

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT REPORT OF THE SEVENTY-FIFTH MEETING  
OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC SECRETARIAT  
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

February 1999

## Table of Contents

	Page
<b>SUMMARY</b>	
Opening Sessions	iii
External Programme and Management Reviews:	
a) CIFOR EPMR	iii
b) ICRAF EPMR	iv
First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme	iv
Centre Financing Plans	iv
TAC Study of CGIAR Commitments in Latin America and the Caribbean	v
1998 King Baudouin Award	v
CGIAR Logframe and Activity Classification	v
Future Reviews	vi
CGIAR Study On Marginal Lands	vi
Strategic Issues	vi
Future Meetings	vii
Other Business	vii
 <b>RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS</b>	
Opening Session (Agenda Item 1)	1
CIFOR EPMR (Agenda Item 2a)	1
TAC Commentary on the CIFOR EPMR	5
ICRAF EPMR (Agenda Item 2b)	7
TAC Commentary on the ICRAF EPMR	11
First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme (Agenda Item 3)	14
TAC Commentary on the First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme	17
Centre Financing Plans (Agenda Item 4)	20
TAC Study of CGIAR Commitments in Latin America and the Caribbean (Agenda Item 5)	21
1998 King Baudouin Award (Agenda Item 6)	25
TAC Commentary on the 1998 King Baudouin Award	26
CGIAR Logframe and Activity Classification (Agenda Item 7)	28

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Future Reviews (Agenda Item 8)</b>	<b>31</b>
a) ILRI and ICLARM EPMRs	31
b) ICARDA, IIMI and WARDA EPMRs	31
c) CIAT, IITA and CIP EPMRs	31
d) Review of Systemwide Programmes with an Ecoregional Approach	31
e) Inter-Centre Review of Cereals	32
f) Incorporation of gender data in future EPMRs	32
g) SCOER working arrangements	32
h) Consideration of review reports	32
<b>CGIAR Study on Marginal Lands (Agenda Item 9)</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Strategic Issues (Agenda Item 10)</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Future Meetings (Agenda Item 11)</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Other Business (Agenda Item 12)</b>	<b>35</b>
• Report of FAO	35
• Poverty Workshop	35
• Poverty as a Strategic Issues in TAC's Priority Setting	35
• Research Returns Redux: A Meta-Analysis of Agricultural R&D Evaluations	36
• Workshop on Assessment of Organizational Impacts of ISNAR's PM&E Project, Washington DC, 4-6 August 1998	36
• Climate Change and Agriculture: CGIAR Research Relevant to Mitigation and Adaptation	36
• NGO-TAC Interactions	37
• System Review	37

## **ANNEXES**

Annex 1	List of Participants
Annex 2	Agenda
Annex 3	List of Documents

**SEVENTY-FIFTH MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY MEETING  
TO THE  
CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH  
CIMMYT, El Batan, Mexico – 21 – 26 September 1998**

## **REPORT OF THE MEETING**

### **SUMMARY**

#### **Opening Session**

The TAC Chair, Dr. Donald Winkelmann, opened the meeting of TAC 75 by welcoming the 10 TAC Members present and acknowledging apologies received from Drs. Jacques Faye (Senegal) and Justin Lin (China). The Chair announced that Dr. Lin had, with regret, resigned from the Committee owing to pressures on his time. On behalf of TAC, the Chair expressed the Committee's gratitude to Dr. Lin for his distinguished service. He then noted with appreciation the presence of Dr. Louise O. Fresco, representing FAO; several Centre Directors General; Board Chairs; and EPMR Panel Chairs; the Chairs of the CBC and CDC; as well as observers from France, South Africa, and United States of America; and staff of the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats. Dr. Timothy Reeves, Director General, CIMMYT, welcomed participants on behalf of the host Centre. The report of TAC 74 was adopted without amendments. There were no matters arising from the report of TAC 74. The agenda of TAC 75 was adopted with minor amendments.

