

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Mailing Address: 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.
Office Location: 801 19th Street, N.W.
Telephone (Area Code 202) 473-8951
Cable Address—INTBAFRAD
Fax (Area Code 202) 334-8750

From: The Secretariat

September 17, 1991
AGR/TAC:IAR/91/9.1

International Centres' Week, October 28 - November 1, 1991
Washington D.C.

Agenda Item 3 - TAC Chairman's Report

Report of the Fifty-Fourth Meeting of TAC

1. Attached is a copy of the Report of the 54th Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee held in The Hague, The Netherlands from March 10 to 17, 1991.
2. The document is transmitted for information and should be considered as background material to the TAC Chairman's report, Agenda Item 3.

Attachment

Distribution

CGIAR Members
Centre Board Chairmen
Centre Directors
TAC Chairman
TAC Members
TAC Secretariat

AGR/TAC:IAR/91/9.1

THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REPORT OF THE
FIFTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC SECRETARIAT
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

July 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Para</u>	<u>Page</u>
A. <u>SUMMARY</u>		iii
1. <u>Main Highlights and Recommendations</u>		iii
1.1. CIAT Strategic Plan		iii
1.2. IBPGR External Reviews		iii
1.3. ICRISAT External Reviews		iv
2. <u>Progress on Other Items</u>		iv
2.1. Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies		iv
2.2. Future Reviews		iv
2.3. Experience with the External Review Process		iv
2.4. Resource Allocation		v
2.5. Follow-up to the Expansion of the CGIAR		v
2.6. Other Business		vi
2.7. Future Meetings		vii
 B. <u>RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS</u>		 1
Opening Session	3 - 9	1
(a) Opening Remarks	3 - 5	1
(b) Adoption of the TAC 53 Report	6	1
(c) Matters Arising from TAC 53	7	2
(d) Adoption of the Agenda	8 - 9	2
(e) Report from the CGIAR	10	2
 Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies	 11 - 35	 3
 CIAT Strategic Plan	 36 - 55	 7
- TAC Commentary on CIAT's Strategic Plan	48 - 55	10
 Future Reviews	 56 - 66	 11
- Report of the Standing Committee for External Reviews	56 - 66	11
 Experience with the External Review Process	 67 - 90	 13
- Report on Experience with the External Review Process	67 - 84	13
- Report of the Standing Committee for Resource Allocation	85 - 90	17

	<u>Para</u>	<u>Page</u>
Follow-up to the Expansion of the CGIAR	91 - 127	18
(a) IIMI Strategic Plan	91 - 104	18
(b) Elaboration of TAC's Proposals on Ecoregional Mechanisms/Centres and Research on Resource Management	105 - 114	21
(c) Elaboration of TAC's Views on IARCs/NARS Interface	115 - 127	23
ICRISAT External Reviews	128 - 173	26
- TAC Commentary on the External Reviews of ICRISAT	152 - 173	31
IBPGR External Reviews	174 - 220	35
- TAC Commentary on the External Reviews of IBPGR	194 - 220	39
Future Meetings	221 - 222	44
Other Business	223 - 244	45
(a) The Winrock Livestock Study	223	45
(b) Managing Intellectual Property at the IARCs	224 - 230	45
(c) TAC-Centre Directors Standing Panel on Plant Genetic Resources	231 - 232	46
(d) First Congress of the European Society of Agronomy	233 - 235	46
(e) Meeting on Global Change and Terrestrial Ecosystems	236 - 241	47
(f) Sharing of Responsibilities and Modes of Collaboration between IITA and INIBAP	242 - 244	48

ANNEXES

- Annex I - List of Participants
- Annex II - Agenda
- Annex III - List of Documents

FIFTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE
CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
(The Hague, The Netherlands, 10 - 17 March 1991)

REPORT OF THE MEETING

A. SUMMARY

1. Main Highlights and Recommendations

1.1. CIAT Strategic Plan

TAC considered the Strategic Plan of CIAT. The plan was well argued, transparent, coherent and showed a clear vision. TAC agreed with the broad directions CIAT proposed to follow with respect to germplasm development, resource management and inter-institutional cooperation. It also concurred with CIAT's revised operational mandate. TAC recognized that CIAT's plans were ambitious and commended the Centre for proposing new directions. TAC is looking forward to receiving the Centre's proposals on how it intends to implement this strategy in the medium term. At that time, the Committee will consider the operational implications of the new strategy proposed.

1.2. IBPGR External Reviews

The report of the Third External Review of IBPGR was considered by TAC. It was found to be perceptive, comprehensive and analytical. TAC noted that IBPGR was in the process of becoming an independent institute within the CGIAR System, administratively separate from FAO. It shared the concern expressed by the review panel on the absence of a Board-approved Strategic Plan, and noted the Board's intention to complete it as soon as the new Director takes up his appointment. TAC endorsed the recommendations of the review panel, particularly those relating to IBPGR's strategy for building national capabilities, to the integration of genetic resources conservation with utilization, to research on policy and social aspects, to information systems, to IBPGR's future leadership role, and to the management of financial and human resources. It noted that some of the recommendations had

System-wide implications, such as those on inter-centre collaboration and intellectual property rights. TAC prepared a commentary on the review report for consideration by the CGIAR.

1.3. ICRISAT External Reviews

TAC considered the Report of the Third External Programme and Second External Management Reviews of ICRISAT. The Committee was pleased that ICRISAT had been found to be a strong, well-run organization with an impressive record of achievement. TAC agreed with the views of the Panels and endorsed in general the recommendations made. ICRISAT also presented its draft Strategic Plan. TAC prepared a commentary on the External Review Report and the draft Strategic Plan for consideration by the members of the CGIAR.

2. Progress on Other Items

2.1. Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies

TAC agreed on the analytical sequence it would follow in reviewing CGIAR priorities and strategies. The Committee also engaged in a broad discussion of important factors that would influence CGIAR priorities. These factors related to considerations of efficiency, equity and sustainability, which are of importance to the CGIAR mission and goals. The Secretariat would prepare a draft report on the review of CGIAR priorities in time for consideration at TAC 55. This draft would deal only with CGIAR priorities. The section on strategies and on the links between priorities and resource allocation would be prepared subsequently. The Chairman reiterated that the review of CGIAR priorities and strategies would be an interactive process between TAC and the stakeholders involved, such as Centre Directors, Board Chairs, NARS and donors.

2.2. Future Reviews

TAC noted that the External Review of ISNAR was being conducted as planned, with the main phase scheduled for June/July 1991. The External Reviews of ILCA and ILRAD were being organized and the selection of panel members was in progress. The main phase of the ILCA review was scheduled to take place in January 1992, and that of the ILRAD review in March/April 1992.

Planning of external reviews of INIBAP and ICLARM was being initiated. TAC endorsed the progress made in the planning of an inter-Centre review of rice, the Fourth External Review of IRRI (main phase September 1992), and the Second External Review of WARDA (main phase January 1993). It noted that the inter-Centre review of rice would begin before the review of IRRI and end after the review of WARDA.

2.3. Experience with the External Review Process

TAC considered a progress report on the experience gained and lessons learnt from the external review process. It concluded that in

view of the importance attached to external reviews by the donors, and given the expansion of the CGIAR to 18 institutions (or more), a modified approach to the review process was urgently required. In summary, the major issues identified included a reassessment of the extent to which donors would accept some flexibility, at least on an experimental basis, in the way in which reviews were conducted, and in the interval between successive reviews. The aim was to ease the burden on panel members and reduce the total number of reviews required, without relaxing the oversight to which the Centres are exposed. TAC agreed that the progress report be presented to the Group at its 1991 Mid-Term Meeting.

2.4. Resource Allocation

The Standing Committee on Resource Allocation reported that preparations were being discussed for the implementation of a new resource allocation process in the CGIAR. The new process, which will link resource allocation to priorities and strategies in the CGIAR, will involve the setting of targets and the preparation of guidelines for a new round of Medium-Term Plans for the Centres. A specific issue discussed and approved by TAC was the transfer of an IRRI senior staff position from computer specialist to training and courseware specialist. TAC endorsed the current guidelines which require Centres to seek approval for changes exceeding 1% of annual budgets.

2.5. Follow-up to the Expansion of the CGIAR

(a) IIMI Strategic Plan

The Director General of IIMI and the Chair of the IIMI Board of Trustees presented the Institute's Strategic Plan to TAC. The Committee asked a number of penetrating questions about IIMI's strategy, raising issues such as equity (and particularly gender equity), sustainability, location specificity (in the context of internationality in research), watershed management, technical assistance versus research, and the extent to which IIMI's programme was donor-driven. Another important question concerned IIMI's relationship with the new International Programme for Technology and Research on Irrigation and Drainage. The discussion provided the background against which TAC will assess the 1992 Annual Programme and Budget submission from IIMI.

(b) Ecoregional Approach to Research in the CGIAR

The Committee discussed a draft paper intended for presentation to the CGIAR in May 1991 on the ecoregional approach to research. TAC suggested a number of changes to the form and content of the paper. It agreed that the ecoregional approach should be set in the context of the wider CGIAR and in parallel with productivity research; should incorporate a broad view of land use, including the human dimension; and should not recommend a global mechanism for resource management research at this point. Rather than including a detailed analysis of the financial and institutional implications of the ecoregional approach in this paper, TAC will undertake this analysis as part of the priorities and strategies exercise, which will be considered first by the CGIAR in October 1991.

(c) IARCs-NARS Interface

In response to the request made at ICW'90 that TAC elaborate on the relationship between IARCs and NARS, the TAC Secretariat had prepared a working draft for consideration by TAC. The paper provided an overview of the status of NARS, with particular reference to their diversity, strengths and weaknesses. The critical factors that determine the effectiveness of NARS, as well as the typology of relationships between IARCs and NARS, were outlined in the light of past policy pronouncements by the CGIAR, TAC and the Centres.

It had become obvious that some of the activities involved in such relationships were largely technical assistance in nature. Other actors, particularly development assistance agencies, were considered to be equally competent to perform such activities. TAC then considered what activities would be appropriate for the IARCs within the CGIAR goal of strengthening institutional and scientific capacity in NARS. The roles of ISNAR and the proposed ecoregional centres were examined.

Although there was broad consensus that cooperation between the IARCs and NARS should be based on the IARC research agenda, there was a diversity of views among TAC Members with respect to what they considered to be the appropriate role of the CGIAR in strengthening NARS. TAC reviewed a number of issues and options for better orchestration of collaborative activities between IARCs and development assistance agencies. These included establishment of separate and clearly defined development units at the IARCs; the use of ecoregional centres; and strengthening ISNAR. It became apparent that the CGIAR needed a policy statement on this topic. TAC decided on a two-stage approach: preparation of an "issues and options" paper for consideration by the CGIAR at its Mid-Term Meeting in May 1991; and development of a policy statement in the light of the Group's discussion of the issues and options paper.

2.6. Other Business

(a) The CGIAR Secretariat reported on the financial situation of the CGIAR System and on progress in discussions between the Chairman of the CGIAR and Chinese government officials concerning the future of AVRDC.

(b) TAC received brief reports on the following issues:

- Winrock Livestock Study on sub-Saharan Africa;
- Managing Intellectual Property at the IARCs;
- TAC-Centre Directors Standing Panel on Plant Genetic Resources;
- The First Congress of the European Society of Agronomy;
- Sharing of Responsibilities and Modes of Collaboration between IITA and INIBAP;
- Meeting on Global Change and Terrestrial Ecosystems.

2.7. Future Meetings

TAC reconfirmed the dates and venues of the 55th and 56th Meetings as follows:

- TAC 55: 24-30 June 1991, FAO, Rome
- TAC 56: 21-27 October 1991, IFPRI, Washington DC
- TAC 57: 15-21 March 1992, ICARDA, Aleppo

B. RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS

1. The Fifty-Fourth Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) was held from 10-17 March 1991 at ISNAR headquarters in The Hague, The Netherlands. Dr. Alex F. McCalla was in the chair.
2. The meeting was attended by 15 TAC members, by representatives of two of the Co-Sponsors (FAO and the World Bank), by observers representing members and institutions of the CGIAR, and by staff of the CGIAR and TAC Secretariats. A number of other participants attended open sessions of the meeting (Annex I).

Opening Session - (Agenda Item 1)

(a) Opening Remarks

3. Dr. McCalla declared the 54th meeting of TAC formally open. He thanked Dr. C.H. Bonte-Friedheim, Director General, ISNAR, for having agreed at such short notice to host TAC 54 after developments in the WANA region had necessitated a change of venue for the meeting from ICARDA, Aleppo, Syria. He reminded TAC members and the observers that the invitation from ICARDA was still standing and that TAC 57 in March 1992 would be held at Aleppo.
4. At the invitation of Dr. McCalla, Dr. Bonte-Friedheim welcomed TAC members, observers and staff of the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats to ISNAR. He pointed out that ISNAR was busy preparing for its Second External Programme and Management Review and looked forward to interacting with TAC members and the observers during their stay in The Hague.
5. Dr. McCalla in turn reiterated his thanks to the management and staff of ISNAR for hosting the meeting, and in particular for the excellent arrangements and the facilities provided to TAC. He then welcomed TAC members and especially the newest member, Prof. Richard S. Musangi, Animal Scientist and Vice-Chancellor of Egerton University, Njoro, Kenya. He also welcomed the representatives of the Co-Sponsors (FAO, and World Bank), observers from donor agencies and IARCs, and staff of the CGIAR and TAC Secretariats.

(b) Adoption of the TAC 53 Report

6. The report of TAC 53 ^{1/} was adopted with one minor change. In para 9, (p.2) the fourth sentence was changed to read: "TAC approved programme changes requested by ILCA and ILRAD". The term "CIMMYT" was deleted from the sentence.

^{1/} AGR/TAC:IAR/91/1

(c) Matters Arising from TAC 53

7. Dr. McCalla recalled that TAC had prepared its commentary on the reports of the External Reviews of IFPRI based on a preliminary IFPRI Board and management response dated 10 October 1990. Since TAC 53, the IFPRI's Board and management had modified their commentary particularly paragraphs A-1 and A-4. In the light of these changes, TAC had decided to revise the corresponding sections in its commentary, (paras 46 and 48 of the TAC report). The paragraphs will now read as follows (the changes have been highlighted):

Para. 46. "A number of recommendations and suggestions were made jointly by the EPR and EMR Panels on the structure and management of research. These are fully endorsed by TAC and we note that the Board has authorized the management to initiate action on some recommendations. TAC welcomes the Board's decision to follow the recommendation to appoint a Deputy Director General. **Considering that the present Director General is on a short-term appointment, the selection of a Deputy should be done either in consultation with the candidate chosen for the long-term Director General position, or the term of the appointee should be co-terminus with that of the incumbent.**"

Para. 48. "TAC commends the Board for its prompt action regarding appointment of a Search Committee for a new Director General. It notes that the term of the current Director General will end in August 1992, and that the Board of Trustees has authorized him to determine and to implement the needed management changes, as well as to undertake the process that will complete the preparation of a Strategic Plan for IFPRI. While TAC fully understands the Board's wish to put its house in order before the appointment of the long-term Director General, it cautions against going too far with the completion of the Strategic Plan without the participation of the long-term Director General. This underlines the importance of proceeding promptly with the selection process for the long-term Director General to ensure that the successful candidate has a chance to provide his or her inputs into the formulation of the Strategic Plan."

(d) Adoption of the Agenda

8. The agenda (Annex II) was adopted with the following additions under item 10 (Other Business):

- The Winrock Livestock Study on sub-Saharan Africa;
- Managing Intellectual Property at the IARCs;
- TAC-Centre Directors Standing Panel on Plant Genetic Resources;
- The First Congress of the European Society of Agronomy;
- Sharing of Responsibilities and Modes of Collaboration between IITA and INIBAP
- Meeting on Global Change and Terrestrial Ecosystems;

9. The TAC Chairman then announced the membership of Ad Hoc Working Groups and their meeting venues.

(e) Report from the CGIAR

10. The CGIAR Secretariat reported that:

- (i) The Group had approved a funding level of US\$ 296 million at ICW'90 for core programmes during 1991, compared to the 1990 operating level of US\$ 240 million (of which US\$ 234 million was expected to be funded). Estimated pledges at ICW'90 totalled US\$ 244 million. Based on exchange rates at the end of February, estimated total core contributions for 1991 (excluding IIMI and INIBAP) stood at US\$ 237 million.
- (ii) The Inter-American Development Bank's contribution in 1991 was expected to go down by US\$ 4 million.
- (iii) Centres were expected to operate at the same level as in 1990 in nominal terms.
- (iv) The Chairman of the CGIAR and the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR had visited China in early March and had held discussions with a number of high ranking government officials on various issues, including the future of vegetables research in the CGIAR and a possible role for AVRDC. The CGIAR decision to support research on vegetables had been highly welcome. Proposals on a possible future role for AVRDC will be submitted by the CGIAR Chairman to the authorities in Beijing for consideration.

Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies - (Agenda Item 2)

11. The discussion was introduced by Dr. C.T. de Wit, Chairman of the Standing Committee for Priorities and Strategies, who recalled that, at TAC 53, he had presented a progress report that outlined a suggested approach to the review of CGIAR priorities and strategies, on which a report is due to be submitted to ICW'91. It had then been proposed to assign priorities first across regional agro-ecological zones, then by research category, and subsequently by commodity. In the assessment of priorities, use would be made of quantitative methods such as the zero sum mechanism, based on user-friendly spreadsheets, recognizing that these were only tools to assist in decision-making. This approach had been discussed with Centre Directors, Board Chairs and members of the CGIAR. Centre Directors had provided further reactions to the progress report in writing, and the Secretariat had organized a technical meeting with a number of resource persons at the end of January 1991 to elaborate the initial proposals made.

12. During its meeting prior to TAC 54, the Standing Committee had carefully considered the proposals made originally, the reactions received from the Centres, the work already undertaken by the Standing Committee and by the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats, and inputs by a number of other organizations such as FAO, ACIAR, IFPRI and ISNAR. The Standing Committee had found that the strict hierarchical approach

originally proposed would not allow for sufficiently meaningful interactions with those that have expert knowledge of the four production categories (crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries) and of the commodities in each category. The Standing Committee had also recognized that the approach initially proposed did not sufficiently explicitly consider priorities for non-production categories such as policy and institution building. The Standing Committee therefore proposed to make some adjustments to the original framework for the review discussed at TAC 53, so as to avoid these disadvantages while maintaining the regional agro-ecological zone concept and the stepwise process proposed initially.

13. Dr. C.T. de Wit reiterated that the process agreed upon by TAC had to be (a) logical and systematic; (b) transparent; (c) able to incorporate both quantitative and qualitative analysis; (d) able to anticipate future trends in important global parameters; and, (e) able to lead to a set of priorities that logically incorporated multiple dimensions representing the multiple goals of the CGIAR.

14. Although the CGIAR had accepted the importance of sustainability and natural resource management goals, priorities should continue to bear a strong relation to the production value of relevant commodities, since these were of direct relevance to the CGIAR mission and to its newly accepted focus on food self-reliance (as distinct from its previous focus on food self-sufficiency). Priorities also had to reflect the need for complementary activities related to policy research and human resource and institutional development.

15. The revised approach suggested by the Standing Committee addressed these needs. It consisted of seven consecutive steps.

16. The first step would consist of setting the stage for CGIAR priority setting. An analysis would be made of the global context in which the CGIAR was likely to operate during the next decade. Attention would be given to the challenges of agricultural development and resource management, and the implications for international research throughout the developing world. The research needs of the nine agro-ecological zones and four regions of the developing world would be analyzed. The exercise would continue with congruence considerations based on tables of production values for the four major production sectors (crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries), disaggregated for each zone and region.

17. The second step would involve priority assessment using a disaggregation of the four production sectors into individual commodities and/or activities by agro-ecological zones, regions, or regional agro-ecological zones as appropriate. The four sectoral assessments would incorporate available quantitative and qualitative indicators and analyses (including the zero-sum spreadsheet where appropriate). They would also incorporate, to the extent possible, issues such as poverty, gender, nutrition, etc, which fit within the mandate and goals of the CGIAR. The comparative advantage of the CGIAR in relation to other research organizations, including national programme partners, would also be considered.

18. The third step would be to adjust priorities in the light of natural resource management/sustainability considerations. The CGIAR had explicitly accepted the challenge of conducting research that would

contribute to the "effective management and conservation of natural resources (i.e., land, water, forests and germplasm) for sustainable production." Thus, this step would address the priorities for research on natural resource management and conservation and their interactions with activities in the four production sectors and in regional agro-ecological zones (RAEZs).

19. Step four would identify the priorities with respect to policy research, institution building and human resource development, as implied by the above assessments. (Primary emphasis at this stage would be on priorities to be given to non-commodity Centres, recognizing the contributions also made by agencies outside the CGIAR). Since there were no readily available indicators of success or failure of activities of this type, the priorities given would have to be treated in a more qualitative fashion, taking as a point of reference the priority currently accorded to these activities.

20. Step five would involve the judgement of TAC regarding the overall adjustments needed after completion of steps 1-4 above, taking into account the implications of the medium- and longer-term vision of the CGIAR System expounded in the Expansion Paper (ecoregional entities and global entities).

21. Step six would involve the development of a change strategy, i.e. an exploration of how the CGIAR System might modify itself in the light of the suggested priorities and the medium- and long-term vision. This would include consideration of issues such as minimum scale, mobilization of resources for the system, balance between core and complementary activities, and modalities in the organization and operations of the system.

22. Finally, step seven would involve translating priorities into suggestions for resource allocation in the system. Work during this step would be linked with that of the Standing Committee for Resource Allocation. The linkage mechanisms were to be determined in joint consultation between the two Committees and the Chairman of TAC.

23. Dr. de Wit demonstrated the workings of the zero-sum mechanism, based on the use of spreadsheets. The main advantages of this approach were that it structured the discussion in such a way that arguments would not be confounded, that the incorporation of each modifying step was made explicit, and that the analysis of problems was separated from allocative decisions. A background paper illustrating the mechanisms of the approach had been distributed to TAC members.

24. At the request of the Chairman, in the ensuing discussion TAC members focussed on the factors that would determine CGIAR priorities. These factors would be used as 'modifiers' of an initial prioritization based on value of production. A range of 'modifying factors' were discussed, which closely related to the CGIAR mission and goal with respect to efficiency, equity and sustainability considerations.

25. The first set of modifiers brought in the spillover concept, the need for strong NARS to deliver CGIAR products to identified regionally defined agro-ecological zones, and the extent of poverty. Spillover effects were one of the prime justifications for international research and were particularly relevant at the strategic research level. An efficient CGIAR programme would seek spillover effects and avoid the

duplication of strategic and applied research programmes. The only spillover coefficients available on a global and AEZ basis were those derived by ACIAR for their research priorities model. It was noted that these coefficients are based on subjective estimates and thus need to be considered with due caution.

26. The status of NARS brought both efficiency and equity considerations into the priority assessment exercise. The CGIAR was only one component of a global research system. For efficiency it was dependent on effective NARS, but the CGIAR mission also implied an obligation to build capacity in weak NARS. TAC would use both quantitative and qualitative information on the status of NARS as modifiers in the priority setting process. This information would be obtained from ISNAR and the other Centres.

27. The major equity criterion to be included in the analytical sequence is poverty. The location of the poor and the use they make of CGIAR commodities would be important modifying factors. An estimate would also be made of women's involvement in agriculture in specific regions and zones.

28. Having established priorities among regionally defined agro-ecological zones according to efficiency and equity criteria, TAC would shift to a more detailed level of priority setting, which would draw in sustainability and research support goals and would identify priorities for the different product groups and for two major types of commodity research activity.

29. The three criteria used to identify RAEZs where sustainability was particularly critical to the support of future populations were the urgency for increases in agricultural production, the extent of human-induced soil degradation, and the need for preservation of forest resources. The need for research and research support activities to strengthen NARS would be the reciprocal of the efficiency modifier already applied at the regional level. TAC would, at this stage, also select priorities amongst commodities important to CGIAR goals on the basis of their value of production and the size of potential spillover effects. The final step, at the lowest level of detail in priority setting, would be to examine opportunities to improve yield potential or to improve commodity management (exploit existing yield potential).

30. Other discussion points raised by TAC members were how the views of NARS would be taken into account, how the review would incorporate environmental concerns and how priorities would be translated into resource allocations.

31. Dr. de Wit informed the Committee that between TAC 55 and TAC 56 the draft report would be discussed at meetings with representatives of NARS in each of the major regions. Contacts had already been made with regional research organizations in Southern Africa, Asia and Latin America with a view to organizing such meetings. Environmental concerns would be given adequate attention through sustainability modifiers and a greater focus on research on natural resources.

32. The Chairman emphasized the importance of the link between priority setting and resource allocation, particularly in view of the fact that during 1992 all Centres would be submitting their draft Medium-Term Plans for consideration by TAC. Assessing the implications

of revised CGIAR priorities for resource allocation was an enormous task - one that was too large to be dealt with by the Standing Committee for Priorities and Strategies alone. It would involve close collaboration with the Standing Committee for Resource Allocation and the Finance Officers of the CGIAR Secretariat. This task would, therefore, be dealt with at a later stage. The Standing Committee for Priorities and Strategies would first have to prepare a draft report on CGIAR priorities. The link with resource allocation would be determined subsequently and discussed in a larger forum prior to its consideration by TAC.

33. Several TAC members noted that insufficient attention was being given to alternative sources of research supply. The CGIAR was only one actor in the global agricultural research system. It was agreed that alternative sources of supply would also serve as a modifier.

34. In answer to a question regarding how the Standing Committee intended to deal with areas or commodities for which few or no data were available, Dr. de Wit said that it was not possible to assign weights in such cases. He noted that the review of priorities would be integrated with TAC's emerging views on ecoregional mechanisms and its medium-term vision of the CGIAR. Dr. de Wit also argued strongly that TAC should not get involved in the setting of individual research agendas for particular commodities or zones; this was a Centre responsibility.

35. The Chairman closed the discussion by thanking Dr. de Wit and the members of the Standing Committee for Priorities and Strategies for the work they had undertaken. He requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft report on the review of CGIAR priorities in time for discussion at TAC 55. This report should provide the necessary analytical background information for this review. At that time, TAC would decide on a weighting for each of the modifying criteria. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the report to be submitted to ICW'91 would only deal with the first five steps of the analytical sequence presented by Dr. de Wit and that the next two steps, which dealt with CGIAR strategies and the link between priority setting and resource allocation, would be dealt with subsequently. The draft paper that would be on the agenda of TAC 55 would also be discussed with Centre Directors so as to obtain their inputs into the process. He reminded TAC members once again that the review of CGIAR priorities had to be an interactive process with the stakeholders in the System, and that TAC's approach had to be transparent and logical. Finally, he thanked the Secretariat for the quantity and quality of the work it had already undertaken and for its willingness to prepare a draft document in the short time available before TAC 55.

CIAT Strategic Plan - (Agenda Item 3)

36. The Chairman introduced the discussion by noting that at the request of CIAT, TAC would prepare a commentary on the Centre's Strategic Plan. TAC should, however, exercise caution and guard against being interpreted as having formally endorsed the Strategic Plan or the resource implications arising from it. The Chairman then welcomed Dr. Lucia Vaccaro, Vice-Chairperson of CIAT (representing the Chairman, Dr. Fred Hutchinson, (who for health reasons could not be present)), Dr. Gustavo Nores, Director General, and Dr. Filemon Torres, Deputy Director General.

37. Dr. L. Vaccaro apologized for the absence of Dr. Hutchinson and briefed the Committee on the process CIAT had followed in developing its Strategic Plan. It had been a highly participatory process, taking 2 years, and had involved formal consultations with NARS, the External Review Panels, TAC, panels of experts and more than 20 working groups on specific subjects. The Strategic Plan proposed to integrate research on germplasm development with research on natural resource management and conservation, since it was recognized that progress in the former could not be achieved without adequate attention to the latter. For the sake of brevity, the rationale for many of the choices made was presented in an Appendix to the Strategic Plan. CIAT's Board of Trustees had approved the Strategic Plan, and had been greatly impressed by the commitment shown by CIAT's staff while preparing the Plan. It considered that the resources outlined in the plan represented the minimum critical mass required for implementation. In order to give adequate attention to natural resource management, the Board had acquired two new members with expertise in this particular field.

38. Dr. Gustavo Nores introduced the contents of the Strategic Plan which began with an analysis of CIAT's external environment. The analysis covered the socio-economic environment of Latin America and the Caribbean, the challenges regarding the natural resource base in the region, emerging trends in the CGIAR, and global institutional and research trends. CIAT had taken a long-term perspective, and had re-examined its basic strategies. It had concluded that sustainability issues should be central to its future programme and that the centre should shift gradually to an approach that integrated germplasm development and resource management. The Centre had reformulated its mission statement and had adopted four basic criteria for determining research priorities: economic efficiency or growth, equity, enhancement of the resource base, and comparative advantage. The new strategy would be based on an integrated, approach combining research on germplasm development on resource management, complemented with a new modus operandi in terms of inter-institutional cooperation.

39. Germplasm development research would focus on beans, cassava, rice and tropical forages. These programmes would concentrate on important constraints and be impact-oriented. Resource management research would consist of a land-use programme, as well as a programme on each of three selected agro-ecosystems: forest margins, hillsides and savannahs. Inter-institutional cooperation would be crucial to the implementation of the strategy, and CIAT could play a catalytic role in fostering the integration of different actors.

40. Dr. Nores also provided an overview of the resource and organizational implications of the new strategy. A minimum critical mass of core scientists would be required in all programmes. CIAT hoped that this could be partly achieved by redeploying of staff. Some additional resources would be required, however.

41. Dr. Gerardo Budowski, TAC liaison scientist, opened the discussion by complementing CIAT on its strategic planning efforts. He particularly appreciated the innovative approach CIAT had followed and the imaginative thinking behind the plan. The plan was very ambitious, however, for example, in its aims to transform subsistence farmers into entrepreneurs and to tackle the issue of deforestation. There was no mention in the plan as to how gender issues were incorporated in CIAT's research, and clarification was sought as to the role of policy research.

42. TAC members were generally very complimentary of the Strategic Plan, which was considered to be analytical and transparent. There was considerable appreciation of CIAT's proposal to integrate commodity and resource management research. Clarification was requested as to the future role of social scientists at CIAT, the Centre's cooperation with IFPRI, the nature of the intended research activities on soybean and sorghum, the role of animal science in the forage development programme and the definition of poverty that had been used. Other speakers asked how CIAT intended to collaborate with NARS in resource management research, whether population trends in Latin America would lead to greater social pressures and how CIAT considered that separate ecoregional and global commodity programmes could be combined in the same Centre.

43. In his response, Dr. Nores recognized that CIAT's plan was ambitious but thought it was feasible. Gender issues were dealt with throughout the plan, while considering "people". CIAT had had a special working group to deal with this issue. The role of policy research was particularly important in combatting deforestation, which had accelerated in the Amazon region because of tax shelters and other market and social pressures. CIAT intended to work closely with IFPRI, but had recognized it would also need in-house capacity in policy research to ensure complementarity. Population growth in Latin America was projected to take place predominantly in urban areas, and the size of the rural population was likely to remain relatively constant. It was difficult, however, to predict the future nature of social pressures, particularly because the lack of urban employment opportunities could push surplus rural population to marginal areas. CIAT's social scientists would play a particularly important role in land-use research. With respect to complementary soybean and sorghum research, CIAT intended to use materials developed elsewhere and would not engage in large scale breeding activities. NARS had been consulted closely as to their activities in resource management research. To date CIAT's collaborative programmes were primarily in commodity research. It was critical for the centre to assemble information on both resource management and germplasm issues: the comparative advantage of Centres in dealing with sustainability issues came precisely through their linkages to strong commodity research programmes.

44. Dr. Filemon Torres provided further clarification on some of the issues raised. In its research on forest margins, CIAT would work closely with other organizations. With respect to the role of animal science, CIAT intended to deal primarily with forage development. At a secondary level, the feed problem would be dealt with within ecosystems research. At this secondary level, feed evaluation trials would be introduced.

45. Other TAC members asked questions about the opportunity cost to CIAT of the shift toward resource management research, about CIAT's low-input strategy and about the international nature of the proposed land-use research. Further information was requested on the strength of NARS and whether CIAT's perceptions of critical mass were not unduly influenced by the situation in Latin America, where NARS are often relatively strong. The case for CIAT's involvement in sorghum research was considered to be inadequately made. Clarification was also requested as to where CIAT would draw the line between research and development activities. It was asked whether CIAT's proposal to start research simultaneously on three ecosystems was not over-ambitious.

46. With respect to the strength of NARS, Dr. Nores saw several new opportunities for cooperation emerging in Latin America, for example joint public/private ventures, and farmers' associations. CIAT intended to have tightly conceived programmes, with clearly defined intended outputs and impact. The expression "low input" was no longer used in CIAT's proposals, although the concept was basic to the Strategic Plan. Emphasis would be given to the exploitation of germplasm. Whether the allocation of 40% of CIAT's resources to land-use research was too much or too little remained to be seen. The allocation had been determined by the need for critical mass and for concerted efforts. With respect to sorghum research, CIAT intended to collaborate closely with ICRISAT and INTSORMIL, and to integrate this work in its programme on the savannahs where the future pay-off was considered to be large.

47. In closing the discussion, Dr. McCalla thanked the Board, management and staff of CIAT for an important document. The ecoregional concept would be further developed over time and TAC was very grateful for CIAT's contribution to the discussion. In considering CIAT's Strategic Plan, TAC formulated the following commentary.

TAC COMMENTARY ON CIAT'S STRATEGIC PLAN

48. TAC was pleased with the Strategic Plan developed by CIAT. The proposed strategy was well argued, transparent, coherent and showed clear vision. TAC complimented the Board, management and staff for their efforts, which had clearly shown the direction in which CIAT would proceed during the next decade. The Committee particularly appreciated the innovative approach the Centre had followed in developing and presenting its proposals. The Strategic Plan was concise, while the detailed logic and rationale for the arguments were provided in the supplementary materials.

