies an ex-post function in assessing impact at the System level to ensure linkage to future priority setting. If investors/stakeholders outside of the CGIAR wish to undertake ex-post assessments of GCPs, the Executive Council would be best placed to coordinate such assessments.*

Recommendation 2 – Enhancing Science Input

13. *The science advisory body would serve the CGIAR and proposed Executive Council by advising it on major science policy questions, monitoring the quality of Centre science, and serving as the hub of a global network of scientific experts in support of the System's research. This role is welcomed but the details should be clarified. It is suggested that the proposed review of TAC, which is also welcomed, be aimed at clarifying the operational implications of the science advisory body's functions. Toward that end, the following suggestions are offered:*

Science quality assurance

14. *While this recommendation emphasizes the need for "science guardianship" in the CGIAR, considerations of research efficiency require that this not be a "gatekeeper" role. Rather, it should be one of assessing whether Centres are accessing appropriate sources of advanced science to achieve their objectives efficiently and employing appropriate research quality assurance mechanisms (i.e., independent evaluations and reliable peer reviews). The mission-oriented nature of CGIAR research requires that the science oversight function encompass as well both the relevance and quality of Centre science to ensure its connectivity to CGIAR objectives. This would involve responsibility not only for enhancing science inputs but monitoring and evaluating science outputs and impacts on poverty reduction and sustainable food security.*

Monitoring and evaluation

15. *Three key oversight functions are essential to assuring the relevance and quality of Centre science: (a) ex ante assessment of the potentials for application of new and existing science to the issues addressed by the CGIAR, (b) on-going monitoring and evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of science being applied in the CGIAR, and (c) ex post assessment of the impacts of the results of quality CGIAR research and related activities in terms of the System's goals. While each of these functions has an independent focus, they interact with one another thereby optimizing the dynamic relationship between planning the development and use of science, monitoring its development and application, and assuring the relevance of science outputs in terms of their ultimate impacts. Given the synergies between them, it is strongly suggested that these three functions continue to be lodged in the science advisory body. (See Annex)*

Global science network

16. *Enhancing the CGIAR's scientific capacity through a global network of scientists would require identifying expertise in fields relevant to the System's goals. It would also likely mean mobilizing that expertise at cost. Centres are well-placed to access the best available scientific talent to meet their research needs. The CDMT proposal is motivated by a desire to strengthen System level access to global science for purposes of strategic planning/priority setting. The scope of the proposed global network would thus be targeted to these System level requirements drawing on a broad range of disciplines.*

Recommendation 3 – Longer Term Finance

17. *The modalities proposed for increasing the CGIAR's multi-year financing is strongly supported. The long-term nature of the System's biological and natural resources management research requires a commitment to stable and sustained finance to ensure the quality of Centre science.*

Recommendation 5 – Restructuring Issues: Mergers and Clusters

18. *The CDMT's proposal that the CGIAR revisit its commitment to restructuring before proceeding further on this issue is well taken. Should the Group decide to restructure, as opposed to utilizing GCPs as a mechanism for fostering programmatic synergies, it would be necessary to develop scientific criteria to provide the rationale for any programmatic realignment, mindful of the potential impact on the capacity of the CGIAR to achieve its strategic objectives. These criteria would be best developed on a case-by-case basis.*

Recommendation 6 – Governance Functions and Structures

19. *The recommendation to establish an Executive Council is strongly supported. The CGIAR's strategy requires concerted action at the System level to facilitate the programmatic integration necessary to making measurable progress towards the goals of poverty reduction and sustainable food security, particularly in geographic regions of high priority.*

20. *In terms of the science advisory function, an Executive Council would provide a specific institutional focal point that would facilitate the Group's consideration of and follow-up to recommendations deriving from strategic studies, review and monitoring outputs, and impact assessment results – all of which should inform decision-making. Ex-officio representation of the science advisory body on the proposed Council would strengthen oversight of the CGIAR's research programmes.*

Recommendation 7 – Decision-Making Processes

21. *The proposed role of the science advisory body in providing scientific and technical input to decision-making processes with respect to strategic and operational planning, implementation monitoring, and evaluation is a sound one in terms of the System's needs. Its operational implications should be specified in greater detail. It should be emphasized in this context that although the System's strategic plan might in its operational form be a short, action-oriented statement, the plan must be based on rigorous, in-depth scientific analysis in order to ensure its relevance to and likely impact on CGIAR objectives.*

22. *It is strongly suggested that the impact evaluation and assessment function continue to reside with the science advisory body for reasons of transparency, accountability, and research efficiency. Lodging responsibility for ex-ante and ex-post assessment of CGIAR research in a single, independent entity is the System's best guarantee that the results of such assessments are objective and credible. It ensures as well that ex-post evidence on impact is systematically incorporated into future rounds of strategic planning at the System level.*

23. *The CDMT notes correctly that other stakeholders, particularly the Centres and their partners, are well-placed to contribute to decision-making processes which, as implied by the new strategy, will in future be increasingly bottom-up and participatory from regional to global levels. In the context of a more complex decision-making process involving inputs from a broader range of actors, the CGIAR's interests would best be served by its continuing to have a single independent source of scientific and technical advice to facilitate decision-making.*

Trends in Science – Implications for the CGIAR (Agenda Item 3)

24. The Committee devoted this session to brainstorming on emerging trends in science and their implications for the efficiency and effectiveness of the CGIAR in making progress toward its strategic objectives. The discussion treated advances in selected disciplines relevant to the CGIAR's mission with a view to identifying opportunities for interdisciplinary ways of addressing issues that might warrant a programmatic approach. TAC explored trends in the biophysical and social sciences as well as in policy and institutional analysis. This exercise was a first step in developing consensus within the CGIAR on an optimal science strategy to address emerging issues through improved disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches.

Biological Sciences

25. This topic was introduced by TAC Members Usha Barwale Zehr and Hirofumi Uchimiya. The discussion focused on genetic enhancement and associated sciences, in particular biotechnology and genomics. Dr. Barwale Zehr first described genetic enhancement in the context of activities from genetic resources management to product development. Technological developments ranged from relatively well established biotechnology tools to areas of new research, such as genomics, bioinformatics and structural biology. New biological sciences would also offer applications in such areas as nutrition and pharmaceuticals as well as for NRM research. The issues associated with the introduction of new biological sciences that merited research, policy actions and monitoring included biosafety, intellectual property issues and bioethics.

26. TAC Member Hiro Uchimiya discussed developments in genome science, including the publishing of the first draft of the human genome and the sequencing of the Arabidopsis and rice genomes, which were giving new impetus to the case for expanding CGIAR investment in novel biological approaches. Micro-array technology linked to microchips allowed analysis of vastly greater amounts of gene information than had been possible before, which would be advantageous in research on complex traits, for instance. Capacity in computing and data management skills were critical for fully exploiting the new opportunities. There was need for a dynamic strategy within the CGIAR in the area of biological sciences to align the System with others committed to greater understanding of germplasm. It was important for the CGIAR to be involved in collective genomics initiatives with adequate in-house competence and institutional linkages to act as a catalyst in applying genome research to the needs of developing countries.

27. TAC also received a summary paper by Dr. John Bennett of IRRI on the status of breeding for tolerance of abiotic stresses and prospects for use of molecular techniques. In his paper Dr. Bennett discussed the scope for further utilising the combined resources of the CGIAR for research on abiotic stresses such as drought, temperature stresses, soil toxicities and soil

nutrient deficiencies. Considerable genetic variation existed within several crop species making plant breeding a feasible option for solving stress related constraints to production. Understanding the mechanisms of stress tolerance had rapidly advanced through discoveries in basic science. Partnerships with leading laboratories were being developed and the private sector was likely to provide genome information towards benefiting the poor, as they weren't currently involved in this area of research.