Dr. Manuel Lantin reported on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR on major developments in the System since MTM'98. Highlights included progress on creating a Central Advisory Service on Intellectual Property and Biosafety; and launching of the Central Asia and Caucasus Programme. The System Review Panel Report will be presented and discussed at ICW'98. External Review Reports will be considered by open ad-hoc committees in parallel sessions, rather than by the full Group, unless Members indicate plenary consideration is warranted. CGIAR funding was on target for 1998 at about US\$ 335-345 million.

## External Programme and Management Reviews

### a) CIFOR EPMR

Dr. Jeffery Burley, Panel Chair of the First CIFOR EPMR, presented the Panel's report highlighting major findings and recommendations. TAC considered the report in the presence of CIFOR Director General, Dr. Jeffrey Sayer who presented the Centre's response. TAC then prepared a commentary for consideration by the CGIAR at ICW'98. The Committee was pleased with CIFOR's progress, endorsed the Panel's recommendations, *inter alia*, on the need to improve priority-setting and to expand social science research in support of work on devolution, smallholder forestry, and forestation of marginal lands. TAC recommended that CIFOR and ICRAF undertake a joint strategic planning exercise to identify opportunities for collaboration and ensure the complementarity of their respective programmes.

### b) ICRAF EPMR

Dr. Jochen Heuvelink, Panel Chair of the second ICRAF EPMR, presented the Panel's report highlighting the major findings and recommendations. TAC considered the report in the presence of the Vice-Chair of ICRAF's Board of Trustees, Dr. Maria de Lourdes de Freitas, and ICRAF Director General, Dr. Pedro Sanchez, who presented, respectively, the responses of the Board and Centre. TAC then prepared a commentary for consideration by the CGIAR at ICW'98. The Centre was found to be playing a major role in agroforestry, and poised to contribute significantly to integrated natural resources management. TAC agreed with the Panel's recommendations, notably on the need for ICRAF to update its strategic plans to ensure a cohesive vision and programme. TAC recommended that ICRAF and CIFOR undertake a joint strategic planning exercise to identify opportunities for collaboration and ensure the complementarity of their respective programmes.

## First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP)

Dr. Jaap Hardon, Panel Chair of the First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP), presented the Panel's report highlighting major findings and recommendations. TAC considered the report in the presence of Dr. Geoffrey Hawtin, SGRP Programme Leader and Director-General of IPGRI, the convening Centre; Dr. Joel Cohen, Chair of the ICWG-GR; and Dr. Jane Toll, Coordinator, SGRP Secretariat. Drs. Hawtin and Cohen presented the respective responses of SGRP and ICWG-GR. TAC then prepared a commentary for consideration by the CGIAR at ICW'98, mindful that the outcome of the System Review may affect future governance of genetic resources in the CGIAR. TAC endorsed the Panel's recommendations on monitoring and analyzing policy decisions at national, regional and global levels; preparing a strategic plan with prioritized objectives and areas of research/activity; and making SINGER more user-friendly and user-responsive to a wider range of stakeholders. The Committee emphasized that the SGRP's functions in the areas of policy, representation, information, and public awareness remained critical to the CGIAR and should be implemented on a priority basis, particularly the maintenance of all in-trust materials at acceptable international standards. In TAC's judgement, and pending the outcome of the System Review, careful consideration should be given to having these priorities carried out by IPGRI, with ICWG-GR serving as an advisory body to the Institute.

## **Centre Financing Plans**

TAC reviewed the 1999 Financing Plans submitted by Centres in terms of their congruence with the substance of the 1999 Research Agenda approved by the Group at MTM'98 and programmatic implications of potential financing gaps. It was aided by the CGIAR Secretariat's synthesis of the financial data. The Committee prepared its report on the Plans for consideration by the Finance Committee at ICW'98. TAC found general consistency between the Plans and the Group's endorsement of the Centres' proposals at MTM'98. However, the Committee was concerned about the System's persistent relative underinvestment in livestock research and water management research, shifting shares in the commodity portfolio compared to endorsed levels, underinvestment in absolute terms in virtually all commodities and Centres, and potentially significant financing gaps faced by several of the smaller Centres. TAC made recommendations to the Group to rebalance investments to correct these apparent anomalies.