49. TAC agreed with the broad direction CIAT proposed to follow with respect to germplasm development, resource management and inter-institutional cooperation. CIAT's strategy was broadly consistent with TAC's understanding of the evolving trends in the socio-economic, scientific and institutional environments of Latin America and the Caribbean, its emerging concepts of global and ecoregional structures within an expanded CGIAR, and its views on future CGIAR priorities and strategies.

50. The Committee concurred with CIAT's revised operational mandate and with its proposals to integrate current efforts on germplasm development with a major effort on resource management. TAC commended CIAT for the innovative concepts it had introduced in this regard, particularly with respect to developing a research agenda in which commodity research needs were discussed within a framework of the broad agro-ecological zone in which the Centre intended to have its major impact.

51. TAC understood CIAT's rationale for concentrating research at the production level on three major agro-ecosystems. These ecosystems had been selected after careful evaluation on the basis of growth, equity, resource preservation, feasibility and efficiency criteria. Each of these criteria represented a major concern of the CGIAR as reflected in its mission and goal statements. Research on the selected ecosystems would contribute to each of these concerns, but in different

orders of magnitude. Sustainability concerns were particularly important in the forest margins, equity was a prime concern in the hillsides, while the savannahs offered considerable opportunities for an increase in agricultural production and productivity. TAC recognized that in order to be effective, the plan had to tackle these concerns simultaneously on a broad front. The research proposals were well thought out, but CIAT would need to be highly selective in choosing among the many activities which it could undertake. Notwithstanding this, TAC applauded the emphasis given to sustainability concerns through these proposed resource management programmes.

52. CIAT's proposals for germplasm development research corresponded with TAC's views on the future directions the CGIAR should take in this regard. The Centre would continue to assume international responsibilities for crops that were important from a global perspective, i.e. beans and cassava, and regional responsibilities in Latin America for rice. With respect to tropical forages, CIAT intended to assume expanded responsibilities in Latin America on tropical forages, and to make new technology fully available to Africa and Asia. The proposed germplasm development efforts implied a move to the more strategic aspects of research so as to exploit the potential of gene-governed mechanisms for achieving sustainable increases in production. The more applied levels of commodity research were addressed at the ecoregional level. TAC concurred with this approach.

53. CIAT proposed to implement its new strategy through a concept that combined its own strong research base with close inter-institutional cooperation at the international, regional and national levels. TAC anticipated that CIAT would play a catalytic role in fostering the integration of efforts at the various institutes involved, recognizing that this task would be particularly challenging in the areas of resource conservation and management.

54. TAC recognized that CIAT's plan was ambitious, and commended CIAT for proposing new directions. The knowledge and experience CIAT had already acquired in the region and the enthusiasm and competence of the Centre's staff were encouraging signs. The CGIAR was in the process of further developing its thoughts on ecoregional and global research mandates and mechanisms. TAC anticipated that CIAT's Strategic Plan would remain a living document and that modifications would be introduced as CGIAR policies evolved.

55. TAC appreciated the opportunity to comment on CIAT's new Strategic Plan and looked forward to receiving the Centre's proposals on how it intended to implement this strategy in the medium term. At that time, the Committee would consider the strategy's operational implications, including the staffing and financing of the proposed programmes, in the light of the total resource constraints faced by the CGIAR.

Future Reviews - (Agenda Item 4)

- Report of the Standing Committee for External Reviews

56. Dr. Arnold, Chairman of the Standing Committee, recalled that in 1987 at the CGIAR meeting in Montpellier TAC had committed itself to

examining commodities on a continuous basis. However, so far it had been possible to look at maize only, after which the review process had been suspended because of the assignment on the non-associated Centres. The process had now been resumed, with TAC having approved at TAC 53 a proposal to conduct an inter-Centre review of rice. He stated that the main purpose of the review was to help TAC and the CGIAR to formulate a global strategy for rice. Also, the review was part of the process by which TAC proposed to keep itself informed about activities which were not coterminous with the activities of the Centres, and would also take a comprehensive System-wide look at activities.

57. TAC approved the terms of reference for the inter-Centre review of rice. It also approved the panel profile, comprising a Chairperson and two panel members, one of whom would be a biological scientist (preference to be given to breeding/germplasm/agronomy) and the other a social scientist. All panel members would be broad strategic thinkers, and the panel would include strength in institutional analysis. The Chairperson would be independent of the IRRI and WARDA review panels, but would participate as an observer in parts of the IRRI and WARDA External Reviews. The two panel members would be selected from the IRRI and WARDA review panels, and would consist of either the two Chairpersons, or one Chairperson and a panel member, or two panel members (one from each panel).

58. The Committee considered the calendar of External Reviews over the next 5 years, including the reviews of INIBAP, ICLARM, IIMI and ICRAF. It noted that, given its input into the last IIMI External Review completed in 1989, an early external review of IIMI might be unnecessary. Further, the timing for the External Review proposed in the letter from the Chairman of the CGIAR, Dr. Thalwitz, of 21 November to Dr. Lenton, Director General of IIMI, was very tentative. Similar uncertainty prevailed with regard to the External Review of ICRAF. TAC agreed that decisions on the exact timing of the IIMI and ICRAF reviews could follow the CGIAR discussion at its Paris Mid-Term Meeting in May and the TAC discussion in June.

59. TAC was informed that planning for the External Reviews of INIBAP and ICLARM had begun. It approved the panel profile for the External Review of INIBAP, comprising four persons including the Chairperson and covering the fields of breeding/germplasm, pathology, NARS/networking and management. A short-list of three potential Chairpersons was approved. The main phase of the Review was provisionally scheduled for early 1992.

60. The panel profile for the ICLARM Review was also approved. The panel would comprise six persons including the Chairperson, and the fields covered would include capture fisheries, aquaculture, socio-economic policy issues, resource management/environment, management change/organizational design/governance, human and financial resource management). The main phase of the ICLARM Review was provisionally scheduled for early 1992, subject to the TAC discussion in June on ICLARM's Strategic Plan.

61. TAC noted that the Second External Review of ISNAR was proceeding as planned. The panel consisted of John Lewis (USA), Bakary Ouayogode (Cote d'Ivoire), Srinivasa Sastry (India), Burton Swanson (USA) and Tilo Ulbricht (UK). Pilar San José (Philippines) was serving as a financial consultant to the panel, and Elizabeth Field was providing support from the CGIAR Secretariat. Eric Craswell from the TAC Secretariat was Secretary to the panel. The initial visit of the panel to ISNAR was to take place on 18-23 March. The main phase was scheduled for June/July 1991, and field visits were being planned prior to the main phase.

62. The Third External Review of ILCA would be chaired by Norman Halse (Australia). Selection of other panel members was in progress, and the final composition of the panel was expected to be decided by the end of April. The main phase would be held in January 1992. Norman Halse, Eric Craswell (Panel Secretary) and Elizabeth Field (CGIAR Secretariat Resource Person) would visit ILCA in May to discuss plans for the review. The panel briefing would be in October, to coincide with the ILCA internal programme review and Board Programme Committee meeting. Field visits were being planned to take place during the period October to December 1991.

63. The ILCA Review would be followed by the Third External Review of ILRAD, which would be chaired by John Vercoe (Australia). Selection of other panel members was in progress, and one of the panel members from the ILCA Review would also serve on the ILRAD panel. The main phase of the Review was scheduled for March/April 1992.

64. A short-list of three potential Chairpersons for the programme component of the Fourth External Review of IRRRI was approved. The main phase of the Review would be in September 1992, with field visits scheduled during the period April - June 1992.

65. TAC approved the panel profile for the Third External Review of WARDA, comprising a Chairperson plus five members and covering the fields of breeding/germplasm, agronomy/resource management, socio-economics/policy, governance/ leadership/structure/research management and personnel/finance/linkage management. A short-list of three potential Chairpersons was approved. The main phase of the Review was scheduled for January 1993, with field visits during August 1992.

66. Dr. Arnold reminded TAC that the Standing Committee was preparing a paper on the information function in the CGIAR as an input into the review of CGIAR priorities and strategies, and as a basis for TAC's decision on the need for an inter-Centre review on information. He concluded by stating that, given its aim to keep the list of questions for panel members as short as possible, the Standing Committee had suggested that the TAC Secretariat should take a hard look at supplementary questions, and merge those questions that needed to be retained with the general list. TAC agreed to this suggestion.

Experience with the External Review Process - (Agenda Item 5)

- Report on Experience with the External Review Process

67. In introducing this item, Dr. McCalla recalled that at ICW'90 he had informed the CGIAR that TAC would present a progress report to the 1991 CGIAR Mid-Term Meeting on experience with the external review process.

68. Two background documents had been prepared to facilitate the discussion on this agenda item; one was by Dr. M.H. Arnold, Chairman of

the Standing Committee, entitled "External Reviews: Which Way Forward?" 1/, and the other by Dr. Selcuk Ozgediz, entitled "The CGIAR's Review Policies and Procedures". These documents had raised two sets of issues: jurisdictional issues related to the role and responsibilities of TAC vis-à-vis the CGIAR Secretariat; and operational issues related to the conduct of the reviews. Dr. McCalla suggested that the discussion in TAC should be confined to the second set of issues. He would discuss the jurisdictional issues with the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR, and report later to TAC. He then invited Dr. Arnold to present his paper.

69. Dr. Arnold began with a summary of the progress achieved, stating that this included the removal from the TAC agenda of routine work; better and more organized briefing of the panels; revision of the terms of reference for external reviews; and an increase in the total number of potential candidates for panel membership and chairperson. One of the main concerns had been to obtain more names of potential candidates from the developing countries, and there was now an upward trend here. However, there had not been much success with the attempt to increase the number of women candidates.

70. The Candidate Information System (CIS), set up by the CGIAR Secretariat and accessible to the TAC Secretariat, was now beginning to provide some names, and the number of names available would increase in the future. The CIS data base had a total of 2 000 names and 350 approved names for various purposes. Ms. Frona Hall would be reporting to TAC in October on the status of CIS.

71. The old-style "Quinquennial Reviews" conducted prior to 1982 had been a much easier assignment for panel members than the present reviews. Since 1987, there had been a sustained effort to make the reviews more strategic in nature, but at the same time, the demands placed on the panels had increased to the point of becoming unrealistic. Dr. Arnold stated that, as reviews had become more strategic in nature, the boundaries between programme and management issues had become increasingly blurred, and there was a greater need to combine programme and management considerations in both the assessment and the reporting. The difficulties encountered in attempting to integrate the programme and management components of reviews more closely while retaining two separate panels had led to experiments with joint reviews under a single leader, as with the IBPGR Review and those proposed for ISNAR, ILCA, ILRAD and WARDA.

72. In addition, there was a need to strengthen the mechanisms whereby accumulated experience from past reviews was adequately absorbed by those responsible for operational aspects. Dr. Arnold stated that there was a need to grapple with the problems that were currently stifling the efficiency of review panels; and to consider ways in which reviews could be improved, both through the present process and by considering more radical alterations to it. However, if changes to the review process were to be made to reduce some of the constraints under which panels currently worked, there needed to be a wider recognition of the trade-offs that have to be made when planning reviews.

73. Dr. Arnold then elaborated on four major types of trade-off. With regard to donor requirements, the most crucial trade-off was between what donors required of reviews, and what could realistically be achieved given financial and time constraints. Current interpretations of what donors collectively required was placing an unrealistic burden on panels.

74. Another important trade-off was between "experience" and "externality". What was meant by "external"? Should the panel be external to the Centre under review, or external to the whole CGIAR system? A balance was needed between internal knowledge and external objectivity, but there was no formula for striking this balance.

75. A third important trade-off concerned "democracy" versus authority. Dr. Arnold stated that too much attention to the democratic approach in conducting reviews was cumbersome. However, when opinions had been widely sought, it was difficult to ignore them, with the result that the complexity and scope of reviews would inevitably increase unless adequate checks were put in place.

76. A fourth important trade-off concerned "immediate imperatives" versus "future necessities": Should panels be constructed to do the immediate job in the most efficient manner, or should they deliberately include some less experienced members as "learners" who have the potential to make contributions to the system's activities in the longer term?

77. Dr. Arnold then discussed the options available for the future. One option was to improve the present review process by modifying the procedures known to be weakest. The other two options were either to increase the support for panels, or to reduce the load on panels. Greater support for panels could be given, for example, by having a study team undertake a review of selected issues and drafting parts of the report before the panel assembled for the main phase of the review. The alternative option of reducing the load on panels could be achieved by drastically reducing the scope of reviews, but this option would be difficult to implement because of the different perspectives of donors. Dr. Arnold concluded by stating that the study team approach would avoid the overload on panel members. It would enable full use to be made of experienced reviewers, including Secretariat staff and TAC members. And it would allow greater continuity in learning how better to conduct reviews.

78. The Chairman invited Dr. Ozgediz to be the first discussant. Dr. Ozgediz stated that external reviews were one of the major strengths of the system, and fully recognized as such by donors. He concurred with Dr. Arnold that one of the principal questions to be raised was that of externality. Assuming that the panel had to be external to the Centre, to what extent did it have to be external to the System also? Additionally, there were model issues that needed to be addressed. For example, perhaps the standard length of review interval of 5 years was too short, and could be extended to 7 years if a mid-point monitoring review were conducted. Similarly, it might not be necessary for Centres to produce a new Strategic Plan every 5 years. Although the next round of strategic planning should prove easier, the idea of a longer interval could be tested provided donors could live with it. He recalled that next year and beyond there would be five to six external reviews every year if the 5-year interval were maintained.

79. Dr. Ozgediz stated that a study team/reactor panel model would be acceptable provided the panel did not end up just rubber-stamping the study teams' reports. Also, the first phase could concentrate on non-strategic issues, and the second phase on strategic issues. Further, there was a need to examine the coverage of reviews in terms of main components, e.g. strategy, impact, management, quality of research, allowing reviews to be based on broad indicators of these components as agreed by TAC and donors. A review methodology needed to be developed. For example, there was no clear notion of how impact, research quality and strategy could be assessed. Dr. Ozgediz concluded by stating that early planning of reviews was important, including visiting the Centre some 6 to 9 months ahead to examine, among other things, what information was already available before lumbering the Centre with the task of preparing new documents.

80. Dr. McCalla then invited Dr. Bonte-Friedheim, Director General of ISNAR, to contribute to the discussion, since ISNAR was in the midst of preparing for its Second External Review. Dr. Bonte-Friedheim stated that the differences between Centres needed to be reflected in the way reviews were conducted. Size of the Centre, the nature of its business and its mode of operation all had important implications for the cost-effectiveness and efficiency of reviews, and the capacity of the Centre to cope with the demands made by the review. He favoured smaller panels and a 7-year interval between reviews, and suggested that reviews should concentrate on strategic issues, a view supported by several TAC members.

81. In the ensuing wide-ranging discussion, TAC members and observers were complimentary about the documents prepared by Drs. Arnold and Ozgediz, and generally endorsed the suggestions for improving the present process and experimenting with changes. It was noted that there was a limit to the number of review reports which could be brought before the CGIAR in any one meeting, and that more than two reports were difficult to handle. With more Centres in the System, there was a need to consider increasing the interval between reviews, possibly with better monitoring of Centre performance between reviews.

82. There was general agreement that the credibility of reviews depended on preserving their external nature and making sure that clients' views were heard; that the study team approach was worth experimenting with; that there was a need to develop assessment methodologies for use in reviews; that flexibility should be retained in the timing of reviews, which should be phased round major strategic and management changes and that the expansion and restructuring of the CGIAR System provided a good opportunity to examine and experiment with the review process. TAC agreed to present a report to the CGIAR at its Mid-Term Meeting. The report, which would be followed by a policy paper in October, would seek the views of stakeholders in the review process, and would include sections on the purpose of reviews, the review process, problems and issues, and options for the future.

83. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman thanked Drs. Arnold and Ozgediz for their presentations and well-written papers. He also thanked TAC members and observers for a stimulating and helpful discussion. He recalled that at the CGIAR Mid-Term Meeting in 1987 in Montpellier, when the Ruttan report on Reviews was discussed, it had been proposed that the interval between reviews should be 6 to 8 years depending on circumstances, but donors had not been happy with the idea.

He also recalled that, before 1987, donors had had two instruments with which to judge the Centres - the reviews and the annual Centres' presentations, which had subsequently become biennial. In the intervening period, Centres had presented their Medium-Term Plans, which also provided an opportunity for donors to obtain information on Centres' progress. Dr. McCalla stated that perhaps the Medium-Term Plans could carry a TAC commentary, in which case there might be greater receptivity to lengthening the review interval.

84. Dr. McCalla concluded that the CGIAR would benefit from a progress report on the external review process at its Mid-Term Meeting in Paris. He requested that the report be prepared to include firm options for the review process that would be seen as retaining its credibility, comprehensiveness, seriousness and independence (rather than externality). He stated that, with TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat moving more and more towards joint reviews, there was a need to resolve the operational issues. This could be achieved through an ad hoc policy group comprising the Chairman and Executive Secretary of TAC, the CGIAR Executive Secretary, the Management Advisor from the CGIAR Secretariat, and the Chairman of the Standing Committee for External Reviews.