28. Dr. Bennett opined that the CGIAR's strengths resided particularly in their germplasm collections, their new capacity for genetic and molecular dissection of complex traits, their ability to conduct multidisciplinary plant improvement programs in target environments with the associated stresses, and in their links with the national partners. The molecular tools increasingly used in many of the CGIAR Centres included easy-to-use single sequence repeat (SSR) markers, means of proteomic analysis and expanded gene databases, chip technology and microarrays with relatively cheap and easily interpretable derivatives for analysing specific traits and stresses, and insertional and deletional mutants, particularly for maize and rice. The case of drought resistance research at IRRI was also presented in the paper. The main elements of this research included access to special genetic resources, special knowledge of traits and environments and a tool called Rice GeneChips that contained half of the rice genes allowing effective study of the relevant genes under drought stress. The position of rice as a model cereal had lead IRRI to initiate a public platform on functional genomics, which was to involve other CGIAR Centres, NARS, advanced research organisations and the private sector.

29. In the future, TAC would continue the discussion of these themes in connection with the evolving agenda of SCOPAS, where genomics research was one item.

INRM/GIS

30. TAC Member Dr. Elias Fereres introduced the topic of integrated natural resources management by stating that the primary goal of INRM was improved management of natural resources for greater productivity. Two areas were of interest: resource characterization and resource management. Three central issues related to these areas needed to be addressed: (a) how to extend from point observations to assessment at higher scales; (b) how to explore alternative scenarios; and (c) how to predict agricultural systems' behaviour and response. The application of information and communication technologies (ICTs) had been an important factor in recent advances in linking natural resources assessments to improved INRM. Dr. Fereres described these advances. Scaling-up to farm, area, watershed, region and global scales had been facilitated by advances in GIS, remote sensing, and advances in GPS technology were providing opportunities for precision farming leading to improved management of resources. Advances in GEOSTAT were facilitating spatial analysis and scenario assessments contributing to simulation models and decision support systems for improved management of resources. Spatial analysis and simulation models were also contributing to germplasm improvement. Finally, accurate weather forecasting was enabling the adoption of response farming which contributed to improved management of resources.

31. In the brief discussion that followed, it was noted that broader use of NRM-ITC advances needed to be made in the CGIAR, including linking NRM assessments with poverty mapping. Scaling-up would remain a continuing challenge. The advances in decision support systems had been mainly on biophysical aspects, and there was a need for research to address gaps in

institutional arrangements for laws and organizations in regulating the use and management of natural resources.

32. Dr. E. De Pauw, an ICARDA agroclimatologist, gave a presentation titled "Trends in GIS with particular relevance to international agricultural research" as an introduction to these topics. Dr. De Pauw briefly discussed the perceptions of GIS as a spatial information system, an organisational set-up and a general-purpose tool. GIS had developed from a tool exclusively used by earth scientists to one with applications in all areas of the society. GIS is now applied in such activities as urban planning, crime detection, disease distribution monitoring and market identification.

33. Dr. De Pauw explained briefly the technical components of a GIS: data input, transformation and data output display and reporting. He illustrated the sequence of steps in the process from GIS-based mapping to use of an analytical tool, which are based on the principles of classification and within-class homogeneity, and gave examples of the overlay approach, spatial interpolation, modeling and surface analysis. He discussed the advantages and constraints associated with the overlay approach, the main GIS principle, and viewed the challenges for GIS in coping with the multiscale nature of agroecosystem diversity. There was need in the CGIAR to address the questions of centralisation vs. distributed operations, GIS products and IPR in a corporate context.

34. A paper prepared by the TAC Secretariat on the applications of GIS in agricultural research was also provided as background information for TAC's discussion. The paper summarised the CGIAR Centres' GIS-related activities. Most Centres were now using GIS, a powerful tool for dealing with the spatial dimensions of complex agroecological problems. For example, in combination with simulation methods GIS was used for geographic extrapolation of research findings, which was offering completely new opportunities for targeting research, whether for varietal improvement or NRM. Need for better standardisation between organisations in systems methods and reliable data, both biophysical and economic, were some of the challenges associated with GIS. The paper described the activities of the Consortium for Spatial Information (CSI), which connected GIS laboratories from around the world, including several CGIAR Centres. The objectives of CSI were to integrate the CGIAR Centres' various approaches to using GIS, strengthen the Centres' capacities to apply GIS to sustainable agricultural research and to share methods, tools and experiences. The paper also briefly described a new project, jointly carried out by FAO, CGIAR, UNEP/GRID and some other expert institutions, to develop improved methods for using map-based information to combat food insecurity and poverty at all levels.

Policy/Institutions

Research Trends

35. This topic was introduced by TAC Member Alain de Janvry who briefly surveyed recent major advances in development economics and their relevance to emerging research issues that required the CGIAR's attention:

- In behavioural economics, the conventional wisdom that economic decision-making was a "rational" process had been challenged. The influence of culture and social norms, as

reflected in perceptions of fairness and morality in transactions that sustain the market order, was seen as key to understanding how markets develop from exchanges based on primary transactions to broad-based, impersonal transactions with associated efficiency and equity gains. In a closely related field, the new household economics was illuminating the behavioural attributes of the “pluriactive” strategies pursued by the rural poor to exit from poverty.

- Institutional economics was revolutionising our understanding of why markets fail, focusing on the role of imperfect information in inducing moral hazard and adverse selection and, hence, higher transactions costs in market exchanges. Institutions were increasingly seen as mechanisms to correct market imperfections or to function as substitutes for markets. In a similar vein, study of the inter-relationship between law and economics, including alternative conflict resolution mechanisms, had begun to shed light on the legal requisites of a market order.
- In environmental economics, the incentives needed to prevent market failure by reducing externalities (e.g., via payment for environmental services) were better understood. In a context of political decentralisation, work on the economics of collective action was similarly improving knowledge of incentives for community cooperation in successfully managing local public goods and common property resources.
- The study of economic growth had begun to distinguish between the sources of growth at global and local levels. Regional growth – a precondition for successful rural development – was increasingly being treated as an endogenous phenomenon whose determinants were rooted in location-specific externalities. This distinction had important implications for designing agricultural technologies to complement the sources of local growth.
- The economics of intellectual property rights and of incentives to innovate in an era of IPR was a field of rapidly growing importance. The effects of IPR on industry concentration and on access to patented materials for research to assist the poor in developing countries had significance for the economics of biodiversity, farmers’ rights, and *in-situ* and *ex-situ* conservation of genetic resources.
- Rapid progress was being made in the field of impact assessment in terms of methodologies and quantitative techniques to assess the effects of programmes and projects on development objectives. These approaches could be integrated into the *ex-ante* design of research experiments to permit the measurement of research impact by capturing the before/after or with/without effects of research programmes.

Emerging Research Issues for the CGIAR

36. The Committee identified the following emerging research issues in the realm of policy and institutional arena as meriting CGIAR attention:

- Any effort at poverty reduction had to be based on economic growth. To alleviate rural poverty, growth of the agricultural sector was obviously key and the determinants of such growth was a question that had long occupied economists. However, of critical importance to contemporary efforts to stimulate agricultural growth was the need to improve the investment

climate, in particular by using public resources to maximise complementarity between public and private investment in the sector. The economics of IPR and of common property rights were central to addressing this issue.