## **TAC Study of CGIAR Commitments in Latin America and the Caribbean**

Dr. Lucio Reca, Chair of the Panel that conducted the TAC Study on CGIAR Commitments in LAC, presented the Panel's report highlighting the major findings. The study emphasized trends toward declining public sector support for agricultural research, privatization of agricultural technology development and growing acceptance of intellectual property rights in LAC countries having well-developed NARS. Such trends had serious implications for the international public goods nature of CGIAR commodity investments in LAC. Also of concern was weak public sector investment in NRM research owing to delayed returns associated with such investments. TAC's consideration of the report yielded suggestions to identify more specific opportunities for CGIAR collaboration with NARS and regional organizations; to broaden the study's geographic scope to include poorer countries in the Andean, Central American and Caribbean sub-regions; and to explore alternative strategies for rural income generation in the context of the rapid urbanization underway in LAC.

## **1998 King Baudouin Award**

The Committee considered submissions from seven centres (CIP, ICARDA, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IITA, IPGRI and IRRI) for the 1998 King Baudouin Award in the light of the criteria established at TAC 74 - direct or indirect, actual or potential impact on resource-poor farmers and low-income people; direct or indirect, actual or potential impact on sustainable production systems; innovation in science; and partners and collaboration. The Committee selected the winning submission which is to be announced at ICW'98. It also prepared a commentary on the selected submission evaluating its contributions against the four criteria for the award.

## **CGIAR Logframe and Activity Classification**

TAC discussed a paper proposing a logical framework (logframe) designed to improve research planning, communication, and impact assessment in the CGIAR. The paper emerged from a series of workshops and consultations convened in 1997-98 under TAC's auspices and

with support from the Government of Germany and DSE. Comments on the proposal by Centre Directors and others were also considered. Uwe Nagel (Germany) led the TAC discussion. The proposed logframe would shift the CGIAR away from an activity/input to a project/output focus, improve transparency of the linkages of outputs to System goals, and thus enhance accountability of Centres to Members and other stakeholders. TAC's analysis focused on the relationship between Centre and System level logframes; a typology of System outputs, purposes, and goals; and a synopsis of output indicators. Suggestions were made to streamline the paper for presentation to the Group at ICW'98.

## **Future Reviews**

The Committee noted progress in the organization and implementation of the EPMRs of ICLARM and ILRI and discussed the planning, organization and conduct of the future external reviews of IIMI, ICARDA, WARDA, CIAT, IITA, and CIP. TAC also considered progress in the planning and organization of the Review of Ecoregional Programmes. It deleted the stripe review of cereals from its work programme in view of other, more pressing priorities.

## **CGIAR Study on Marginal Lands**

The Committee considered results of TAC's Strategic Study on Marginal Lands, commissioned in 1996 to assist the CGIAR in setting its priorities and strategies for poverty alleviation. The study found, *inter alia*, little evidence to support the view that the incidence of poverty was consistently greater in marginal than in higher potential lands, or that the poor were the prime cause of resource degradation in such lands. It noted that the biophysical characteristics of land were insufficient to explain the locus and incidence of poverty. Thus, suitable strategies need to include not only biophysical characteristics but the institutional, policy, infrastructural, and human capital determinants of poverty in a given area. TAC decided to conclude the Study by preparing a synthesis paper for TAC 76 drawing conceptual, definitional, and data inferences for the poverty dimension of its 2010 priorities and strategies exercise.