- Report of the Standing Committee for Resource Allocation

85. The Chairman called on Dr. R. Dudal, Chairman of the Standing Committee for Resource Allocation, to present his report under this agenda item. Dr. Dudal highlighted several issues which his Committee had discussed. The first was the major issue of the links between resource allocation and priorities and strategies. He had attended the technical meeting in Rome which the Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies had called in January. It had been agreed at the meeting that, by June 1991, a scoring of priorities by commodities and RAEZs would be completed. The priority ratings would take into account the desirable structure of the CGIAR system in the long and medium term. Subsequently, the Standing Committee on Resource Allocation would use the scores as the basis for projecting funding targets for the CGIAR Centres.

86. Although at this stage it was difficult to foresee exactly how the funding targets would be set, the Standing Committee on Resource Allocation had identified a number of key issues which should be taken into account in converting priorities into resource allocations. These included: the scale factor (i.e. the need for a critical mass in research); the different costs of research in different regions; the need for capital expenditure; the likelihood of success; and the evolving strength of NARS. The latter two issues would already have been considered in the priority-setting phase, but would need to be revisited in the resource allocation process against the background of the specific environments in which the different Centres are working.

87. As part of the implementation of the new resource allocation process, the Standing Committee would review at TAC 55 new guidelines for Medium-Term Plans from Centres. The 1997 target resource allocations would be included in the guidelines, the development of which would require both a bottom-up and a top-down approach. At TAC 55 the Standing Committee planned to review a draft report on the issue of capital expenditure in the CGIAR, the findings of which would also be used in the new resource allocation process.

88. The Standing Committee had also discussed the annual budgets of ICARDA and IRRI. In the case of ICARDA, the Committee had recommended TAC approval of the 1991 annual budget at the level specified in the Medium-Term Plan. TAC had concurred. In the case of IRRI, the Centre had requested approval to change a position from Computer Specialist to Training and Courseware Specialist. Dr. Dudal noted that IRRI had made a good case for this change, and TAC had approved it accordingly. However, TAC did not approve IRRI's request that responsibility for such decisions be delegated to the Centres. As a matter of policy TAC endorsed the current guidelines which require a Centre to seek approval for changes exceeding 1% of the annual budget and requested Centres to continue to follow these guidelines.

89. In closing his report, Dr. Dudal foresaw a heavy workload for the Standing Committee and TAC in the area of resource allocation in the next four TAC meetings. At TAC 55, 18 annual budget submissions would have to be reviewed. New guidelines for 1993 annual budgets would also have to be issued. Some Centres would develop 1993 budgets based on current Medium-Term Plans and others based on new plans.

90. In thanking Dr. Dudal for the report of the Standing Committee, the Chairman reiterated his point that the new resource allocation process would create a lot of work for TAC, and requested that the Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies take note of its responsibility in preparing for this process.

Follow-up to the Expansion of the CGIAR - (Agenda Item 6)

(a) IIMI Strategic Plan

91. Introducing this agenda item, the Chairman expressed pleasure in welcoming IIMI to a TAC meeting for the first time as one of the newest members of the CGIAR. IIMI had been one of a number of non-associated centres recommended by TAC for inclusion. A process of transition had subsequently been devised and set in train by the CGIAR Secretariat and TAC. The tentative schedule for IIMI would involve an informal dialogue on the IIMI Strategic Plan; the submission of a 1992 Annual Programme and Budget to TAC 55; the preparation of a Medium-Term Plan for consideration at TAC 57 in March 1992; and, pending a final appraisal by the Standing Committee on External Reviews, the deferring of an external review of IIMI until 1993, at which time IIMI would re-draft its Strategic Plan. At this first interaction with TAC, the Board Chair and Director General would discuss the 1989 version of IIMI's Strategic Plan, which had been distributed to TAC with an enclosure - "Preliminary Notes for a Review and Revision of the IIMI Strategy Paper". IIMI was looking to TAC for critical and constructive comments on its plan.

92. The Chairman then welcomed Mr. David Bell, Chair of the IIMI Board, recalling that he had been closely involved with the CGIAR for many years in his position with the Ford Foundation and had contributed a great deal to the System. He also welcomed Dr. Roberto Lenton, the Director General of IIMI.

93. Mr. Bell said that he was pleased to represent IIMI's Board at this first meeting with TAC. He particularly looked forward to hearing

TAC's comments and advice as IIMI began the task of updating its Strategic Plan to take into account the issues arising as the Institute entered the CGIAR.

94. Dr. Lenton began by recollecting the history of TAC's consideration of the issue of water management, which had begun in the 1970s. Based on the recommendations of various study teams, TAC had endorsed an initiative in water management, but the CGIAR had decided it could not adopt IIMI. A sub-set of donors had therefore met in 1982 to form the IIMI donor support group. IIMI had formally begun operations in 1984 in Sri Lanka, subsequently establishing a number of country programmes. The Strategic Plan had been developed in 1987-88 through extensive consultations with staff and clients and with help from the CGIAR Secretariat. The Plan began by outlining the context of irrigated agriculture, which has involved massive capital investments and makes an important contribution to rural development. However, the performance of irrigation systems is below potential in terms of productivity, equity, sustainability, and impact on human wellbeing. IIMI's job is to address these problems, recognizing that many countries have no irrigation management programmes and that research is dispersed across a wide range of disciplines.

95. IIMI's internal environment and values are in line with those of the CGIAR Centres. The Institute conducts multidisciplinary, collaborative field research using a problem-solving approach. IIMI believes in strengthening NARS and in the promotion of social justice. IIMI's comparative advantage in the pursuit of these goals lies in its international status, which promotes objectivity; its multi-country focus; its long-term presence in some countries; its spirit of collaboration; and its emphasis on multidisciplinary programmes. IIMI's mission is to "strengthen national efforts to improve and sustain the performance of irrigation systems in developing countries, through the development and dissemination of management innovations". Management innovations are methods for improving performance and are concerned with management in the broad sense - i.e. technology, policy and organization.

96. Dr. Lenton said that IIMI had identified 13 important factors affecting irrigation management. These had been grouped as seven themes on which IIMI's programmes focussed. Three of these themes concerned institutional issues. Management innovations were developed in both thematic and specific contexts and disseminated through field research and through the IIMI training and information programmes. Training emphasized management, including the development of curricula for management training and the building of institutional capacity in developing countries. IIMI's mode of operation was decentralized, totally collaborative, and concentrated in five agro-ecological zones. A balance had been struck in terms of the number of countries involved, avoiding spreading the programme too thinly, but including enough countries to provide a diversity of agro-ecologies and a basis for comparative studies. The organizational structure had recently been changed to include a Research Director, previously the Programme Director.

97. Concluding his presentation, Dr. Lenton discussed changes planned by IIMI as it entered the CGIAR and the changes the CGIAR itself was currently undergoing. IIMI's mission statement would be re-examined for clarity; the interaction between irrigation management and

technology would be examined in the light of the creation of the International Programme for Technology and Research on Irrigation and Drainage (IPTRID); the relationship between IIMI and other CGIAR Centres would be discussed; IIMI would look carefully at its relationships with NARS as they evolve; and the Institute would examine its country-specific and thematic research as the ecoregional approach evolved within the CGIAR. IIMI looked forward to TAC's comments on these and other issues related to its Strategic Plan.

98. Opening the discussion, the Chairman called first on Drs. Amir Muhammed and Kamla Chowdhry, who had recently represented TAC at IIMI Board meetings. Dr. Muhammed pointed out that this was a historic moment for IIMI and TAC, water management having been raised as a possible research area at the first TAC meeting 22 years ago. The IIMI Strategic Plan was clear, concise and systematic. Irrigation management was a wide topic involving the planning, lay-out, management and engineering of irrigation systems. Among major questions facing IIMI were where to lay emphasis and whom to work with. IIMI had to contend with the fact that in some countries irrigation departments and agriculture departments competed with one another. There was heavy emphasis on engineering and design in the strategy. The dominant theme should be the farmer and advancing his/her welfare through the improved supply of irrigation water. IIMI should also carefully monitor the development of IPTRID.

99. Dr. Chowdhry commented that she had found the level of discussion at the IIMI Board meeting she had attended to be extraordinarily good. She felt that IIMI's mission statement should better reflect the CGIAR goals, which encompassed sustainability, gender equity and other concerns. IIMI should consider a shift in emphasis from large to smaller irrigation schemes. Shortages of water in aquifers, and other uses for water, had to be taken into account. Legal questions, common resource issues and the distribution of water in the future should also be considered. Irrigation water is primarily a male concern, whereas drinking water is a female issue. Dr. Chowdhry said that IIMI's programme currently appeared to be donor driven, and this should be reviewed now that the Institute had joined the CGIAR.

100. Other TAC members raised many important points about IIMI's strategy. IIMI should clearly indicate the choices it had made and should comment on what it did not include in its programmes and why. In particular, the balance and emphasis between productivity and sustainability should be clarified, in terms of the trade-offs involved, especially in relation to work on problems such as salinity and waterlogging. The criteria for judging where to locate research should be stated explicitly. Lastly, it was asked how IIMI would lead from thematic research into generic principles. The question of the benefits and impact of IIMI's programme should also be addressed.

101. TAC members asked whether IIMI would take on the issue of watershed management, which was a key factor determining the sustainable supply of irrigation water in many developing countries. A related comment concerned the need for a parallel institution to IIMI to undertake studies of the organizational needs of groups of farmers in rainfed areas.

102. Other issues raised included: the difficulty of working with farmer-managed systems owing to the scarcity of partner organizations;

the need to give more emphasis to humid areas, where environmental problems such as erosion were serious; the importance of IIMI's focus on irrigation rather than water management, since irrigation changes the whole ecosystem and requires a broader approach; the question of IIMI's role as a service organization and its involvement in technical assistance rather than research; and the possible competition and overlap between IPTRID and IIMI in the irrigation field.

103. Mr. Bell and Dr. Lenton responded to all of the points raised, many of which would be taken into account in the revision of the Strategic Plan. They said that they considered IIMI to be a research, not a service, organization. Most research at IIMI aims to develop solutions to problems through collaboration with national programmes. Although the Asian Development Bank classified the IIMI projects which it funds as technical assistance, the work is not technical assistance in the sense of passing on existing knowledge. IIMI is concerned with irrigation management in the broad sense and not with the narrower field of water management. For this reason, IIMI's programme was somewhat different from that of IBSRAM, which IIMI believed to consider soil management in a somewhat narrower context. Dr. Lenton said that IIMI would be looking closely at its strategy in relation to irrigation technology research. IIMI had been included in the discussions at which IPTRID had been planned and had ensured that IIMI's work was taken into account in that planning. An IIMI staff member was being seconded to IPTRID to foster collaboration between the two organizations. Mr. Bell commented that this was an evolving situation at which IIMI was looking closely. He concluded by saying that he was pleased and impressed by the effectiveness of TAC.

104. The Chairman concluded the discussion by commenting that TAC had presented IIMI with a set of penetrating questions. He looked forward to discussing IIMI's budget in June and the Centre's Medium-Term Plan at a later date. He thanked Mr. Bell and Dr. Lenton for participating.

(b) Elaboration of TAC's Proposals on Ecoregional Mechanisms/
Centres and Research on Resource Management

105. The Chairman introduced this topic by recalling the TAC report on a "Possible Expansion of the CGIAR" ^{1/}, which had been presented to ICW'90. This report described two distinct kinds of entities or approaches in the TAC medium- and long-term visions of the CGIAR System. One kind was ecoregional entities, the other global entities with responsibilities for particular germplasm or subject-matter areas. The CGIAR had generally endorsed these concepts, but had raised questions about what exactly TAC meant by ecoregional mechanisms and what were the researchable problems better addressed at that level. The Group had also asked for more explanation concerning the conceptual approaches that TAC foresaw would allow the CGIAR to address research on the management of natural resources in a more positive fashion. The Chairman had agreed that TAC would prepare a paper which elaborated the Committee's thinking on an ecoregional approach to research and particularly to research on resource management. This paper was to be

^{1/} AGR/TAC:IAR/90/24

available for discussion by the CGIAR at its meeting in May. A draft 1/ had been circulated for discussion at the current meeting.

106. The Chairman exhorted TAC members and observers at the meeting, especially donor representatives, to comment frankly on the draft during the discussion. TAC would consider all comments and distil them into a revised annotated outline which would serve as a basis for the rewrite to be undertaken by the TAC Secretariat. To introduce the paper he then called on Dr. Eric Craswell of the TAC Secretariat, who had been its primary author.

107. Dr. Craswell's presentation focussed on the major issues in the paper, and particularly on policy issues on which TAC's decisions were needed. After discussing background issues such as the CGIAR programmes on the sustainability of agriculture, the paper reviewed the global context and agenda for research on resource management. However, this section was kept brief, so as to avoid overlap with TAC's revision of the CGIAR priorities and strategies paper, currently in progress. Although the paper dealt with resource management in the broad sense, it also pointed out that CGIAR research in this area should be selective, focussing primarily on resource issues related to the production of those commodities in the CGIAR research portfolio.

108. The paper reviewed the lessons learned in the CGIAR in the organization of research on the management of natural resources. To strengthen this research in the system effectively would require a re-organization of CGIAR activities into ecoregional and global commodity or subject matter mechanisms. The CIAT Strategic Plan, which illustrated how an ecoregional Centre could utilize knowledge of the resource endowment of a region to define resource management research priorities, was amongst a number of Centre plans analysed in the paper. The ecoregional concept was then discussed in the context of the role of NARS. The paper also elaborated on an evolving multidisciplinary systems approach to resource management. Staff of the CGIAR Secretariat had made a valuable contribution to this section of the paper.

109. A number of areas of strategic research on resource management, in which overlap might occur between ecoregional entities, were listed and discussed in the paper. To improve the efficiency of research in the CGIAR, mechanisms such as the assignment of mandates, the formation of inter-Centre networks and the creation of small coordinating mechanisms, had been used. The paper analysed these mechanisms in relation to the ecoregional approach. It made a case for creating a focal point within the CGIAR in the area of natural resources - similar to IBPGR for genetic resources - to handle information dissemination, the standardization of methodologies and the coordination of research on resource management.

110. Dr. Craswell concluded by pointing out three key policy issues on which decisions were needed - the scope of CGIAR research on the management of natural resources, the need for a central coordinating mechanism and the question of how far the paper should go in analyzing the institutional and financial implications of the ecoregional approach. On the last point, the paper stopped short of a detailed

1/ An Ecoregional Approach to Research in the CGIAR (AGR/TAC: IAR/91/8)

analysis on the grounds that the priorities and strategies paper, and the subsequent implementation of the new resource allocation process in the CGIAR, would address these issues.

111. In the ensuing discussion TAC members and observers raised a number of important points concerning the paper. A TAC member suggested that the paper state the main advantages of the ecoregional approach which lay in: additional resource management research; coordination benefits, especially with NARS; enhanced research spillovers; and greater cost-effectiveness. Another commented that the IBPGR analogy for the focal point was not appropriate because unlike seeds, most natural resources had to be conserved in situ. Human dimensions, TAC's policy on levels of inputs, the need to continue to emphasize crop productivity research, the need for focus and selectivity, the necessity for a decentralized rather than a global approach, and the use of "free-entry, free-exit" networks were other issues raised by TAC members and observers. Donor representatives, who had been asked to make comments, observed that this paper was seen as a step in the right direction by providing further background against which outstanding institutional issues, such as the inclusion of IBSRAM and IFDC in the CGIAR, could be reconsidered.

112. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman commented on a number of recurring themes which had been raised. These included: the need to set the ecoregional approach in the context of the expanded CGIAR and in parallel with productivity research; the need to incorporate a broad view of land use, including the human dimension; and the question of whether the global mechanism should be further explored at this point.

113. TAC decided on a number of changes to the structure and content of the paper. The chapter on conceptual notions and roles for ecoregional mechanisms should be moved in front of the section on the research agenda for sustainable agriculture. Other structural changes were to move the detailed description of an approach to resource management research to an annex, to consolidate the sections on research organization and coordination, and to add a brief section on conclusions and implications. A number of changes were proposed to clarify: (a) the rationale for the ecoregional approach; and (b) the role of ecoregional entities in the adaptive - strategic research spectrum. It was felt that the human and socio-economic aspects of resource management research should receive more attention in the paper.

114. TAC also decided that ecoregional research should focus on increased and sustainable production of crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries, with special reference to the farming systems and commodities in the CGIAR portfolio. It was felt that the decentralized approach proposed in the paper precluded the need for a global entity, at least at this early stage in the CGIAR's re-structuring. The issue of non-associated Centres involved in soil and water management and fertilizer research would not be re-opened in this paper. Institutional aspects would be discussed as part of the priorities and strategies exercise, and during the implementation of the new resource allocation process.

(c) Elaboration of TAC's Views on IARCs/NARS Interface

115. The Chairman introduced this item by recalling that, while many delegates at ICW'90 had appreciated TAC's interest in strengthening

NARS, some had felt that the relationship between NARS and the CGIAR required further elaboration. Of particular concern among participants was the appropriate division of responsibilities for basic, strategic, applied and adaptive research. Further, in the light of the statement in the expansion paper that "if the CGIAR is to be judged a success, the capacity of national programmes has to be increased" (Section 8.2), several participants had emphasized the view that the task of strengthening NARS should receive higher priority. However, it was not clear what role the CGIAR could be expected to play.