- The contemporary debate in development circles over “aid effectiveness” had highlighted the role of enabling conditions for public investments to have impact on development goals. Following this logic, it would be useful for the CGIAR to track its research investment expenditures across countries and regions with a view to identifying the underlying preconditions that had enhanced or impeded impact in terms of technology adoption and poverty reduction. The new methodologies and tools available from the field of impact assessment made such an investigation possible and the results would serve as a useful guide to future priority setting.
- Work was already underway within the CGIAR to characterise poverty and identify pathways out of it. An approach was now needed that highlighted the dynamics of these pathways by showing the connections between the heterogeneous contexts of poverty, the different strategies pursued by the poor, and the instruments designed by researchers and other development agents to alleviate poverty. The concept of regional growth as an endogenous process, coupled with behavioural insights into households’ “pluriactive” strategies, offered an integrated approach to this issue that could enable the CGIAR to tailor its technologies to needs of the poor in different contexts.

Social Sciences

37. This topic was introduced by TAC Members Dr. Michael Cernea and Dr. Joachim von Braun. Dr. Cernea briefed the Committee on social sciences research within the CGIAR with particular attention to where further efforts are still required. He highlighted two major areas where CGIAR social scientists have been active (based on results of a recent informal survey) and where further input is essential for realizing the goals of the CGIAR. These related to client-oriented poverty and integrated natural resources management. The social scientists have played a critical role in focusing the CGIAR on people, and in shifting the poverty emphasis away from a narrow, reductionist view (based largely on income) to a broader and more comprehensive one (e.g., encompassing empowerment).

38. More social science research was required to deepen our understanding of behaviour at the individual, family, and group levels. This work should focus on characterising different organizational structures and analyze issues associated with empowerment, *vis-à-vis* property rights, access to legal support, distributional analysis, and ethics. Use of a typology of clients for promoting suitable NRM strategies and for targeting farmers' motivation was still an under-developed concept for which research was needed. Participatory research methods had received much attention and had been very helpful in designing and targeting appropriate technologies, but in some cases this needed to move beyond simple rhetoric.

39. Dr. Cernea concluded by calling for greater investment in social science research and more social scientists (particularly non-economists) in the System to address new or under-researched areas within social sciences, in particular, social capital formation processes, issues related to trust and transactions, marketing, and associational capital (to understand factors influencing effective collective action). Finally, he proposed a workshop be convened in the near

future to bring together social scientists (economists and non-economists), NRM scientists, breeders, and other researchers in the System to discuss issues pertaining to critical needs and contributions of social scientists in the CGIAR.

40. Dr. von Braun shared his view of the role of social sciences using a diagrammatic framework for economic development comprising four major elements. The first two related to the cultural-institutional subsystem – i.e., culture (the value system) and institutions (rules). The other two related to the economic subsystem – i.e., resources (production factors) and technology (the production function). Specific disciplines had concentrated on their own elements within the two broad subsystems, but there was a pressing need to facilitate greater dialogue between the different disciplines in order to reach a shared understanding of development objectives and acceptable development pathways. The debate, for example, on the value and importance of culture, must transcend any one particular element or discipline. The lack of such understanding and dialogue had resulted in the extreme polarisation between "modernist" and "post modernist" views about development.

41. In the plenary discussion which followed the presentations on policy/institutions and social sciences, TAC Members and other participants raised a number of questions, issues, and points which were given further consideration by the Committee. Following are highlights of this discussion:

- Given projected increases in population and incomes for certain developing countries and in the sizes of their economies, within the next two decades the value of environmental services from diverse landscapes would likely far exceed the value of photosynthetic product. The market structure for these services would require analysis and modelling. Is the science of environmental economics up to this task and what role, if any, should the CGIAR play?
- Farmers' future access to markets and market information, including labour markets, would in future be profoundly influenced by modern communications. The smallholder would increasingly be a part-time farmer dependent on non-agricultural sources of income and employment. A premium would, therefore, attach to development of labour-saving technologies that improve the efficiency and productivity of poor people's labour, whether on- or off-farm. Multiple labour strategies also had important negative implications for natural resources management since less labour would be available for resource conservation. The latter is a looming problem which also requires the CGIAR's attention.
- Participation in research had both sociological and economic dimensions. While the CGIAR had absorbed participatory research into much of its breeding work, the benefits of participation had to be weighed against its costs in terms of time and resources. From a sociological standpoint there might be need to maximize participation; economics demanded that it also be optimized. A second issue was the relevance of participation to strategic research with a time horizon of 15-20 years. While Centres were currently able to undertake *ex-ante* assessments of economic and environmental research, assessments of social impact had thus far eluded them as client populations tended over time to move on to other pursuits. These issues were cited as requiring future consideration.

42. The Chair brought this session to a close by first thanking those who contributed in preparing papers/leading discussions and secondly noting that the various themes which had been

discussed would be taken up by the relevant sub-committees of TAC as they develop their respective workplans.

Report from Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies (SCOPAS) (Agenda Item 4)

43. Dr. Alain de Janvry, Chair of SCOPAS, presented the report of the Standing Committee's activities with particular attention to planning CGIAR priorities and strategies; regional research planning and priority setting; progress of TAC and the CGIAR Centres and partners in poverty mapping; the TAC commissioned IFPRI poverty and technology study; and future strategic studies in support of quality of science in the CGIAR and TAC decision making. TAC discussed these and related matters in the context of the CGIAR's new vision and strategy. The Committee generally endorsed SCOPAS' on-going activities and workplan and provided guidance to the Standing Committee on future directions of its work in support of TAC's responsibilities for reviewing strategic considerations within the external environment and developing priorities and strategies. Following are highlights of SCOPAS' activities as endorsed by TAC:

Planning CGIAR Priorities and Strategies

44. The integration of regional research priorities into CGIAR global priorities and the formulation of future CGIAR priorities and strategies would be undertaken by SCOPAS in 2002 and 2003, assuming TAC had an active role in this area in the future. The Committee might retain outside technical expertise for the next priorities and strategies exercise. In the meantime, the TAC database for priorities and strategies would be kept updated by the Secretariat, particularly as the datasets could be useful in the regional priority setting activities.

Regional Planning

45. Dr. de Janvry introduced the SCOPAS "Progress Report on Regional Planning" (SDR/TAC:IAR/01/03) which had been prepared to inform TAC about: how the regional organizations and CGIAR Centres had responded to Plank 4 of the new CGIAR vision and strategy since ICW'00; what suggestion had been made by the various stakeholders including TAC and GFAR regarding the way forward; and what sub-regional consultations and planning meetings had been held or planned. The "Progress Report" was also to serve as source material for a TAC paper on the "Regional Approach to Research for the CGIAR and its Partners" for consideration at MTM'01. The Committee noted that a draft outline of the TAC paper for MTM'01 had been discussed by SCOPAS. The paper was to be an intellectual contribution to the debate on Plank 4, focussing on the reasons for adopting a regional approach for research planning, priority setting, and implementation by the CGIAR and its partners. Given the poverty and impact focus of international public goods research, the paper would highlight the mutual advantage for both the NARS and the CGIAR in pursuing a regional approach as a complement to their respective national and global research strategies. This, in turn, would facilitate partnerships in regional research between NARS and regional organizations and the CGIAR, and help NARS to mobilize resources. The paper would weigh the advantages of the regional approach against its risks and limitations, noting the lessons that were emerging from the various regional consultations held since ICW'00 and identifying steps that might be taken to eventually establish a regional approach. It would also describe the actions taken by TAC, in collaboration

with GFAR, national and regional institutions, and CGIAR Centres to implement the Group's decision for piloting an experimental bottom-up, priority setting approach in the Central America and the Caribbean sub-region. TAC discussed the "Progress Report" and made a number of suggestions to SCOPAS for purposes of finalizing it for consideration by the Group at the MTM'01.