116. At the request of the Chairman, Dr. Monyo outlined the main highlights of the paper on this subject prepared by the TAC Secretariat 1/. He gave an overview of the status and perspectives of NARS, and outlined some of the critical factors that determine their effectiveness and efficiency. He also summarized some of the major policy statements by the CGIAR, TAC and Centres on the issue of the IARC-NARS interface; the historical evolution of relationships between IARCs and NARS; and the special role of ISNAR. Finally, he re-stated TAC's position on future modes of collaboration between IARCs and NARS, including a possible role for ecoregional mechanisms.

117. The presentation was followed by a lengthy and lively discussion covering all shades of opinion regarding the appropriate role and future directions of the CGIAR in strengthening NARS.

118. On the one hand, some TAC members and observers considered the problem of poor NARS performance to be highly political and primarily a reflection of the policy environment at national level. This group also considered structural problems to be associated with the poor performance of NARS: examples of inefficient NARS that had large cadres of well trained scientists and adequate financial resources were cited. For such NARS, lack of autonomy from civil service procedures was identified as a major bottleneck. The strengthening of NARS was seen by this group to be largely a development function. Given the political nature of the issues to be resolved, the CGIAR did not have a comparative advantage for tackling the problem. Nonetheless, the CGIAR could play a significant role, especially through ISNAR, by training NARS leaders and by developing training materials for policy-makers. There was strong support for the view that all CGIAR relationships with NARS should be research-based.

119. On the other hand, there were those who advocated a greater role for the CGIAR, beyond research and research-related activities in the medium term, in strengthening the scientific and institutional capacity of NARS. Among the approaches suggested were self-supporting development units at the IARCs, to provide technical assistance as well as to support institution-building activities. Centres would develop country programmes for the weaker NARS and for small countries that could not afford a critical mass of researchers. There was also support for forging close links with development agencies, especially in the case of forestry and fisheries.

120. A Centre Director noted that the mandates of the IARCs required them to work with NARS. In operational terms, this was done mainly

1/ Elaboration of TAC's Views on the Relationship Between the CGIAR and National Research Systems (AGR/TAC:IAR/91/5)

through complementary activities using special project funding. This mechanism helped the Centres build bridges between themselves and NARS. He advocated flexibility. However, since the Centres were receiving different signals from TAC and from some donors, he urged TAC and the CGIAR to define specific criteria which should be used by the IARCs to accept or reject complementary projects related to the strengthening of NARS.

121. During further discussion some elements of an emerging consensus became apparent. There was general support for the analytical framework used in the paper on "Activities and Modes of Operation in the CGIAR" ^{1/}, particularly for relations between NARS and individual Centres. The need to define what is meant by "NARS", and "Strengthening of NARS" was stressed. Some participants wanted explicit criteria to distinguish "weak NARS" from "strong NARS".

122. TAC decided to limit the discussion to public-sector research institutions and organizations, so as to avoid confusion. There was general agreement that strengthening of NARS was largely a development function for which the CGIAR had no comparative advantage, since the System neither covered all the commodities and subject matter areas of concern to the crop, livestock, forestry and fisheries sectors, nor did it have the required resources. However, TAC considered that the CGIAR could and should contribute to the strengthening of NARS. For instance, the IARCs could provide advice on project design. Some TAC members and observers considered that without IARC involvement in the strengthening of NARS, the new initiatives on forestry and fisheries could not be implemented successfully. The need for strong links with development agencies like FAO was reiterated.

123. There was some support for the creation of an explicit "development" component in IARCs' Medium-Term Plans. This would distinguish technical assistance from "research" activities, making "development" activities more transparent. Since a conducive policy environment at national level is necessary for any sustained public-sector support to NARS, the IARCs should be sensitive to the level of political commitment in formulating their approaches to strengthening NARS. Through ISNAR, the CGIAR should develop methodologies to enable NARS leaders to articulate their priorities and strategies in ways that would help them to build political support.

124. The conclusions of the paper were generally endorsed. It was suggested that the range of collaborative activities between the IARCs and NARS should be elaborated further. In addition, the paper should include an update of current special projects involving collaboration between IARCs and NARS.

125. Many participants advocated an increased role for ISNAR in the strengthening of NARS capacity, especially in forestry and fisheries. TAC saw an important role for ISNAR in project preparation in collaboration with other IARCs. It was suggested that ISNAR should consider outposting some of its staff to the other IARCs to enhance inter-institutional collaboration and interaction. It was also

^{1/} AGR/TAC:IAR/90/4

suggested that ISNAR should mount a study on the management of research and information networks, since the number of these was likely to increase in future given the proposed expansion of the CGIAR.

126. TAC considered that IFPRI and IIMI could also play a significant role with respect to the policy environment, human resources and management issues. The use of ecoregional mechanisms to enhance interactions between CGIAR Centres and NARS should receive serious consideration and support.

127. Finally, a two-stage approach to defining a CGIAR policy on relations between the IARCs and NARS was suggested. Stage one would consist of the preparation of a brief "Issues and Options" paper for consideration at the Mid-Term Meeting of the CGIAR in May 1991. This would contain a concise description of the array of current and potential activities of the IARCs that contribute to the strengthening of NARS, so as to provide a framework for discussion. In order to solicit the views of developing countries, the Regional Representatives to the CGIAR should be requested to obtain the necessary feedback from their regions. Stage two would be the preparation of a policy statement for discussion at ICW'91. This second paper should specify explicitly those activities considered appropriate for the CGIAR System.

ICRISAT External Reviews - (Agenda Item 7)

128. In introducing the discussion on the ICRISAT External Reviews, the Chairman welcomed Dr. E.F. Henzell, Chairman of the External Programme Review, Mr. D. Walton, Chairman of the External Management Review, Mr. W. Mashler, Chairman of the ICRISAT Board of Trustees, Dr. L.D. Swindale, Director General, Dr. Y.L. Nene, Deputy Director General, and Mr. R.W. Gibbons, Executive Director, ICRISAT Sahelian Centre. Although the External Review had been conducted by two panels, they had produced a single report.

129. Dr. E.F. Henzell presented an overview of the main findings of the External Programme Review. He first pointed to the general conclusion of both panels, namely that ICRISAT was a strong, well-run organization with a good record of achievement. The panels had recognized the difficulties, both technical and non-technical, of working in the semi-arid tropics. Considerable efforts had been made by the panels to examine ICRISAT's record of achievements and impact. ICRISAT had a very good record of achievements and there was already clear evidence of its impact. However, the Centre needed to make a greater effort to analyse its impact, too much of the information available at present being anecdotal. The panels had noted the importance of policy changes for obtaining impact. They had, in addition, assessed ICRISAT's contributions to science. Overall, the panels had concluded that ICRISAT had contributed substantially to the mission and goals of the CGIAR, including building national research capacities.

130. ICRISAT's mandate was considered to be broad. There was a danger of diluting the research effort as a result of pressures to undertake more adaptive and applied research. The panels had recommended that ICRISAT formulate a precise operational mandate within its formal mandate.

131. Research at ICRISAT was organized as three multidisciplinary programmes - cereals, legumes and resource management - supported by several specialized units and facilities. The cereals programme had moved towards more strategic research, as recommended by the previous EPR in 1984. The boundary between the cereals programme and the Genetic Resources Centre was diffuse, however, and required clarification. The legumes programme should gradually phase out the production of finished varieties and give greater attention to crop protection research, including integrated pest management, in view of the strong pest and disease pressures of the semi-arid tropics. The resource management programme had good analytical ability and was performing well, but there was a need to strengthen its interdisciplinary work. Greater attention should also be given to problems of technology adoption and the implications of new technology for sensitive social issues, such as those related to gender, and to the problems of soil degradation in the semi-arid tropics. With respect to the supporting units, the panels had recommended that ICRISAT commission a major review of the need for biochemistry in its crop improvement research.

132. The panels had been generally impressed with ICRISAT's activities in Southern and Sahelian Africa. In the Sahelian Centre, the only source of concern was the Groundnut Improvement Programme, which needed to review its objectives and priorities. With respect to ICRISAT's draft Strategic Plan, the panels had made a number of comments and had suggested that ICRISAT have a thorough dialogue with national programmes. The panels had also considered the issue of "one or more ICRISATs?", and had concluded that there would not be an advantage in splitting ICRISAT.

133. Mr. D. Walton presented the outcome of the management review. ICRISAT had responded very well to the recommendations of the previous EMR conducted in 1984. The Centre could now be given a certificate of very good health. It would face a major challenge in the near future as the Director General and four out of five programme directors would all be retiring. The External Management Review had identified six pressure points. First, a study on the relations between ICRISAT and the NARS of India was needed. This study should be non-confrontational, should deal with institutional relations and should contain an agreement on research priorities. Second, there was a need to develop a project-based research management system at ICRISAT. Third, the management and administrative system should be upgraded. Fourth, ICRISAT should look at its long-term staffing problem and at career opportunities at the Centre, which were limited at present. Fifth, ICRISAT would have to carefully assess its future activities in Southern Africa. Sixth, the panels had been impressed with the operations of ICRISAT's Sahelian Centre which also provided a roof for several other research organizations, but relations with national programmes in West Africa were not always optimal. The absence of a regional entity like SACCAR made the development of such relations more difficult.

134. Mr. William Mashler expressed the gratitude of ICRISAT's Board of Trustees and of its management for a fair, well-presented, constructive and helpful report. The way the panels had interacted with the management, staff and Board of ICRISAT had been particularly appreciated. The constructive recommendations made in the report were welcomed and would be treated seriously. They would be implemented to the greatest extent possible, as had also been the case with the recommendations of the previous review. Mr. Mashler expressed concern

at the high costs Centres have to bear when preparing for External Reviews and producing Medium-Term and Strategic Plans. In the case of ICRISAT, these tasks had taken 3 years. While recognizing their importance, the burden on Centres' core budgets was very large. Mr. Mashler then pointed to the large amount of work that had been performed by the Board, and to the role it had played in the selection of a new Director General. With respect to the gender issue, he expressed disappointment at the limited number of female candidates for Board membership. Mr. Mashler made some further comments on the excellent relations between the Government of India and ICRISAT. Finally, he drew attention to the fourth version of ICRISAT's draft Strategic Plan, which had been submitted to TAC for comments. It was intended to incorporate the comments of TAC, the incoming Director General and the Board, which was due to meet shortly, into a final version.

135. Dr. Swindale also expressed his appreciation of the External Reviews and paid tribute to the two panel Chairmen for their professionalism and skill in projecting a positive image of the review to the management and staff of the institute. He welcomed the combined single report and found the recommendations largely acceptable. He stated that most of them would probably be adopted, although in ICRISAT's written formal response to the reviews this had not been explicitly indicated since some CGIAR members did not like Centres to declare that they would adopt recommendations before the Group had made its comments.

136. In response to the panels' observations on ICRISAT's relations with India, the Centre had developed a clear workplan for cooperative research, and a special study had been undertaken by the Government of India on its relationship with ICRISAT. ICRISAT was pleased that the panels had concluded that the Centre had developed good relations with NARS. As to the Strategic Plan, Dr. Swindale delayed his introductory comments until after the discussion of the external review reports.

137. Dr. K. Chowdhry, TAC liaison scientist, opened the discussion by expressing her appreciation of the External Reviews. The report was extremely useful and informative. She asked for clarification on the panels' recommendation to formulate an operational mandate within the boundaries of the formal mandate. Was this not going to hinder flexibility in the Centre's activities and should such a judgement not be left to ICRISAT? Dr. Chowdhry agreed with the panels' observations on governance and gender, and asked how ICRISAT could eventually operate as an "ecoregional" Centre. With respect to relations with the Government of India, these were generally excellent, but the panels' recommendation to review them merited support. She suggested that ICRISAT should give greater attention to the role that could be played by non-governmental organizations.

138. Dr. C.T. de Wit, TAC resource person in the External Programme Review, pointed to the importance of the nematode problem and the need for more research on this subject. He also expressed concern about the groundnut programme at the Sahelian Centre.

139. Other TAC members were generally complimentary of the report and paid tribute to the work of the panels. There was a lively discussion on the section on impact in the report, and on the need for Centres to undertake impact assessment studies. One TAC member noted that more and more Centre resources were being allocated to activities

other than research geared to increasing productivity, and cautioned against an over-emphasis on impact studies. Other TAC members stressed the need for Centres to undertake impact assessment studies which were based on solid evidence. Such studies should also be conducted in concert with Centres' priority setting and strategic planning exercises. Donors also wanted impact analysis. With respect to ICRISAT's impact in Sahelian Africa, it was recognized that this was likely to be slow to materialize.

140. Questions were raised as to whether the attention given to the striga problem was adequate, and to the relations of ICRISAT with national programmes in West Africa. Clarification was sought on ICRISAT's involvement in adaptive research, on the quality of ICRISAT's science and on the rationale for its groundnut research in India. One observer commented on the observations by the Board Chairman on the cost of the review process, noting that in the absence of External Reviews commissioned by TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat donors would be obliged to mount their own individual reviews.

141. In his response, Dr. Henzell stressed that it had been the panels' view that impact assessment should be a cost-effective process and that it was necessary for better planning of future research. In recommending the formulation of an operational mandate, flexibility would not be affected. The panels had found the quality of science at ICRISAT to be good and the output of publications by scientists satisfactory.

142. Mr. Walton stressed the need for impact assessment studies based on solid evidence. Reviews should be conducted every 5 or 6 years; the Centres and the panels could improve their preparations for reviews. ICRISAT needed to give greater attention to the gender issue. Mr. Walton also noted that many NARS would not survive long in the absence of the Centres.

143. Dr. Swindale pointed to the many stakeholders in the CGIAR System and to the difficulties faced by Centres in setting priorities because of donor pressures. TAC should give guidance to the Centres on what constituted impact. ICRISAT would appoint a scientist to work on ex-ante impact assessment in relation to the Centre's resource allocation and priority setting exercises. ICRISAT had already prepared an interesting impact study on its vertisol work and had also undertaken analytical work on the gender issue. He also noted that the panels may have given inadequate recognition to the excellent policy research undertaken by ICRISAT in collaboration with IFPRI in Southern Africa, and to the good relations that existed between ICRISAT and other Centres.

144. Dr. Swindale noted that some scientists in national programmes are not always fully committed to the collaborative research they are engaged in. ICRISAT had positive experiences in working with NGOs and intended to give them more attention in future. In response to the question on the rationale for groundnut research in India, Dr. Swindale pointed to that country's important market for vegetable oils.

145. Mr. R.W. Gibbons commented on the need to review the groundnut programme of ISC; he agreed with this need, and a review was already scheduled to take place. This programme received substantial cooperation from other institutions and was therefore able to take on a

larger research agenda than other programmes. Several varieties that had performed well in Asia had also adapted well in Eastern Africa. With respect to the problem of nematodes, he recognized its importance. There was a need for a soil biologist who would have to study the useful as well as the harmful ones. Ongoing work on nematodes was under discussion and was implemented in cooperation with ORSTOM and a Dutch programme.

146. Dr. Swindale then introduced the fourth draft of ICRISAT's Strategic Plan. The process ICRISAT had followed in developing this strategy was described in the draft and had included a series of meetings, consultations and reports. The External Review Panels had considered the third draft, and references in their report to ICRISAT's strategy had been carefully reviewed and incorporated. This fourth draft also incorporated the results of ICRISAT's discussions with the heads of 13 African and 6 Asian NARS. The section on operational implications had been completely re-written. The semi-arid tropics would remain at the heart of ICRISAT's mandate. The mandate crops would remain the same, with the minor addition of finger millet in Africa. There were clear shifts in the plan towards strategic research, sustainability concerns, income generation, women in development and technology assessment. Commodity priorities had been carefully considered on the basis of quantitative analysis. Finally, Dr. Swindale noted that the ICRISAT Board, management and staff had carefully considered the draft Strategic Plan and its implications for ICRISAT's future goals, directions, activities and approaches.

147. In the ensuing discussions, TAC members were generally complimentary about ICRISAT's draft Strategic Plan. It read well and gave a good overview of the problems and opportunities for research in the semi-arid tropics. Several of the important issues raised in the plan were not tackled in depth, however, such as the relations between ICRISAT Hyderabad and its host country and with ISC, and the balance between strategic and applied research. ICRISAT remained rather "fuzzy" on several of these important issues. A number of System-wide issues were raised, such as ICRISAT's possible role as an ecoregional Centre, and its activities in resource management and agroforestry.

148. Questions were also raised with respect to ICRISAT's intended activities in satellite imagery and farming systems research, how views of NARS had been incorporated in the Strategic Plan, and the Centre's views on accountability. It was noted that ICRISAT needed to more clearly define the specific agro-ecological environments within the semi-arid tropics at which its research was targetted. This would facilitate the drawing of boundaries for ICRISAT's work and allow for the clear identification of adaptive, applied and strategic research needs. One TAC member asked for a clearer rationale for ICRISAT's involvement with pearl millet, and how ICRISAT would prioritize its activities in a situation of severe financial constraint. The issue of the role of social science at ICRISAT was also raised.

149. Dr. Swindale elaborated on the involvement of NARS in the development of the plan. They had been invited to participate in a meeting, and their comments on the third draft of the report had been requested. He noted that NARS are composed not only of publicly funded institutions but also included the private sector and NGOs.

150. ICRISAT gave attention to agroforestry research. It has a full-time agroforestry scientist in its resource management programme

and closely collaborated with ICRAF and an NGO on this subject. ICRISAT was involved in satellite imagery, also in collaboration with other institutes. ICRISAT had not addressed its possible role as an ecoregional Centre because the CGIAR had not yet developed a position on this. The Centre focussed its activities on the drier parts of the semi-arid tropics. Dr. Swindale could not see the need for ICRISAT to state in the plan how it intended to respond to a situation of reduced financial resources. The Centre had made an analysis of different types of research needs/activities for each commodity for each region. This had been part of the background work in preparing the strategic plan. With respect to economics research, the last external review had suggested merging the farming systems programme with that of economics in the newly proposed resource management programme. Greater emphasis would in future be given to the role of economists in priority setting and impact assessment.

151. In closing the discussion, the Chairman informed the Committee that a workshop on impact assessment in international agricultural research would shortly be organized at Cornell University. He thanked the Chairmen of both reviews for their excellent work, and the representatives of ICRISAT for their contributions to the discussion. After further consideration, TAC offered the following commentary.

TAC COMMENTARY ON THE EXTERNAL REVIEWS OF ICRISAT

152. TAC was grateful to Dr. E.F. Henzell and Mr. D. Walton and the members of the External Programme and Management Review Panels for the thorough and forward-looking assessment of ICRISAT. It appreciated that the Panels had worked closely together and integrated their efforts in a single report, reflecting the inseparable nature of research and management issues. The report dealt with the major strategic issues facing ICRISAT in an analytical, innovative and positive way.

153. TAC was pleased that ICRISAT had been found to be a strong, well-run organization with an impressive record of achievements and impact. The Committee agreed with the views of the Panels and generally endorsed the recommendations made. Together with the External Review Report, TAC also considered the fourth version of ICRISAT's draft Strategic Plan. In transmitting the report of the External Review, TAC offers the following commentary, prepared with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat.

ICRISAT's Response to the External Reviews

154. TAC appreciated that, in his verbal presentation to the Committee, the Director General of ICRISAT had stated that the Centre found the recommendations of the Panels largely acceptable and that it would probably adopt most of them. TAC noted, however, that ICRISAT's written response to the reviews was largely noncommittal with respect to the Centre's agreement or disagreement with many of the observations and recommendations made by the Panels. The rationale given was that the Centre would formulate a more concrete response following the discussion of the Reviews by the CGIAR.

155. While TAC understood ICRISAT's reluctance to provide a comprehensive response at this stage, the uncertainty of ICRISAT's

position, particularly concerning the changes recommended by the Panels complicated the CGIAR's decision-making about this review. A clearly stated ICRISAT position would have provided the CGIAR with an alternative rationale on issues where ICRISAT disagreed with or did not fully endorse the viewpoint of the Panels. Also, a clearer response would have enabled TAC to provide a commentary to the CGIAR in full consideration of possible differing views.

Mandate

156. TAC concurred with the Panels that ICRISAT's formal mandate was very comprehensive and so broad that there was a danger of diluting the research effort. Therefore, it agreed with the recommendation that ICRISAT should develop an operational mandate within the boundaries set by its formal mandate. TAC stressed that ICRISAT should retain sufficient flexibility, enabling the operational mandate to be regularly updated.

Strategic Plan

157. TAC commended ICRISAT for its efforts in developing a new Strategic Plan for the 1990s, and particularly appreciated the Centre's efforts to obtain inputs from NARS in the planning process. The plan was well-written and informative, and discussed many issues and problems that ICRISAT may confront during the next decade. The Committee considered that ICRISAT's plan provided a good basis for developing a research agenda, but agreed with the Panels that a number of important issues were treated rather superficially, if at all. TAC noted that one of the essential elements of strategic planning was to deal explicitly with a number of important choices a Centre must make. With respect to ICRISAT, these choices were among others related to priorities in resource allocation among mandated commodities and ecoregional activities under financial constraints, the future direction of ICRISAT's activities in the host country, the balance between applied and strategic research, the targetting of research towards specific agro-ecological and geographic zones within the semi-arid tropics, and how the mandate would be operationalized to respond to changing needs and opportunities. Another issue that needed to be explored was the relationship between ICRISAT headquarters and its entities in sub-Saharan Africa.

158. The draft Strategic Plan presented to TAC was not fully definitive on these and a number of other issues. TAC recognized that a Strategic Plan was not a blueprint for action, but a statement of institutional direction. This called for some degree of flexibility. For it to be useful to ICRISAT and the System, however, the plan needed to show more explicitly the choices made, and spell out major institutional directions ("pathways"). It was difficult to decipher from the current draft plan in what significant ways the ICRISAT of tomorrow will be different from the ICRISAT of today. Without further clarity, the plan is not likely to serve as a guide to the Institute's future actions; any "pathway" might be argued to be permissible under the present formulation.

159. TAC recognized that ICRISAT might not wish to "tie its hands" by making hard choices; it was better to leave one's options open in order to take full advantage of future opportunities and make the harder

choices when the time comes. However, being part of a larger system required some degree of transparency to enable the whole system to direct its collective efforts towards its common goals.

160. TAC suggested that, in the next draft of the plan, ICRISAT introduce greater clarity in selecting its future priorities. The final draft of the plan should also show (perhaps in attached documentation) the rationale for the directional choices proposed. This information was necessary for an objective appraisal of ICRISAT's next Medium-Term Plan. TAC understood that the incoming Director General would play a significant role in finalizing the Strategic Plan.

Research Programme

161. TAC appreciated the significant changes that had been made in the structure of ICRISAT's research programme since the previous review, and the increasing share of strategic research being undertaken. The Committee was also pleased to note that responsibilities for technology dissemination in the area of groundnut production had been handed over to the National Dairy Development Board of India. TAC was also encouraged by the close collaboration of ICRISAT with the private sector on seed production, and by the growing cooperation with non-governmental agencies.

162. TAC appreciated the integration of biological and social scientists in the resource management programme. However, this approach, which had been initiated in response to a recommendation of the previous external review, had not yet achieved its intended effect, and it was not entirely clear how social scientists now contributed to commodity research at ICRISAT. Greater attention to the role of social scientists would be warranted, particularly in the identification of constraints, the specification of desired technology characteristics, priority setting and the assessment of technology adoption. ICRISAT might also consider allocating a greater share of resources to social science research. At present such research represented no more than 3% of ICRISAT's total core budget.

163. TAC noted the observations made by the Panels on the quality of science at ICRISAT and on the publication record of its research staff. The Committee encouraged ICRISAT to continue its efforts to ensure that the Centre's output remained of high quality and that publications were subjected to sufficient independent peer review.

External Relations

164. TAC was impressed with the web of relations ICRISAT had developed with its major stakeholders, and was pleased that these relations were managed effectively. It particularly appreciated ICRISAT's excellent relations with the Indian Government and other host countries. In view of the strength of the NARS in India, and the need for ICRISAT to give greater emphasis to strategic research, TAC concurred with the Panels' observation that there was a need for a thorough examination of ICRISAT's relations with India and its modes of collaboration and sharing of responsibility with Indian institutions.

165. TAC was pleased that ICRISAT had already initiated steps to undertake such an examination. ICRISAT's relations with Indian

institutions was a subject of great interest to the members of the CGIAR. The Committee suggested that ICRISAT should keep TAC and the CGIAR informed of the progress of this discussion.

Impact

166. TAC was pleased with the comprehensive approach the Panels had taken in assessing the achievements and impact of ICRISAT. It particularly appreciated the analytical framework used by the Panels in making this assessment, using as a basis the mission and goals of the CGIAR and the Centre's contributions to science. TAC was encouraged by ICRISAT's record of achievements and the emerging evidence of the Centre's impact. It also recognized that progress in semi-arid sub-Saharan Africa would be slow and concurred with the Panels' observation that a major effort in resource management would have to complement the current breeding efforts. The Committee noted that available information on ICRISAT's impact was to a large extent anecdotal, and concurred with the Panels that ICRISAT should commission an ex-post evaluation study of the impact of a sample of its activities.

Gender

167. TAC appreciated ICRISAT's efforts to incorporate gender issues in the research and management of the Centre. Greater efforts were necessary, however, particularly with respect to research on resource management, and the recruitment of a larger number of female staff.

Research Organization and Management

168. TAC was pleased to learn that ICRISAT had a decentralized system of research management and that it was working well. TAC endorsed the Panels' observations and views on the need to introduce a project-based research management and budgeting system. Such a system was necessary as a management tool and for linking research activities to strategic objectives, not as a replacement for the individual work plans of scientists.

169. TAC noted with concern the high number of senior management staff that would retire in the near future, and hoped that ICRISAT's Board and new Director General would ensure that timely steps were taken to fill these positions in order to sustain effective leadership.

Management of Human Resources

170. TAC was pleased that ICRISAT agreed with the major thrust of the recommendations for further improving this function. However, the Centre's response made no reference to a recommendation made by the Panels regarding the adoption of a policy of fixed-term appointments for all internationally recruited staff. Several CGIAR Centres had recently moved in this direction; some had already adopted such a policy. TAC encouraged ICRISAT to carefully consider this recommendation of the Panels and its underlying rationale.

Financial Management

171. TAC was pleased that ICRISAT had managed its finances well, under strong personal leadership from the Director General. His departure would undoubtedly leave a vacuum in this area. The Panels had repeated the 1984 ICRISAT EMR Panel's recommendation that an international staff member should be recruited in the area of financial management. The Board's response did not seem to favour this course of action. TAC suggested that the incoming Director General examine the adequacy of ICRISAT staffing in the finance area and ensure that ICRISAT continued to have strong and competent leadership in financial management.

Governance

172. The Panels had made a number of useful suggestions for further improving the performance of ICRISAT's Board of Trustees. These covered both the operations of the Board and its composition and committee structure. In particular, there was a need to take a fresh look at the way the Board fulfilled its policy-making and oversight responsibilities for ICRISAT's operations in sub-Saharan Africa.

Director General

173. TAC congratulated the outgoing Director General for his outstanding record in managing and guiding ICRISAT. The Committee was grateful for the contribution made by Dr. Swindale in providing leadership, furthering the cause of the CGIAR, and assisting NARS throughout the semi-arid tropics in the developing world.

IBPGR External Reviews - (Agenda Item 8)

174. In his introductory remarks, Dr. McCalla noted that the External Review of IBPGR had been conducted by a single Panel, and that its findings and recommendations were recorded in one integrated report. These arrangements reflected the attempt by TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat to streamline the external review process by closely integrating the programme and management components of reviews.

175. Dr. McCalla then introduced and welcomed Dr. William Tossell, Chairman of the IBPGR Board of Trustees, Ir. Dick van Sloten, Acting Director of IBPGR, Dr. Alison McCusker, Head of the Research Programme, and Mr. Hugh Rogers, Chairman of the Review Panel. He invited Mr. Rogers to present his report.

176. Mr. Rogers expressed his thanks to IBPGR for the excellence of the documents prepared, for the detailed arrangements made for the Panel's field visits and for the many friendly but frank discussions with the Board, senior management and staff. He acknowledged the invaluable professional and advisory contributions made by the TAC and CGIAR Secretariat resource persons, as well as by the legal consultant.

177. The Panel was determined to produce a positive, reasonably concise, and forward-looking report. It had concluded that this was an opportune time not only to examine the programme of IBPGR, but also to

comment on the wider role of the CGIAR System in the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources. Further, the Panel was concerned that there should be a positive response to the problems of conservation. This was because the Panel was firmly convinced of the need for efficient, long-term conservation of plant genetic resources.

178. Mr. Rogers then highlighted the considerable achievements of IBPGR in the area of germplasm collection and conservation, institution building, training, dissemination of information and generation of new knowledge. He noted that IBPGR relied on FAO for a variety of services and was unique in the CGIAR System in being subject to FAO personnel and financial policies. The plan now was to move towards independence, and IBPGR was in the process of separating administratively from FAO. Mr. Rogers stated that, taking into account all the changing circumstances with which IBPGR had had to contend during the period under review, the Panel had considered that IBPGR's Board and management had responded in a most commendable way.

179. The Panel had made 20 recommendations relating to aspects of IBPGR's programme and management that needed urgent attention. These included: the relatively high annual turnover of staff; the tentative nature of employment arrangements; the crisis management mode adopted by interim management; the weakness in the area of financial management; the dangerously low level of the operational budget; the vastly inadequate resources currently deployed to meet the challenge of IBPGR's mandate; the near impossible task given to the Regional Coordinators, and the lack of an overall, clear conceptual framework for research.

180. The Panel had found that there was a need for IBPGR staff to remain in close touch with plant breeding programmes, especially in developing countries and at the CGIAR commodity Centres. Attention had also been drawn to the need for the CGIAR Centres to broaden the scope of their scientific and technical support for the utilization of plant genetic resources by applying their research capabilities to solving problems that are "common denominators" across a range of species.

181. In addition to the above aspects, the Panel had noted two major developments whose implications had to be taken into account in the future activities of IBPGR. These were (a) the inability of NARS to mobilize the financial resources needed to maintain and exploit the collections they already had; and (b) the political awareness of "property rights", which was creating a desire for individual NARS to build and maintain their own genebanks, instead of relying on regional or international facilities. The latter development could also seriously affect access to germplasm. Finally, the Panel had concluded that IBPGR was at an important crossroads in its history, and that the present global interest in germplasm conservation and biodiversity offered the CGIAR System and IBPGR unique opportunities to contribute.

182. In his response the Chairman of the IBPGR Board of Trustees recalled that he had asked for a forward-looking and rigorous review, and thanked the Panel for meeting that challenge. He noted that the Board completely agreed with the outcome of the review, which was considered very fair. Dr. Tossell then informed TAC on IBPGR's recent progress. He noted that the main clients of IBPGR were the NARS, that IBPGR now had an integrated programme focus and good working space, that the management capacity was being restructured and strengthened, that collaboration with IARCs was improving, and that there would be a name

change to The International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI), once the institute was independently established.

183. Dr. Tossell stated that the Board of Trustees did not consider that its role was any different to the Boards in other CGIAR Centres. It saw its responsibilities in terms of creating an appropriate enabling environment for IBPGR. He admitted that the Board had got certain things wrong, such as staff contracts, but it had also got, or was getting, many others right, e.g. administrative separation from FAO, programmatic relations with FAO, arrangements to create the "new" international institution, the headquarters agreement with the Italian Government, and recruiting Dr. G. Hawtin as the next Director of IBPGR, starting 1 August 1991. With regard to strategic planning, Dr. Tossell stated that it was essential to ensure that there was sufficient organizational capacity to attend to this task, and this had been achieved. He admitted that there had been delay in producing a completed draft Strategic Plan by the time of the review, but he expected a Board-approved plan to be ready by June. In the meantime, the Board had other urgent business to attend to, namely to strengthen the financial management capacity of IBPGR.

184. Ir. van Sloten stated that IBPGR had operated in crisis mode during the recent past because of conditions beyond its control. He stated that the review Panel had visited most of the outposted staff, and that the documents prepared for the review could also be used in the preparation of the Medium-Term Plan. In responding to the Panel's report, he emphasized that NARS were at the centre of IBPGR's Strategic Plan, and concurred with the Panel that IBPGR should not act as a vehicle to finance national programmes. Regarding legal issues related to germplasm accessibility, there was a need for a CGIAR policy, and IBPGR could make an input into the policy formulation process. Ir. van der Sloten agreed with the Panel that IBPGR should undertake contract research rather than bench research, and that the research agenda should include the social aspects of the conservation of plant genetic resources. He emphasized the importance of crop genetic resource networks in achieving several objectives of IBPGR, and agreed with the review report that IBPGR could become a world centre for information in the area of plant genetic resources.

185. Over the review period (1986-91) the number of senior staff had increased from 17 to 30, but operating funds had decreased from US\$ 2.5 million to US\$ 1.9 million. Thus in 1986, IBPGR could spend US\$ 145,000 per senior scientist, but by 1991 this had fallen to US\$ 64,000. Also, there had been a loss of 17.5% in the purchasing power of the 50 to 60% of IBPGR's budget spent in Italian Lire, so that in 1990 there had been an actual loss of US\$ 1 million on a budget of US\$ 7.5 million that had less than 10% complementary funding. A mechanism was needed to bring the Institute back to adequate levels of operating funds. Ir. van Sloten also expressed his pleasure with the forward-looking nature of the review, and with the support received from donors for an expanded IBPGR. He concluded by stating that IBPGR was planning to present its 1993-97 Medium-Term Plan to TAC in March 1992, and hoped that TAC would agree to these plans.

186. In the ensuing discussion, opened by Dr. M.S. Zehni from FAO, TAC was informed that there had been ample opportunity for FAO to interact with the Panel and to express its views on the findings. He complimented the Panel for the high quality of its report. He stated

that it was particularly gratifying to see IBPGR emerging as a strong institution with an impressive global impact and a large global clientele. Dr. Zehni stated that he would like to hope that IBPGR's long association with FAO had contributed to this success.