46. The Committee was informed that, as explained in the "Progress Report", TAC was monitoring progress in all the regions in collaboration with GFAR, and would facilitate exchange of information between regions.

Central America and the Caribbean

47. Dr. de Janvry and Dr. Amir Kassam, TAC Secretariat, had attended the FORAGRO "brainstorming" meeting at IICA in San Jose, Costa Rica, 8-9 February 2001. The purpose of the meeting was to define the regional planning methodology to develop a process for agricultural research prioritization which would serve as a regional input to the global research priorities of the CGIAR. The San Jose meeting had been held as a preparatory meeting to the next multi-stakeholder FORAGRO meeting to be held at CIMMYT in Mexico from 2-4 May 2001. TAC's contributions to the Mexico meeting would be: a paper on "Advantages and Added Value of the Regional Approach to Research for the International Agricultural Research System" to be prepared by Alain de Janvry and Amir Kassam; a TAC commissioned report by Dr. Reed Hertford on "Poverty in Meso-America"; and data-sets for Central America and the Caribbean from the TAC database on priorities and strategies. TAC was also informed about the other studies that had been commissioned for the meeting by FONTAGRO, GFAR, IICA and CIDER. The main outcome of the Mexico meeting was expected to be a proposal for a regional approach for the Central America and Caribbean sub-region which would be submitted to donors for funding. Drs. de Janvry and Hertford would attend the Mexico meeting.

48. TAC noted the reasons why Central America was an attractive candidate for the experimental pilot exercise. The area from Pueblo (in Southern Mexico) to Panama was becoming a political region with the signing of the Presidential Agreement "From Pueblo to Panama". The region is relatively small and fairly homogeneous with good communication but has high rates of poverty and rising absolute numbers of rural and urban poor. The NARIs were decapitalized although there were good regional organizations such as FORAGRO, IICA, CATIE, PROCIs and FONTAGRO. The specific advantages of a regional approach for Central America were: the region being composed of small countries that could not capture positive externalities for R&D leading to underinvestment; economies of scale in research could not be achieved at the national level; regional agreements could elevate research above short-term political and financial cycles and help to create continuity and accountability; regional research and development plans could help give consistency to donor projects; for the CGIAR, demand-driven research could create higher likelihood for technology adoption; participatory research planning could help recognize local heterogeneity, customize technological response, and open up new possibilities of research partnerships and division of labour for particular commodities and farming systems; and regional organizations could help link technology to other instruments for poverty reduction, e.g. as part of the national Poverty Reduction Strategy Process. TAC was informed that the success of the regional planning process will show whether the non-agricultural stakeholders can be drawn in and whether the Centres can adopt the broader multi-stakeholder regional approach.

West and Central Africa

49. TAC Member Dr. Oumar Niangado and Dr. Shellemiah Keya, TAC Secretariat, attended the WECARD/CORAF-CGIAR Centres Consultation meeting "Towards an Agricultural Research for Development Strategy" in Dakar, Senegal, from 27-28 January 2001. The meeting discussed ways to improve the efficiency with which WECARD/CORAF, CGIAR Centres and partners in the West and Central Africa sub-region could carry out research jointly. Dr. Niangado informed the Committee that the meeting had concluded that good progress has been made towards regional integration and had encouraged the parties to broaden the participation of other stakeholders including CGIAR Centres other than IITA, WARDA, and ICRISAT. Dr. Niangado also attended the FARA/CGIAR Consultation on Agricultural Research in Sub-Saharan Africa in Nairobi from 18-20 March 2001 where an inventory of activities of CGIAR Centres IITA, WARDA and ICRISAT was presented. It had been decided that a planning workshop would be held some time after MTM'01 between the NARS in the West and Central Africa sub-region and the CGIAR Centres operating in the sub-region to identify regional priorities that may be of interest to the CGIAR. Dr. Niangado would be prepared to attend the workshop on behalf of TAC.

50. It was pointed out that in the WCA sub-region research priorities were project oriented and did not necessarily take into account the priorities formulated by the sub-regional research organizations. To facilitate the planning process in the sub-region, TAC endorsed SCOPAS proposal that it should prepare draft terms of reference for a consultancy study on the "Effectiveness of Past Research on Poverty in WCA Sub-Region and the Identification of Bottlenecks". This study, similar to the one done for the Central America and Caribbean sub-region, would contribute to the regional planning process in the sub-region which was gathering momentum. In this regard, TAC noted that the priority setting process was also moving forward in the Eastern and Southern Africa sub-region.

South Asia and CWANA

51. TAC Member Dr. Usha Barwale Zehr, and Dr. Kassam had attended the South Asia Regional Integration Meeting of IARCs at ICRISAT from 1-3 March 2001. The main objectives included: the exchange of experiences on research activities in the sub-region; the identification of priority eco-geographical targets and potential topics for joint activities and the identification of mechanisms for engaging with APAARI and other partners. An inventory of CGIAR activities in the sub-region was being put together to serve as an input into discussions with APAARI and other regional stakeholders who were scheduled to meet in June 2001 to discuss the regional planning process. It was noted that it was important for the regional research planning process in South Asia to link up with national development planners. It was anticipated by SCOPAS that TAC would be requested to support a poverty-technology study for the South Asia sub-region, and possibly for CWANA when AARINENA and the CGIAR Centres in the CWANA region held their planned consultation meeting to discuss the regional approach to research.

Regional Research Priority Setting Methods

52. TAC was informed that ISNAR had been requested after ICW'00 to undertake a study of the regional research priority setting methods and approaches which could assist in setting

regional priorities. ISNAR had submitted to the TAC Secretariat a compilation of literature on regional priority setting but due to lack of time, the Centre (through Dr. Willem Janssen) had not been able to analyse the collated information on the different methods and approaches used for regional priority setting. SCOPAS was informed that Dr. Janssen was agreeable to coming to Rome to complete the work. The focus of the work would be a synthesis paper on what could be most useful in terms of methodology and insights for regional priority setting, and also for the integration of regional priorities into CGIAR priorities.

Poverty Mapping

53. Dr. de Janvry introduced the SCOPAS "Progress Report on Poverty Mapping" (SDR/TAC:IAR/01/07). It was pointed out that the information on the locus and level of poverty was needed for strategic planning and impact assessment, and that the decade long effort by TAC, the Centres and others in poverty mapping was an important contribution. First was the CGIAR/TAC-FAO-GRID Arendal meeting on Poverty Mapping scheduled for 26-27 April in Washington, and the second the annual meeting of the CGIAR Consortium for GIS which would take place during August 2001 in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. The first meeting would jointly work on establishing a web-based network of individuals and institutions mapping food insecurity, poverty and vulnerability. At the second, CGIAR Centres would share their experiences in poverty mapping and representatives of other major institutes dealing with poverty mapping of interest and relevance to the CGIAR would also present the results of their work. TAC was impressed with the long history of effort that had been directed by the Committee in the area of poverty mapping. It endorsed TAC's participation at the Washington meeting in April 2001.

IFPRI Poverty and Technology Study

54. In introducing the second draft of the TAC commissioned study on "CGIAR Research and Poverty Reduction" (SDR/TAC:IAR/01/02), prepared by IFPRI (Drs Peter Hazell and Lawrence Haddad), Dr. de Janvry recalled that the terms of reference for the IFPRI study had been prepared in Dresden in support of Plank 1 of the new CGIAR vision and strategy. The objective was to provide guidelines to centres for the allocation of resources to agricultural research with the objective of poverty reduction. IFPRI's first draft was reviewed by the Committee at TAC 79 and TAC had made comments for improvement of the study. Many of these comments were incorporated in the revised version. The paper could, however, still be improved, particularly by clearing up a number of inconsistencies. Many elements were still missing to understand the technology-poverty relation and typology, and this paper could not be expected to provide answers to elements of knowledge which were still unavailable. Further, the typology was technocratic and did not take account of conflicts and political instability.

55. The main deficiency of the current paper was that it gave five blocks of elements on the technology-poverty relation, but was not able to establish rigorous links between the parts. As a consequence, while each block was interesting, given state of the art information, the causal links were missing, and hence also the desired linkages between CGIAR technology options and poverty impacts. The five semi-autonomous blocks in the paper were the following: (i) exogenous context (typology): Chapter 4; (ii) endogenous technology choice variables: Chapter 5; (iii) processes relating technology to poverty: pathways out of poverty: Chapter 3; (iv) definitions of poverty (Chapter 2); net poverty outcomes (Chapter 3); and (v) recommendations

for the CGIAR: Chapter 6. These five blocks should be logically articulated. The Committee was informed that the current paper provided a useful and logical framework for the relation between technology and poverty, and that subsequent analysis would be required to provide the content of the linkages. These linkages could be established by: (a) using the case studies currently developed for SPIA; and (b) turning to formal modelling analyses to track causal relations in papers that could be developed for TAC that could also include a study on poverty using a political science approach as opposed to the poverty-technology approach.

56. TAC endorsed the proposal that the TAC comments on the document be shared with IFPRI with a view to finalizing the study for TAC 81, and that SCOPAS should plan the follow-up work on the technology-poverty relationship utilizing formal modelling as well as case studies commissioned by SPIA (see Agenda Item 5).

Future Studies

57. SCOPAS proposed, TAC discussed and endorsed, the planning or preparation of a number of other TAC studies or discussion notes in support of quality of science in the CGIAR. TAC decisions were as follows: a state-of-the-art paper on integrated natural resources management for the INRM 2001 meeting to be held at CIAT in August; a proposal for a study on social science aspects of INRM involving an initial survey for basal data collection and analysis on social science capacity for INRM research in the CGIAR followed by a possible seminar or workshop; a proposal for a study on abiotic stress genomics; a preliminary discussion paper on the role of water management research in the CGIAR's mission, its future integration and strategic direction in consultation with IWMI and other Centres; a discussion note on issues relevant to the CGIAR in the area of information and communications technology; a study of international public goods in an era of IPR; a discussion note on biosafety and bioethics in the context of CGIAR's needs; and a discussion note on food safety. Terms of reference for the proposed studies and survey would be considered by SCOPAS at TAC 81. Progress on the preparation of discussion notes on water, information and communication technology, biosafety and bioethics, and food safety issues would be considered at TAC 81.

58. TAC Members expressed strong support for the work programme of SCOPAS, and several Members agreed to provide an input into drafting the discussion papers and study proposals. TAC Chair expressed his appreciation to SCOPAS for putting forward an exciting work programme for the period up to 2002 in the context of the new CGIAR vision and strategy. He thanked TAC Members for a stimulating discussion and for their support to the work of SCOPAS. In bringing the agenda item to a close, the TAC Chair stated that the new CGIAR vision and strategy will have an impact on the work and budget of SCOPAS and TAC. To lessen the burden, TAC must identify economical ways of implementing its work agenda.

Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) (Agenda Item 5)

59. Dr. Hans Gregersen, Chair of SPIA, introduced a report on the Standing Panel's activities highlighting the results of studies completed or nearing completion. A draft SPIA paper on the impact of the CGIAR in sub-Saharan Africa was tabled for discussion with a view to finalizing it for MTM'01.

60. The preliminary conclusions of the SPIA-commissioned study of the impact of CGIAR germplasm improvement, conducted by Dr. Robert Evenson (USA) in collaboration with the Centres, were, *inter alia*, that IARC varietal improvement programmes had contributed directly to annual total factor productivity gains ranging from 1 to 2 percent per year. The study was currently being peer reviewed and would be published in book form by CABI in 2001.

61. A SPIA project implemented by IFPRI was assessing the impact on the poor of a representative sample of CGIAR research activities, including commodity improvement work, NRM, and policy research. Early findings had confirmed that agricultural research can have very favorable impacts on the poor under certain enabling conditions. A series of country case studies now in progress would enhance understanding of the CGIAR's impact on the poor at regional and global levels.

62. An assessment by Michael Nelson (New Zealand) and Mywish Maredia (India) of the potential impacts on the environment of technologies developed by the CGIAR and its partners had been completed. The main positive impact was that because of the use of these new technologies less land was required to produce a given output of agricultural crops. It had not been possible to make aggregate quantitative estimates of potential negative environmental impacts, given present analytical methods and available data. The study will be published during 2001. A separate paper on the issue of negative environmental impacts had been prepared by Drs. Maredia and Pingali and is currently being peer reviewed.

63. SPIA, in collaboration with SCOER, had initiated an assessment of the CGIAR's impact on scientific capacity strengthening of NARS. A synthesis report on Centes' training activities and a methodological review had been undertaken. The study would assess, to the extent possible, changes in institutional capacity attributable to CGIAR activities and how these changes might be associated with impacts in terms of CGIAR goals.

64. A number of other studies had been prepared under the auspices of SPIA, including a "milestones" paper synthesizing the contributions of CGIAR scientists to the theory and methods of impact assessment, and a state-of-the-art paper on impact assessment in agricultural research evaluation. Planning was underway for an international conference jointly organized by SPIA/TAC and CIMMYT on "Impacts of Agricultural Research and Development", 5-7 February 2002, San José, Costa Rica. The conference will address methodological issues and experiences in measuring impacts on agricultural productivity, equity, poverty, social health, nutrition, environment, institutions, and human capital. Novel approaches to measuring impacts in such areas as training, networks, participatory research, and policy research will also be considered.

65. The draft SPIA/TAC paper on the contributions of the CGIAR and its partners to agricultural development in Africa had been prepared at short notice in response to a request from FARA and as a contribution to MTM'01's Africa Day discussion and relied on readily available documentation. It was, of necessity, incomplete in terms of documenting the full range of actual and likely contributions of the CGIAR. With this caveat, the paper nonetheless provided clear evidence that the CGIAR and its partners had made substantial contributions to agricultural development in Africa. Much work remained to be done before a more comprehensive, quantitative assessment of impact on CGIAR goals could be made. SPIA planned to pursue further the question of regional impacts of the CGIAR.

66. Dr. Gregersen closed by outlining the agenda of the next meeting of SPIA, to take place 9-10 May, World Bank, Washington DC. The Panel welcomed suggestions on its work and its future plans.