187. Dr. Zehni agreed with Dr. Tossell that FAO and IBPGR should be forward-looking, and that the IBPGR Board could expect full support from FAO as it looked to the future in its commitment to the cause of conserving plant genetic resources. However, FAO believed that, in the years to come, IBPGR would need to consolidate its achievements and sharpen its focus. He said that he realized that being part of a larger organization had not been easy, but IBPGR appeared to have done very well. Dr. Zehni concluded by stating that FAO valued its cooperation with IBPGR.

188. TAC noted that the review report had raised a number of issues of concern to the whole of the CGIAR System, such as the respective roles of the CGIAR System, of IBPGR and of the commodity Centres, as well as inter-Centre collaboration and intellectual property rights. TAC recognized the need to discuss inter-Centre issues and proposed to include in its future agenda a joint discussion of these issues with the Centre Directors.

189. Clarification was sought regarding IBPGR's strategy for assisting NARS in the light of the financial problems faced by most of these; as to whether IBPGR could play the role of honest broker; on the extent to which IBPGR looked at policy issues; on ways to assess impact; and on how to integrate forestry into the IBPGR programme (in the light of a luke-warm response from the Panel to IBPGR's proposal on forest genetic resources).

190. Concern was expressed regarding the funding problems faced by IBPGR when it had all the attributes required for CGIAR support. Some members wondered whether a more aggressive fund raising strategy was required. Similarly, was there a need for IBPGR to link up with ISNAR and IFPRI to help mobilize the resources for plant genetic resources activities at national level? Some TAC members thought that IBPGR should be more actively involved in shaping the global agenda on plant genetic resources, and in making an input into the international debate on biodiversity. Also, given the implications of intellectual property rights for access to germplasm, it was suggested that IBPGR should publicize these, thereby helping governments take into account the interests of plant breeding and germplasm conservation when formulating national policies in this area.

191. In his response, Mr. Rogers stated that IBPGR needed to earn a "leadership" position in the global plant genetic resources community in order to become effective as a catalytic institution. IBPGR could do this in five different ways, as described in the Overview section of the Panel's report. He emphasized that commodity Centres could take on more work on plant genetic resources, and that through inter-Centre collaboration, Centres could become involved in "common denominator" issues. Mr. Rogers stated that IBPGR had a role in forestry, but the Panel had drawn a distinction between tree germplasm and in situ forest conservation. The latter was generally the domain of organizations outside agriculture and production forestry. With regard to issues related to intellectual property rights, the Panel's view was that IBPGR should keep a firm watch on these but not get too involved.

192. The IBPGR Board and management observed that there was as yet no overall strategy regarding national programmes, but the issue was being addressed in the current strategic planning exercise. In their opinion IBPGR should be cautious in taking on board policy issues because the inter-governmental organizations, including the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources, already provided an appropriate forum for addressing these. IBPGR was collaborating closely with FAO on issues of intellectual property rights, and was making an input into the Convention on Biodiversity, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, and the Keystone Dialogue. IBPGR had a global role on plant genetic resources, but if it were to become involved in setting the global agenda, as suggested by the Panel, it would not necessarily be able to carry out all the necessary research. IBPGR was also assisting in placing the topic of plant genetic resources on the agenda of national governments not only through ISNAR and IFPRI, but also through a public awareness strategy. With regard to impact assessment, IBPGR's suggestions were that its work should be judged through the numbers of genebanks established, its publication record and its training efforts. IBPGR supported the idea of a System-wide programme, but pointed out that the commodity Centres have a different primary objective, i.e. to supply germplasm for crop improvement programmes.

193. In closing the discussion, Dr. McCalla thanked the Panel Chairman. He expressed his appreciation for a perceptive, analytical and stimulating report which had carefully analysed issues that were System-wide, distinguishing these from issues that were Centre-specific. It was now necessary for TAC to define the role of the CGIAR as opposed to that of individual CGIAR Centres in the area of genetic resources and biodiversity. He also thanked Dr. Tossell, Ir. van Sloten and Dr. McCusker for the cooperation extended by IBPGR to the Panel and to the TAC Secretariat.

TAC COMMENTARY ON THE EXTERNAL REVIEWS OF IBPGR

194. TAC is grateful to the Chairman, Mr. Hugh Rogers, and to the Panel for the perceptive, comprehensive and analytical report on IBPGR. The Committee also expresses its appreciation to IBPGR's Board of Trustees and management for their thoughtful response to the content of the report. TAC shares the views of the Panel on IBPGR's outstanding contribution to the work on the conservation of plant genetic resources in the developing countries. TAC benefitted from inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat in the preparation of the following Commentary.

195. TAC is pleased to note that after 5 years of arduous negotiations with FAO, IBPGR is now in the process of becoming an independent CGIAR institute. TAC is aware that this change in status has proved unsettling to the institute and its staff, and is taking place under interim management, at a time of rapid change in the programme and objectives of IBPGR. TAC joins the Panel in expressing its admiration for the achievement of IBPGR's Board, its interim management, and the dedication and enthusiasm of the staff. TAC is also encouraged to know that, after a long search, a new Director has been designated.

196. The Panel report provides valuable insights into the changes IBPGR should make as it charts its future course. In general TAC commends the report to IBPGR's Board and management for careful

consideration. There are, however, several issues on which TAC wishes to comment.

Strategic Plan

197. A Board-approved strategic plan is essential to an External Review. The Panel has commented on the limitations imposed on its conclusions by the fact that IBPGR has not completed its strategic planning exercise. The plan made available to the Panel was an early draft document prepared by staff, but for which the Board had not assumed responsibility. Also, the draft did not include the operational implications of the emerging strategy. TAC notes the Board's intention to complete the Strategic Plan as soon as the new Director takes up his appointment.

National Programmes

198. TAC concurs with the Panel's conclusions that IBPGR has made a significant contribution to the growth in awareness of the need to conserve plant genetic resources, such that there is now a world network of cooperating genebanks and plant genetic resources programmes. Within this global network, national programmes are considered as the building blocks. However, TAC is concerned that many national genebanks are still under-financed and ill equipped to fulfil their task. Consequently, base collections in genebanks are under severe threat of being lost through secondary genetic erosion. TAC therefore agrees with the Panel's suggestion that IBPGR should explore the possibility of accommodating at CGIAR Centres base collections of germplasm for which developing countries require a "safe haven".

199. Further, TAC agrees with the Panel's views that instead of seeking to respond to all reasonable national requests, IBPGR should develop a basic strategy and set of criteria to guide its involvement with national programmes. This is especially necessary as IBPGR is changing from a general support organization to an institute with equally important concerns in research and technology development. TAC encourages IBPGR to strengthen its ability to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of national programmes, as well as available sources of support in order to develop its strategy for building national capabilities.

Integration of Conservation with Utilization

200. TAC agrees with the Panel's recommendation that work on genetic resources should be regarded as an integral part of crop improvement, and that IBPGR, in the further development of its strategy, should place increased emphasis on making genetic resources more easily accessible to plant breeders and other scientists. It should also ensure that activities associated with the conservation of plant genetic resources are more closely integrated into national and international breeding programmes. TAC believes that this will help to improve the cost-effectiveness and long-term viability of national and regional programmes in plant genetic resources. TAC agrees with the Panel that criteria and techniques are urgently needed for the selection of genetic material to be conserved if national and international resources are to

be used cost-effectively. In this connection, TAC encourages IBPGR to undertake more research to further develop and apply the concept of an "optimum genepool".

Research

201. TAC recognizes the commendable progress made by IBPGR in establishing a research programme, and supports the approach adopted by IBPGR. TAC agrees with the Panel's recommendation that IBPGR should include issues relating to policy and to social aspects of the conservation of plant genetic resources in its research agenda, and analyze ways in which this might be accomplished.

Forestry

202. TAC agrees with the Panel in drawing a distinction between tree germplasm and forest conservation. The latter is generally the domain of organizations outside agriculture and production forestry. TAC notes that tree species, including fruit trees, plantation crops and a range of "multi-purpose trees" (including palms) are already within the mandate of IBPGR, and that with the inclusion of forestry and agroforestry in the CGIAR mandate, the list of tree species should be kept under review. TAC is not in a position to comment fully on this matter until IBPGR has completed its Strategic Plan and has clarified its role in the conservation of forest species, relative to those of other organizations such as FAO, IUCN, CGIAR Centres and certain regional centres.

Information

203. The Panel drew attention to the overriding importance of information systems and modern information technology in managing the conservation and use of plant genetic resources. Information technology facilitates the efficient management of collections, reveals gaps in coverage, helps to identify useful material, and provides a means of collaborating internationally in germplasm collection and exchange. Further, in the development of crop networks, there will be an increasing need to exploit modern information technology to develop standardized information systems, which could make a significant contribution to the integration of world genetic resources.

204. TAC endorses the Panel's comments that IBPGR is uniquely placed to become the central institution for expertise on information systems in the field of plant genetic resources, and that it should be in a position to give objective advice to national programmes in this area. TAC agrees with the Panel's recommendation that IBPGR should strengthen its activities on information systems as soon as possible, and place greater emphasis on this approach as it refines its strategy.

Governance

205. TAC is pleased that the IBPGR Board of Trustees has endorsed the recommendations of the Panel regarding its composition and operations. The administrative separation from FAO will undoubtedly

generate many transition problems which will require Board attention. Also, the Board itself is in a transition as the terms of several members will expire next year. This demands careful planning to ensure future effective leadership for the Board and its committees.

206. On the future size of the Board, TAC notes the view expressed by the Board that this issue should be revisited after IBPGR has separated from FAO.

Medium-Term Plan

207. TAC endorses the Panel's suggestion that the next Medium-Term Plan period for the IBPGR should coincide roughly with the start of the Institute's administrative separation from FAO. Possible delays in administrative separation from FAO may require a longer-period interim planning and budgeting period than that envisaged by the Panel and the Board.

Financial Management and Administration

208. Throughout its history IBPGR has worked under the FAO framework for most of its financial and administrative systems and procedures. These two areas of management will need to be built anew when IBPGR becomes independent. Yet, IBPGR now lacks the expertise it needs, at the Board and staff levels, even under the FAO umbrella. The Panel has pointed to the urgency of the staffing problem faced in the financial management area, and the Board agrees with the recommendation made. IBPGR should try to bring on board a competent senior finance officer as soon as possible. In the area of administration the current need is for the development of policies and procedures.

Human Resources

209. TAC notes with concern that IBPGR is now facing problems in its management of human resources, relating to the attraction, retention and motivation of staff, and the development of appropriate policies. One source of the problem is the fact that IBPGR staff are under 1-year contracts. TAC concurs with the Panel that IBPGR needs to treat these issues expeditiously to avoid further complications; and that Board and management should attach high priority to developing clear policies and procedures for the future management of human resources.

Relations with FAO

210. TAC notes with satisfaction the significant strides made by FAO and IBPGR in improving their relationship since the last External Review. The principal actors involved in bringing about this change deserve praise. IBPGR's future relations with FAO have now been put on a firm footing with the signing of a memorandum of understanding on programme cooperation and another memorandum on administrative and financial arrangements.

System-wide Issues

211. TAC notes with interest the comments made by the Panel on System-wide issues, and agrees with the Panel that their resolution would facilitate the further development of the respective roles of the CGIAR System, of IBPGR, of the commodity Centres and of the Inter-Centre Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources.

212. The Committee endorses the Panel's recommendation that the CGIAR should broaden the scope of its scientific and technical support for the conservation of genetic resources by using the research capability of all its institutions with relevant mandates to assist in solving problems that are "common denominators" across a range of species; and that such research should be planned and undertaken within the framework of a programme agreed across the whole CGIAR System. TAC encourages IBPGR to examine the possibilities of research collaboration with commodity Centres.

213. TAC also concurs with the Panel that for the CGIAR System to be effective in a leadership role in the conservation of plant genetic resources, the strategies (and perhaps the mandates) of the individual Centre programmes would have to be broader, and there would have to be a strong integrating mechanism for collective activities. A well-coordinated programme across the whole CGIAR System would provide a nucleus of activities that could stimulate research and conservation activities in national programmes and in the work of other institutions. In this regard, TAC also encourages IBPGR to take account of the strategies of the individual Centres when finalizing its Strategic Plan. It should also explore possibilities for new and imaginative types of funding involving the leveraging of funds through seed money.

(a) Inter-Centre collaboration:

214. In the paper "CGIAR Policy on Plant Genetic Resources" (CGIAR 1989), TAC reaffirmed the high priority accorded to the conservation of plant genetic resources. The policy statement makes it clear that, in addition to the responsibilities of IBPGR, the commodity Centres "have responsibility for ensuring the establishment and maintenance of collections of material relevant to the improvement of their mandated crops". Further, it states that they should "collaborate as an international network in promoting the exploration and collection necessary to fulfil this responsibility".

215. TAC commends the establishment of the Inter-Centre Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources to foster closer collaboration among the institutes of the CGIAR System. However, TAC notes the Panel's conclusion that the Working Group does not appear to have come to grips with any of the major inter-Centre issues in ways that will lead to the collective formulation of an overall strategy by the Centres. TAC proposes to include in its future agenda a joint discussion of these issues with the Centre Directors.

(b) Intellectual property rights:

216. Given the importance for the CGIAR System of the effects of modern biotechnology on the transfer of useful genes, of the implications of intellectual property rights on access to germplasm, and of the increased interest in the conservation of biodiversity, TAC

encourages IBPGR to analyze these issues and publicize them, so as to help governments take into account the interests of plant breeding and conservation. TAC agrees with the Panel that IBPGR can do this by upholding an impartial and apolitical stance on controversial issues.

Conclusions

217. During the review period, IBPGR has made commendable progress in (i) changing its structure to that of a CGIAR institute governed by a Board of Trustees and headed by a Director, (ii) widening its mandate to include important elements of research, and (iii) renegotiating its agreement with FAO. Today, IBPGR is on its way to becoming a fully independent, international scientific and technical institution.

218. Over the period of its existence, IBPGR has successfully contributed to the development of solutions to first-generation problems, such as collecting land races before they disappear, developing standard routines and procedures, disseminating information, and inaugurating formal courses of training. A second generation of problems has now arisen, such as the financial viability of national programmes and the implications of intellectual property rights. The CGIAR System is uniquely placed to take a leading and catalytic role in resolving the second generation of scientific and technical issues. Given the commendable past achievements of IBPGR, the emerging independent "new" IBPGR, the challenge posed by the second-generation issues requiring international attention, and the role of germplasm visualized in the medium-term and long-term "visions of the future" set out by TAC, the Committee commends IBPGR to the Group as worthy of its continued support.

219. There are several uncertainties about how IBPGR will work under independent administration. Clearly, there is need for careful planning of the transition and for building the systems and processes that will be needed. The Acting Director should be commended for having initiated several of the necessary actions. IBPGR needs further assistance and should, in the first instance, seek it from within the System. TAC will monitor IBPGR's progress carefully and appraise the CGIAR of further developments.

220. Finally, TAC extends its thanks and congratulations to the outgoing Acting Director, Ir. Dick van Sloten, for his key role in guiding and managing IBPGR through a period of rapid and major change in its programme and organization.

Future Meetings - (Agenda Item 9)

221. TAC reconfirmed the dates and venues of the 55th and 56th Meetings as follows:

- TAC 55: 24-30 June 1991, FAO, Rome
- TAC 56: 21-27 October 1991, IFPRI, Washington, DC

222. TAC also decided to honour the standing invitation to hold one of its meetings at ICARDA. Accordingly, the 57th Meeting of TAC will be held at ICARDA, Aleppo, Syria, 15-21 March 1992.

Other Business - (Agenda Item 10)

(a) The Winrock Livestock Study

223. Dr. McCalla recalled that TAC was one of the co-sponsors for the Winrock Livestock Study in sub-Saharan Africa, which is part of a global study covering all developing regions. A consultant identified by TAC for the study had prepared a common chapter on global livestock trends. This chapter would be elaborated further and refined as more detailed information became available on the livestock situation in Asia, Latin America and WANA. At a joint meeting of the technical and scientific advisory panels for the study, held in February 1991, in Nairobi, Kenya, it had been reported that good progress had been made. It was expected that a paper stating the major conclusions, chapter by chapter, would be ready by mid-April, and a final draft of the sub-Saharan study would be available by early June for consideration by TAC at its 55th meeting.

(b) Managing Intellectual Property at the IARCs

224. Dr. Jim Ryan reported on his attendance at the inter-Centre workshop on "Consequences of Intellectual Property Rights for IARCs" held at ICRISAT Patancheru, Hyderabad, India, 19-21 November 1990. He had presented a paper entitled "The Evolution of TAC's Position on Intellectual Property Rights and the IARCs: Some Notes from the Record". The workshop had been attended by representatives of the IARCs, USA universities, and the private sector. The forum had provided a cross-section of opinions. Dr. Ryan considered the issue to be important, particularly with respect to the interactions between IARCs and NARS, and with advanced institutions.

225. In his opinion there was an urgent need to protect the processes, results and products generated by the IARCs. To achieve this objective it would be necessary for the CGIAR to develop explicit guidelines or a policy on the management of intellectual property at the IARCs. He drew the attention of TAC members to the workshop summary and briefly stated the main highlights.

226. The proceedings were being published and would include the papers presented at the workshop. Dr. Ryan considered that TAC would need to come to grips with the issue as part of its ongoing review of CGIAR priorities and strategies.

227. In the ensuing discussion it became apparent that several actors and organizations were involved in a study of the legal aspects of patenting and intellectual property rights. It was also revealed that a paper was being prepared by Mr. W. Siebeck, Special Advisor to the Vice-President of Development Economics at the World Bank, and would be presented to the meeting of Centre Directors in June. The paper could also serve as an input into a possible policy statement by TAC.

228. Dr. Arnold recalled that the issue of intellectual property rights had been on the agenda of the TAC-Centre Directors Standing Panel on Plant Genetic Resources since 1986. The terms of reference for the panel included the development of CGIAR guidelines and a policy statement on the free exchange of germplasm, including the issue of

intellectual property rights and patents. Progress had been delayed because the Panel was awaiting the outcome of the new European legislation. The International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) had been expected to draft a new convention.

229. Dr. Arnold considered that the CGIAR should not take a passive view of the matter. It should make known its firm support for the free exchange of germplasm. Through the activities of the TAC-Centre Directors' Standing Panel on Plant Genetic Resources and further deliberations among Centre Directors, IBPGR had been requested to prepare a document on the subject. This document would come to TAC in June. He noted that the CGIAR Biotask was also looking at the issue, with respect to the molecular biology aspects.

230. In closing the discussion the TAC Chairman stated that he would expect the TAC-Centre Directors Standing Panel on Plant Genetic Resources, with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat, to come up with an appropriate proposal to TAC in June.

(c) TAC-Centre Directors Standing Panel on Plant Genetic Resources

231. Part of the report on the activities of the Panel on Plant Genetic Resources was given during the discussion on "Management of Intellectual Property at the IARCs". Another major item on the Panel's agenda was the security of germplasm collections held at the IARCs. The need to ensure duplication/replication of germplasm collections was stressed.

232. Dr. Arnold recalled that the political situation in Peru during the late 1980s had caused some alarm regarding the security of the potato collection held by CIP. Concern had been expressed that the potato collection might be lost. Since there was not much information on the security of other gene banks either, the TAC-Centre Directors Panel and IBPGR had been requested to compile information from the commodity Centres on the current status of their collections. He noted that IBPGR had already prepared and distributed a report on the subject to the Centres and TAC 1/. The report showed that the maintenance conditions for many of these large collections were generally satisfactory, but that the duplication of the material was ad hoc and lacking, both in extent and in the documentation of the process. It was widely believed that much germplasm material in Centre gene banks had not yet been duplicated. Centre Directors were aware of this problem and had requested IBPGR to help identify where duplicate collections could be safely placed.

(d) First Congress of the European Society of Agronomy

233. Dr. Scarascia Mugnozza reported that the First Congress of the European Society of Agronomy (ESA) had been held in Paris from 5-7

1/ Status of Maintenance and Duplication of IARCs' Germplasm Collections. Annex IV of the report of the Third Meeting of the Inter-Centre Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources, held at IBPGR, 21-22 August 1990. IBPGR, Rome, Italy, December, 1990.

December 1990. The Society drew its membership from all over Europe as well as from non-European countries.

234. The main objectives of ESA were to: promote the science of agronomy; link European agronomists; create opportunities for the exchange of scientific information and collaborative programmes among members; promote an European Journal of Agronomy and a newsletter; and cooperate with organizations having similar objectives. ESA focused on the following scientific fields: physiology of crop productivity; management and breeding; agroclimatology and agronomic modelling; plant-soil relationships; crop quality and post-harvest physiology; cropping systems and environment; and farming systems.

235. Some 475 agronomists from 24 countries had attended the First Congress of ESA. The Congress had been organized in five working sessions. Over 40 oral presentations had been made and several posters had been displayed. Dr. Scarascia Mugnozza considered the Congress to have been a great success.

(e) Meeting on Global Change and Terrestrial Ecosystems

236. Dr. Arnold, in his capacity as Vice President of the Commission on the Application of Science to Agriculture, Forestry and Aquaculture (CASAFA), had attended the above meeting organized by the International Geosphere - Biosphere Programme (IGBP). The IGBP, like CASAFA, is one of the committees of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), an umbrella organization for a vast array of scientific organizations involving mainly universities but also other institutions. ICSU tries to promote collaboration among these institutions.

237. The meeting had been attended by over 110 scientists from all over the world, but very few had been from developing countries. It was convened to discuss Report Nos. 12 and 15 of IGBP. Report No. 12, published during 1990, defined the programme on global change. The report also covered the oceans and atmospheric climatic change in addition to terrestrial ecosystems. The report contained a first listing of call projects for funding and collaboration.

238. The implementation of call projects is considered through the mechanism of a Bellagio Conference. The Bellagio Conference recommends and identifies regional Centres that will be the hubs of the networks. One of the networks is Agriculture and Forestry. A Bellagio Conference held in December 1990 had produced IGBP Report No. 15, called "START - The System for Analysis, Research and Training". This report was the second major background document for the meeting on Global Change.

239. The IGBP is organized into foci, activities and projects. The foci include areas such as Ecosystem Physiology (e.g. effects of increasing CO₂ levels in the atmosphere); Change in Ecosystem Structure (e.g. ecosystem dynamics at the landscape level: crops, forestry, etc); and Global Change: Impact on Agriculture and Forestry.

240. The meeting had dealt with the focus on global change. Activities under this focus cover:

- effects of climate and atmospheric change on key production systems and key agronomic species;

- changes in pests and diseases of crops and livestock;
- changes in in situ property redistribution and net loss of soil.

241. Since many of these activities were relevant to developing countries and to the work of the CGIAR, Dr. Arnold had taken the opportunity to explain what the CGIAR was doing in this field and the role of TAC. It was apparent that for many of the participants it was the first time they had heard about the CGIAR. TAC was invited to attend the next meeting of START in Stockholm, Sweden, 24-26 April 1991, because of the need felt by IGBP for further consultations with the CGIAR during the development of START. The TAC Chairman had requested Dr. Dudal to represent TAC at the meeting.

(f) Sharing of Responsibilities and Modes of Collaboration between IITA and INIBAP

242. The Chairman recalled that after the Group had decided at ICW' 90 to adopt INIBAP into the CGIAR as an innovative operational mode on an experimental basis it had directed IITA and INIBAP in consultation with TAC to work out the sharing of responsibilities and modes of collaboration between them. Consequently, he had convened a meeting in Montpellier, France on 6 and 7 February 1991 to enable IITA and INIBAP to discuss the matter.

243. The meeting had been attended by representatives of the Boards of Trustees and senior management of both IITA and INIBAP, the TAC Chairman, Dr. C.T. de Wit and the Executive Secretary of TAC. IITA and INIBAP had outlined their strategies and activities on banana and plantain, and this had been followed by a very constructive and amicable discussion. The meeting had noted the impressive achievements of IITA with respect to the generation of hybrids with resistance to Black Sigatoka. It had considered that INIBAP could serve as the vehicle through which IITA material could be circulated globally. Likewise IITA's research strength would provide the much needed research hub for the network. Agreement was reached between IITA and INIBAP on the following:

- IITA would act as the executing agency for INIBAP's Regional Evaluation and National Integration Programme (RENIP) in sub-Saharan Africa.
- IITA's promising hybrids would be included in INIBAP's International Musa Testing Programme (IMTP) trials in Africa, Latin America and Asia.
- INIBAP would be expected to play a crucial role in promoting and developing collaborative research networks among laboratories working on the major pests and diseases of banana and plantain.
- The relationships of IITA and INIBAP with IBPGR would be similar to those currently existing between IBPGR and the other CGIAR Centres with major crop mandates.
- IITA and INIBAP would undertake joint planning of their banana and plantain research programmes.

- Representatives of senior management and the Boards of Trustees of IITA and INIBAP would be invited, as observers, to each other's Programme Committee Meetings.
- IITA and INIBAP would review and revise their memorandum of understanding to clarify some points and also to reflect the recent developments in the CGIAR.

244. Dr. McCalla noted that a full report would be presented to TAC in June. TAC members welcomed the positive manner in which IITA and INIBAP were approaching the issue of sharing responsibilities and modes of operation. They were also highly impressed by the encouraging results generated by IITA from its Onne substation.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Alexander F. McCalla
Chair
Technical Advisory Committee/CGIAR
219 E Street, Suite 2C
Davis, CA 95616, USA

Dr. Michael H. Arnold
"Hamlec"
4, Shelford Road
Whittlesford
Cambridge, CB2 4PG, UK

Dr. Gerardo Budowski
University for Peace
Apartado 199
1250 Escazú, Costa Rica

Dr. Doris H. Calloway
Department of Nutritional Sciences
119 Morgan Hall
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

Dr. Kamla Chowdhry
c/o ICRISAT
23 Golf Links
New Delhi 110 023, India

Prof. Cornelis T. de Wit
Abersonlaan 31
6703 GE Wageningen
The Netherlands

Prof. Raoul Dudal
Center for Irrigation Engineering
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Kardinaal Mercierlaan 92
B-3001 Leuven, Belgium

Dr. Hans Gregersen
College of Forestry
University of Minnesota
Room 110, Green Hall
1530 N. Cleveland Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108, USA

Dr. Ken-Ichi Hayashi
Special Advisor
Tropical Agriculture Research Centre
4.24.11 Nishikebukuro
Toshima, Tokyo, 171 Japan

Dr. Mitsuma Matsui
Japan Forestry Association
3-42-6 Kugayama
Suginami-ku
Tokyo, 107 Japan

Dr. Eugenia Muchnik de Rubinstein
Department of Agriculture Economics
Pontificia Universidad Católica
de Chile
Casilla 6177
Santiago, Chile

Dr. Amir Muhammed
House No. 03
Street 35, F-8/1, P.O. Box 2316
Islamabad, Pakistan

Prof. Richard S. Musangi
Vice Chancellor
Egerton University
P.O. Box 536
Njoro, Kenya

Dr. James Ryan
Deputy Director
Australian Centre for International
Agricultural Research (ACIAR)
P.O. Box 1571
Canberra City, A.C.T. 2601
Australia

Dr. Salleh M.N.
Director General
Institut Penyelidikan Perhutanan
Malaysia (FRIM)
Kepong, Selangor
52109 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Prof. Gian Tommaso Scarascia-Mugnozza
Rettore
Università degli Studi della Tuscia
via S. Giovanni Decollato
01100 Viterbo, Italy

B. CO-SPONSORS OF THE CGIAR

FAO

Dr. M.S. Zehni
Director
Research and Technology Development Division
Agriculture Department
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy

World Bank

Dr. Anthony J. Pritchard
Agricultural Research Adviser
Agriculture and Rural Development Department
World Bank, Room S-5055
Washington, DC 20433, USA

C. CENTRE BOARD CHAIRS

Dr. Lucia Vaccaro
Vice Chairman, CIAT Board
Universidad Central de Venezuela
Apto. 4579
Maracay, Venezuela

Mr. William T. Mashler
Chairman, ICRISAT Board
4 Woody Lane
Larchmont, NY 10538-1330, USA

Dr. William E. Tossell
Chairman of IBPGR Board
Director, Centre for Food Security
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1

Prof. David E. Bell
Chairman, IIMI Board
Department of Population Sciences
Harvard School of Public Health
665 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115-6009, USA

D. INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)

Dr. Gustavo A. Nores
Director General
Apartado Aereo 6713
Cali, Colombia

Dr. Filemón Torres
Deputy Director General

International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR)

Ir. D.H. van Sloten
Acting Director
Via delle Sette Chiese 142
00145 Rome, Italy

Dr. A. McCusker
Head, Research Programme

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)

Dr. Leslie Swindale
Director General
Patancheru P.O.
Andhra Pradesh 502324, India

Mr. R. Gibbons
Executive Director, West African
Programmes, and Director ICRISAT
Sahelian Centre

International Irrigation Management Institute (IIMI)

Dr. Roberto Lenton
Director General
P.O. Box 2075
Colombo, Sri Lanka

International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR)

Dr. C.H. Bonte-Friedheim
Director General
P.O. Box 93375
2509 AJ The Hague
Netherlands

Dr. M. Dagg
Senior Research Officer

Dr. Warren Peterson
Research Fellow

E. CGIAR MEMBERS

Belgium

Dr. Luc Sas
Senior Agricultural Advisor
Belgian Administration for Development Cooperation (BADC)
Marsveldplein 5 - Box 57
1050 Brussels, Belgium

Canada

Dr. Iain C. MacGillivray
Senior Programme Officer, MTC
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull, Quebec, Canada K1A 0G4

France

Dr. Jean-Paul Rivaud
Chargé de Mission
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
Deste 34 rue la Parouse
75116 Paris, France

Germany

Dr. Barbara Becker
Liaison Officer for CGIAR
German Council on International Agricultural Research (ATSAR)
Hans-Böckler-Str. 5
5300 Bonn 3, Germany

Netherlands

Ir. Hans Wessels
Research and Technology Programme
Directorate General for
International Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Postbox 20061
2500 EB The Hague, Netherlands

Ir. Willem van Vuure
Senior Scientific Officer for
International Relations
Department for Science and
Technology
Postbox 20401
2500 EK The Hague, Netherlands

United Kingdom

Dr. John C. Davies
Deputy Chief Natural Resources Advisor, NRED
Overseas Development Administration (ODA)
Eland House, Stag Place
London SW1E 5DH, U.K.

USA

Dr. Dana Dalrymple
Research Advisor
International Agricultural Research Centres Staff
Bureau for Science and Technology
Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20016, USA

F. OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Dr. E.F. Henzell
Chairman ICRISAT EPR
Director
Institute of Plant Production
and Processing
CSIRO, P.O. Box 225
Dickson, ACT 2602, Australia

Mr. Declan J. Walton
Chairman ICRISAT EMR
Oliveto
52024 Loro Ciuffenna (AR)
Italy

Mr. Hugh Rogers
Chairman IBPGR Review
95 High Street
Bottisham
Cambridge CB5 9BA, UK

Dr. Jaap Hardon
Member IBPGR Review
Director
Centre for Genetic Resources
Postbus 224
6700AE Wageningen, Netherlands

G. CGIAR SECRETARIAT

Mr. Alexander von der Osten
Executive Secretary, CGIAR
World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20433, USA

Dr. M. Collinson
Scientific Advisor

Dr. D.L. Plucknett
Scientific Advisor

Dr. S. Ozgediz
Management Advisor

Mr. Ravindra Tadvalkar
Senior Financial Officer

Mr. Harry Palmier

H. TAC SECRETARIAT

Dr. John H. Monyo
Executive Secretary, TAC
Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy

Dr. Eric Craswell
Senior Agr. Research Officer

Ms. Marioara Lantini
Programme Assistant

Dr. Guido Gryseels
Senior Agr. Research Officer

Ms. Dominique Veck-Rosignoli
Secretary

Dr. Amir Kassam
Senior Agr. Research Officer

AGENDA

1. Opening Session
 - (a) Opening Remarks
 - (b) Adoption of TAC 53 Report
 - (c) Matters Arising from TAC 53
 - (d) Adoption of the Agenda
 - (e) Report from the CGIAR
2. Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies
3. CIAT Strategic Plan
4. Future Reviews
5. Experience with the External Review Process
6. Follow-up to the Expansion of the CGIAR
 - (a) IIMI Strategic Plan
 - (b) Elaboration of TAC's Proposals on Ecoregional Mechanisms/
Centres and Research on Resource Management
 - (c) Elaboration of TAC's Views on IARCs/NARS Interface
7. ICRISAT External Reviews
8. IBPGR External Reviews
9. Future Meetings
10. Other Business

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

<u>Item</u>		<u>Document Number</u>
1	Draft Report of the 53rd Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee	AGR/TAC:IAR/91/1
3	CIAT in the 1990s and Beyond: A Strategic Plan - Board-approved, final draft for comment by TAC - Supplement	Centre Document Centre Document
4	Future Reviews: Progress Report on ILCA, ILRAD, IRRI and WARDA	AGR/TAC:IAR/91/4
	Future Reviews: ISNAR - Progress Report	AGR/TAC:IAR/91/7
	Future Reviews: Commodity Review on Rice	AGR/TAC:IAR/91/3
5	External Reviews - Which Way Forward?	AGR/TAC:IAR/91/6
6	(a) The Strategy of the International Irrigation Management Institute	Centre Document
	(b) An Ecoregional Approach to Research in the CGIAR	AGR/TAC:IAR/91/8
	(c) Elaboration of TAC's Views on the Relationship between the CGIAR and National Research Systems	AGR/TAC:IAR/91/5
7	Report of the 1990 Programme and Management Review of the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)	AGR/TAC:IAR/90/26
	Pathway to Progress in the Semi-Arid Tropics - Fourth Draft of ICRISAT's Strategic Plan for the Nineties	Centre Document
8	Report of the Third External Programme and Management Review of the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR)	AGR/TAC:IAR/91/2