67. In the ensuing discussion, TAC Members were complimentary about the progress made by SPIA in its work. They also raised a number of methodological questions regarding the draft paper on the contributions of the CGIAR to agricultural development in Africa. In particular, there was debate on the relative utility of internal rate-of-return analysis, and on the issue of distinguishing between impacts attributable to the CGIAR Centres versus those of the NARS and other actors. A number of suggestions were made to refine the focus and thematic scope of the paper. It was necessary to distinguish between the CGIAR's achievements (or outputs) in the region and the ultimate impacts in terms of CGIAR goals. It was noted that, in the absence of baseline data, it was not possible to measure poverty reduction in SSA. SPIA had, therefore, encouraged Centres to initiate collection of such data for purposes of future assessments. Documenting the impact of the CGIAR's policy research in Africa and elsewhere was identified as a major challenge for the future, given the sensitivity of policymaking processes and the complex nature of their effects.

68. TAC members were also pleased about SPIA's efforts to ensure that the studies it commissioned were being peer reviewed. In closing the discussion, the TAC Chair expressed his satisfaction with the work of SPIA and its proposed programme. He also stressed the importance of using the results of impact assessment studies for strategic planning and for evaluation and urged a close collaboration between SPIA, SCOPAS and SCOER.

Report from Standing Committee on External Reviews (SCOER) (Agenda Item 6)

69. The Chair of SCOER, Dr. Lucia de Vaccaro, introduced this item. Her report dealt with external programme and management reviews, Systemwide programme and stripe reviews, a proposal to improve evaluation processes within the CGIAR, and development of a TAC roster of scientists. the TAC Chair complimented SCOER for its work and its contribution to TAC's agenda.

External Programme and Management Reviews

IITA EPMR

70. Planning for the Fifth EPMR of IITA was on-schedule. The Initial Phase of the review had taken place 15-24 January 2001 and had consisted of panel briefings at the Centre's headquarters in Ibadan followed by field visits to Kano, Nigeria and Yaounde, Cameroon by one sub-panel and to Cotonou, Benin and Accra, Ghana by another. A sub-panel was scheduled to visit Uganda from 18-19 April just prior to arriving at Ibadan for the Main Phase of the review (20 April-8 May). The EPMR report would be discussed at TAC 81 and presented to the Group at ICW'01. A set of "quality of science" indicators proposed by SCOER was agreed upon for use

in this EPMR. These indicators might be used in subsequent EPMRs, with modifications as required.

CIP EPMR

71. The dates for the Main Phase of CIP's Fifth EPMR were 25 February-16 March 2002, just prior to CIP's annual Board of Trustees meeting. The Initial Phase of the review would take place 1-6 October 2001 followed by field visits. Dr. Edward Schuh (USA), the Chairperson for the review, together with Dr. Jean-Yves Maillat (France) who was covering Organization/Management aspects, attended CIP's annual Board meeting in March 2001. Proposed shortlists of candidates for the crop improvement, NRM, pest/disease management, social sciences, collaborative research partnerships slots had been drawn up. These would be finalized by SCOER after the TAC meeting with coordination from the TAC Secretariat. The report of this review would be discussed at TAC 83 and presented to the Group at AGM'02.

ISNAR and ICRISAT EPMRs

72. The TAC Secretariat had initiated discussions with the Directors General of ISNAR and ICRISAT to set dates for the Initial and Main Phases of the reviews of these centres and to solicit names of candidates for panel chairs. Although SCOER had previously considered delaying these reviews until late 2002/early 2003, it now would explore options for moving the reviews forward. In particular, ISNAR would be approached to see whether its review could be re-scheduled to mid-2002 (Main Phase). Proposed shortlists of candidates for panel chairs for the two reviews had been drawn up for TAC's consideration.

73. Given the on-going discussions and consideration for revising the evaluation processes within the CGIAR, no decisions had been taken on scheduling and planning for the next round of EPMRs, those of IPGRI and CIMMYT.

Evaluation and Review Process in the CGIAR

74. An ad-hoc working group of SCOER/SPIA members had met on 18-19 January in Rome to discuss various options for improving the current system of reviews within the CGIAR. A major outcome of this meeting had been a draft document which: (1) outlined the main components of the CGIAR's work that require regular or periodic evaluation; (2) provided an assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the procedures currently in place for evaluating science and management; and (3) described elements of a proposal for improving the current system with a stronger emphasis on output and impact, and a review system characterized by a Centre-based, continual evaluation process having appropriate independent (external) checks. This document, entitled "Proposal for a New Approach to Evaluation in the CGIAR System", had been circulated to SCOER members for comments and subsequently to TAC members and various stakeholders of the System.

75. SCOER's discussion of the second draft of this document had raised a number of key issues for TAC's consideration, namely:

- Did it compromise the independence of the review system?
- Were Centre Boards sufficiently motivated and capable of effectively implementing such a system?
- How would the Management Information System be established and staffed?
- When and by whom would the 'guidelines for internal evaluation' be developed?
- Would a periodic comprehensive review still be required?
- Could duplication of reviews be avoided/eliminated, i.e., would this meet the requirements of individual donors funding special projects?
- How would the transition from the current system to the new one be handled?

76. SCOER had suggested procedures for finalizing the proposal for presentation either at MTM 01 or ICW 01. However, it was the TAC Chair's view that the Group was due to take action upon the CDMT recommendation to transform TAC into a Science Council, it will no longer be appropriate to present it at MTM or ICW. The paper could be a contribution to the Science Council Task Force or a Committee which will be tasked to recommend to the Group how the Science Council will be organized. In this regard, input from and close association with the CGIAR Secretariat, Investors and the Chairs of the CBC and CDC were considered critical.

Systemwide Programme (SWP) Reviews

77. At TAC 79, the Committee had agreed to assist with ILRI in defining the terms of reference for a centre-commissioned external review of the Systemwide Livestock Programme (SLP) for which ILRI was the convening centre and in the selection of a chairperson for the review. The TOR drawn up by TAC had been adopted by the Centre with only minor modification, and the Review Chair was being chosen by the Centre from a list of TAC-endorsed candidates. It was expected that the review would be completed by May/June 2001.

78. TAC had also agreed to commission an external review of the Systemwide Programme on Integrated Pest Management (SP-IPM) in parallel with IITA's Fifth EPMR. A two-member panel comprised of Drs. Andrew Gutierrez (USA), Chair, and Hermann Waibel (Germany) was now undertaking the review and had already participated in three field visits in this connection. Dr. Gutierrez was also a member of the IITA EPMR panel and would present the preliminary findings of the SP-IPM review to that panel when it re-convened for the Main Phase in late April. The SP-IPM report would be discussed at TAC 81 and presented to the Group at ICW 01.

79. At TAC 79, the Committee had also agreed to a proposal for a joint SCOER/SPIA review of the Systemwide Programme on Alternatives to Slash and Burn in late 2001 or early 2002. The TAC Secretariat would shortly be contacting ICRAF, the lead centre to establish dates for the review (probably first half of 2002) and to solicit names of candidates for chairperson.

80. SCOER recommended the external reviews of the remaining SWPs be scheduled as follows: Systemwide Programmes on Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI) in 2002 and on Farmer Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (FPR&GA) and Soil, Water and Nutrient Management (SWNM) in 2003.

Review of Training and Capacity Building

81. Progress had been made on a joint SCOER/SPIA review of capacity strengthening in the CGIAR which would focus, in its first phase, on training. A plan of the study including draft terms of reference had been finalized by SCOER and was being shared with the full Committee. A short-list for selection of panel chair had also been prepared and circulated. A desk study, currently underway, was examining training issues identified in recent EPMRs and previous Centre evaluations of training programmes. TAC favoured conducting a two-phase training evaluation study. This would consist of a stripe review phase to collect evidence to support the research phase, which would focus on relevance, effectiveness and impacts. The latter would be conducted by a panel, which would be selected through a pre-proposal procedure. The TAC Secretariat would circulate the training study plan to the Centres and members and a revised plan would be discussed at TAC 81. The desk study, including compiling of information, would continue.

Development of a TAC Roster of Scientists

82. SCOER had long recognized the need to systematically organize, update and expand on a candidate information system from which to draw names for members of review teams. Following the TAC Chair's request that SCOER draw up a 'roster of scientists', the TAC Secretariat had drafted a proposal including suggestions for classification criteria, information on TAC's existing candidate lists, and the underlying need to hire a consultant/specialist in data base management to work with the Secretariat in initially developing the roster and in training staff to maintain it.

83. SCOER recommended that TAC aim at drawing up a data base of highly reputable scientists known to members, who might themselves be candidates for reviews but whose main function would be to make reliable suggestions about suitable names when a specific review or study was being planned. This could be considered as an 'inner ring' of experts who would provide information on a wider pool of the most outstanding candidates who should be considered for the review/study at a given moment in time.

Conclusions on the SCOER Report

84. In the discussion which followed Dr. Vaccaro's report, TAC noted the progress of the EPMRs and SWP reviews underway and of those which were being planned. The Committee endorsed the proposed shortlists of candidates for panel chairs for the ISNAR and ICRISAT reviews. After considerable discussion and debate on the evaluation proposal, TAC decided an updated draft would be prepared taking into account suggestions for clarification and improvement made by TAC 80. This draft would be circulated to Centre Directors and Board Chairs and key stakeholders in the System seeking further input. After consideration of the proposal at TAC 81, it would then be finalized and presented to an appropriate organ of the CGIAR. The Committee also endorsed the recommendation to create an 'inner ring' of experts to contribute to the candidate information system for the TAC roster of scientists.

The 2002 CGIAR Research Agenda and Initial Proposals for 2004 (Agenda Item 7)

85. TAC reviewed proposals from the 16 CGIAR Centres for the 2002 Research Agenda and initial proposals for 2004 in the context of CGIAR priorities and Centre Medium-Term Plans for the period 2002-2004. The Committee focused in particular on changes from existing plans that were responsive to the CGIAR's new strategy. Within this broad frame of reference, TAC's analysis took into account scientific priorities and foci of the Centres' research portfolios; research content of portfolios as reflected by significant restructuring of projects; evidence of planned outputs as indicated by the relevance, utility and robustness of milestones; linkages and partnerships with other institutions; and responsiveness to major recommendations of external programme and management reviews.

86. The analysis of the MTPs was facilitated by the designated TAC liaison scientists for each of the Centres. MTPs of all Centres were seen to be broadly consistent with Group-endorsed Plans. Significant restructuring of project portfolios by four Centres – CIP, IRRI, ISNAR, and IWMI – had permitted these Centres to respond to the major planks of the CGIAR's new strategy in the areas of technical and policy support to intergovernmental bodies concerned with agriculture, institutional development at national and regional levels, and accessing advanced biological sciences. At the System level, TAC noted significant positive trends in the 2002 Research Agenda in the areas of functional genomics, integrated natural resources management, poverty impact assessment, and cooperation with regional organizations, among others.

87. Based on its assessment, the Committee certified that Centre's proposals were congruent with CGIAR priorities and strategies. TAC prepared a report summarizing its views and recommendations on the 2002 CGIAR Research Agenda and Centres' 2002-2004 MTPs for consideration by the Group at MTM'01.

Future Meetings (Agenda Item 8)

88. TAC reconfirmed dates and venues for the following meetings:

TAC 81	CIFOR, Bogor	24-28 September 2001
TAC 82	CIP, Lima	18-22 March 2002
TAC 83	FAO, Rome	23-27 September 2002
TAC 84	WARDA, Bouaké	24-28 March 2003

Other Business (Agenda Item 9)

89. TAC discussed a proposed adoption of IBSRAM programmes by IWMI based on a brief presentation by IWMI Director General, Dr. Frank Rijsberman, who explained the rationale for the proposed action. The Committee was informed that as IBSRAM's activities as an independent institution came to a close, IWMI saw it fit to incorporate part of the IBSRAM research agenda into the new IWMI Strategic Plan. Thus, the incorporation of IBSRAM into IWMI only represented a logical addition to the IWMI research agenda, now centred on

integrated water resource management. This was said to be consistent with TAC's own view of the need to better understand the various linkages between soil and water resources within an integrated natural resources management framework. IWMI, therefore, would hire five scientists from IBSRAM, all of whom would be integrated into IWMI's project on "Sustainable Smallholder Land and Water Management Systems". This was one of IWMI's seven new MTP projects focusing on the integration of land and water management research approaches for the improvement of smallholders' livelihoods.

90. TAC believed that this integration was a positive step forward and that the contribution of IBSRAM scientists to this effort would be critical for achieving the integration. However, it was stressed at the meeting that an important precondition for this integration was the assurance of continuing support by donors of the IBSRAM projects that have been incorporated into the IWMI agenda. In addition, it was indicated that land was a factor of production whose productivity depended on how and for what purpose it was used and managed. Several CGIAR centres are engaged in land use and management research in the context of INRM at several levels and scales. IWMI should look for opportunities in the area of water and land management strategies in which the Centre in collaboration with other CGIAR centres and partners could make contributions towards integrated land and water management for increased productivity and poverty alleviation. TAC believed that IWMI could integrate the land dimensions of water management into its research agenda without changing its name and mandate from water management to land and water management. IWMI should maintain its clear focus on water, and partner with those CGIAR and other institutions whose comparative advantage was the management of crop or animal (or aquatic) resources. The foregoing views of TAC on IWMI's proposal would be transmitted to the CGIAR Chair and to the Centre.

91. TAC also heard a progress report on the Systemwide Initiative on Malaria and Agriculture (SWIM II) by the IWMI Director General.

92. The CDC Chair, Dr. Hank Fitzhugh, briefed the Committee on a Systemwide Initiative on the Impact of HIV/AIDS on agriculture. The draft proposal being developed had received inputs from several Centres and was due for discussion and detailed assessment at future CGIAR meetings. In its subsequent consideration of Centres' MTPs, TAC noted that proposals for research on HIV/AIDS and agriculture had been received from a number of Centres and that several Centres had begun modestly-scaled projects on the interactive effects of HIV/AIDS on agricultural systems, and on the potential for technological changes in those systems to ameliorate the severe impacts of the disease on family and community incomes and food security. The Committee commended these initiatives but cautioned that the goals and objectives of such research needed to be clearly defined and implications for potential technological and/or policy changes in agricultural systems articulated. TAC encouraged the Centres which were developing proposals in this area to communicate amongst themselves to share plans, effective approaches, and lessons learned as the CGIAR moved into this important but largely uncharted area of research.

93. Finally, Dr. Barwale Zehr briefed the Committee of the outcome of the 20-23 February 2001 meeting of the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee, which she had attended as a representative of TAC. An outstanding issue that had been discussed was the status of the negotiations for the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources under the umbrella of FAO. IPGRI was playing a leading role for the CGIAR. TAC expressed a need to be updated on

these developments at its 81st meeting either by an FAO-designated officer or by the Director-General of IPGRI. The TAC Chair recognized and thanked Dr. Barwale Zehr for her continued participation in the SGRP on behalf of TAC.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Emil Q. Javier

TAC Chair
Institute of Plant Breeding
UP Los Baños
College 4031 Laguna
Philippines

Dr. Michael Cernea

Professor
6113 Robinwood Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
USA

Alain de Janvry

Professor
Department of Agricultural and Resource
Economics
Giannini Hall 207
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
USA

Lucia de Vaccaro

Professor and Head, Animal Breeding
Facultad de Agronomia
Instituto de Produccion Animal (IPA)
Universidad Central de Venezuela,
Apartado 4579, Maracay
Aragua
Venezuela

Hans M. Gregersen

Professor
2090 E. Tumble Brook Way,
Tucson, AZ 85737
USA

Dr. Richard R. Harwood

Professor
Department of Crop and Soil Sciences
Michigan State University
260 Plant & Soil Sciences Building
East Lansing, MI 48824-1325
USA

Oumar Niangado

Delegation Foundation NOVARTIS Mali
BP E 1449
Bamako
Mali

Joachim von Braun

Director, Centre for Development Research
University of Bonn
Water Flex – Str. 3
53113 Bonn
Germany

Dr. Elias Fereres

Professor
Instituto de Agricultura Sostenible (IAS)
Consejo Superior de Investigaciones
Cientificas (CSIC)
Alameda del Obispo, s/n, Apartado 4084,
14080 Cordoba
Spain

Maria Antonia Fernandez-Martinez

Am Büchel 63
53173 Bonn
Germany

Dr. Usha Barwale Zehr

Joint Director Research
Maharashtra Hybrid Seeds Co.Ltd.
Sardar Patel Road
Jalna 431203, Maharashtra
India

Dr. Vo-Tong Xuan

Director
Farming Systems R&D Institute
University of Cantho
Cantho City
Vietnam

Dr. Hirofumi Uchimiya

Professor
Institute of Molecular and Cellular
Biosciences
University of Tokyo
Yayoi, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0032
Japan

CGIAR COMMITTEES

Hank Fitzhugh

Chair of CDC
Director General ILRI
P.O. Box 30709
Nairobi
Kenya

Robert Havener

Board Chair, ICARDA and CBC Vice-Chair
625 Regency Circle (C1)
Sacramento, CA 95864-6178
USA

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES

International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)

Adel El-Beltagy

Director General
P.O. Box 5466
Aleppo
Syrian Arab Republic

Mohan C. Saxena

Assistant Director General (At Large)

Willie Erskine

Acting Assistant Director General (Research)

and also:

Samir El-Sebae Ahmed

Eddy De Pauw

Mustapha Bounejmate

Head, Human Resources Development Unit

Agro-ecological Characterization Specialist

Forage Specialist

Elizabeth Bailey
Mahmoud B. Solh
Faisal Maya
Khaled Makkouk
Jan Valkoun
Luis Iniguez
Theib Oweis
Michael Baum
S. Varma

Murari Singh
Salvatore Ceccarelli
Samuel Kugbei
Fawzi Karajeh
Stefania Grando
R.S. Malhotra
Richard Tutwiler
Adriana Bruggeman
Aden Aw-Hassan
Michel Valat
Tidiane Ngaido

Project Officer
Assistant Director General (Int. Cooperation
Director (Govt. Liaison)
Acting Leader Germplasm Program
Head, Genetic Resource Unit
Small Ruminant Specialist
Water Specialist
Biotechnologist
Head, Communication, Documentation &
Information Services
Acting Head of Computer & Biometric
Senior Barley Breeder
Seed Economist
Marginal Water Specialist
Barley Breeder
Chickpea Breeder
Facilitator, Dryland Project (Egypt)
Hydrologist
Socio-economist
Director of Administration
Socio-economist, ICARDA/IFPRI

International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

Hank Fitzhugh
Director General
P.O. Box 30709
Nairobi
Kenya

International Water Management Institute (IWMI)

Frank R. Rijsberman
Director General
P.O. Box 2075
Colombo
Sri Lanka

International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)

George W. Ayad
Regional Director IPGRI – CWANA
IPGRI-CWANA Regional Office
ICARDA
Aleppo
Syria

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

CGIAR OBSERVERS

Egypt

Magdy A. Madkour

Director, Agricultural Research Center
Agricultural Genetic Engineering Research
Institute (AGERI)
9 Gamaa Street
Giza 12619, Cairo
Egypt

France

Yves Savidan

International Relation Officer
AGROPOLIS
34394 Montpellier Cedex
France

USA

Dana G. Dalrymple

Research Adviser
USAID
Washington D.C. 20523-2110
USA

Germany

Marlene Diekmann

Advisor, International Agricultural Research
BEAF/GTZ
Dottendorfer Str. 86
53129 Bonn
Germany

Italy

Marina Puccioni

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Agricultural Director
Istituto Agronomico per l'Oltremare (IAO)
Via Antonio Cocchi, 4
50131 Firenze
Italy

CGIAR SECRETARIAT

Francisco Reifschneider

Director, CGIAR
CGIAR Secretariat
The World Bank
1818 H Street NW
Washington D.C. 20433
USA

Selcuk Ozgediz

Management Adviser

Shey Tata

Senior Financial Officer

TAC SECRETARIAT

Shellemiah Keya

Executive Secretary, TAC

SDRC – FAO

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

00100 Rome

Italy

Guido Gryseels

Deputy Executive Secretary, TAC

Amir Kassam

Senior Agricultural Research Officer

Timothy Kelley

Senior Agricultural Research Officer

Sirkka Immonen

Senior Agricultural Research Officer

Robert Bordonaro

Rosanna Corazzi

Secretary

AGENDA

- Item 1: Opening Session
- Item 2: SG/CDMT Report on System Structure and Governance
- Global Challenge Programmes
 - System Governance
 - Role of TAC
- Item 3: Trends in Science - Implications for the CGIAR:
- Biological Sciences
 - INRM/GIS
 - Policy/Institutions
 - Social Sciences
- Item 4: Report from Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies (SCOPAS):
- Planning CGIAR Priorities and Strategies
 - Poverty Mapping
 - Regional Planning
 - IFPRI Poverty and Technology Study
- Item 5: Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA):
- Germplasm Impacts
 - Environment Impacts
 - CGIAR Impact in Africa
- Item 6: Report from Standing Committee on External Reviews (SCOER):
- Future Reviews
 - Evaluation Processes in the CGIAR
- Item 7: The 2002 CGIAR Research Agenda and Initial Proposals for 2004
- Item 8: Future Meetings
- Item 9: Other Business:
- Proposed Merger of IWMI and IBSRAM
 - Report on Systemwide Initiative on Malaria and Agriculture (SWIM II)
 - GRPC Meeting

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	NUMBER/SOURCE
1	Draft Report of the Seventy-Ninth Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee	SDR/TAC:IAR/01/01
2	Designing and Managing Change in the CGIAR	
4	CGIAR Research and Poverty Reduction	SDR/TAC:IAR/01/02
4	Progress Report on Poverty Mapping	SDR/TAC:IAR/01/07
4	Progress Report on Regional Planning	SDR/TAC:IAR/01/03
5	Report from TAC's Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)	SDR/TAC:IAR/01/05
6	Proposal for a New Approach to Evaluation in the CGIAR System	SDR/TAC:IAR/01/04
7	Financial Summary of 2002-2004 Center Medium Term Plans	(CGIAR Secretariat)
8	Future Reviews	SDR/TAC:IAR/01/06
9	Proposed Merger of IWMI and IBSRAM	IWMI
ditto	GRPC Meeting Report	
ditto	Systemwide Initiative on the Impact of HIV/AIDS on Agriculture	

Y1267/E