## **Strategic Issues**

TAC considered three strategic issues that have figured in its previous deliberations: (a) Rapid advances in biotechnology and the impingement of intellectual property rights on agricultural technology development: what will be the projected impact of these trends on the CGIAR's portfolio of international public goods in 2010 and how should TAC and the CGIAR respond to these changes? (b) The characteristics of the CGIAR Centres' working relationships with NARS and extent to which they are consistent with the best interests of the System. (c) The characteristics and extent of partnerships more generally in the CGIAR and the degree to which they are congruent with the System's goals. Plans were endorsed regarding modalities for moving further on these issues. Progress will be reported at TAC 76.

## **Future Meetings**

TAC reconfirmed and/or amended dates and venues for the following meetings:

TAC 76	FAO, Rome	22-27 March, 1999
TAC 77	ISNAR, The Hague	20-25 September, 1999
TAC 78	IITA, Ibadan	27- 31 March, 2000

## **Other Business**

The Committee considered the report of the TAC-initiated study on the rates of return of agricultural R&D to NRM and decided to provide further guidance to the consultant with a view to completing the study for TAC 76. The Committee was briefed on TAC interaction with the NGO Committee as facilitated by Dr. Lucia Vaccaro and the TAC Chair. Dr. Maria Antonia Fernandez reported on the ISNAR workshop, 'Assessment of Institutional Impacts', 4-6 August 1998, which she attended on behalf of TAC. Dr. Alison Withey (USAID) presented a progress report on the USAID inventory of CGIAR activities related to Global Climatic Change. The Committee considered other items raised during the course of the opening session.



## **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

### **Opening Session (Agenda Item 1)**

1. The TAC Chair, Dr. Donald Winkelmann, opened the meeting of TAC 75 by welcoming the 10 TAC Members present and acknowledging apologies received from Drs. Jacques Faye (Senegal) and Justin Lin (China). The Chair announced that Dr. Lin had, with regret, resigned from the Committee owing to pressures on his time. On behalf of TAC, the Chair expressed the Committee's gratitude to Dr. Lin for his distinguished service. He then noted with appreciation the presence of Dr. Louise O. Fresco, representing FAO; several Centre Directors General; Board Chairs; and EPMR Panel Chairs; the Chairs of the CBC and CDC; as well as observers from France, South Africa, and United States of America; and staff of the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats. Dr. Timothy Reeves, Director General, CIMMYT, welcomed participants on behalf of the host Centre. The report of TAC 74 was adopted without amendments. There were no matters arising from the report of TAC 74. The agenda of TAC 75 was adopted with minor amendments.

2. Dr. Manuel Lantin reported on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR on major developments in the System since MTM'98. Highlights included progress on creating a Central Advisory Service on Intellectual Property and Biosafety, and launching of the Central Asia and Caucasus Programme. He stated that the System Review Panel Report would be presented and discussed at ICW'98. On External Programme and Management Reviews, the Committee was informed that the reports will be considered by open ad hoc committees in parallel sessions, rather than by the full Group, unless Members indicated plenary consideration was warranted. He said that CGIAR funding was on target for 1998 at about US\$ 335-345 million.

### **External Programme and Management Reviews (Agenda Item 2)**

#### **a) CIFOR EPMR**

3. Dr. Jeffery Burley, Panel Chair of the First CIFOR EPMR, presented the Panel's report highlighting major findings and recommendations in the presence of CIFOR's Director General, Dr. Jeffrey Sayer who presented the Centre's response.

4. Dr. Burley reported that, based on the Panel's comprehensive review of CIFOR's programmes, and outputs since the Centre's inception, CIFOR had done an excellent job in carrying out its mission. There was a large measure of convergence between the Panel, Board and management on the Panel's recommendations; only a few of them were in dispute.

5. Both the social and the biophysical environments figured in CIFOR's research, the aim being to increase the productivity of forests in terms of local, regional, and international public

goods. Information was being generated and synthesized to produce policy advice; national capacity building was central to its activities.

6. CIFOR's ten projects all addressed its main objectives and its mission. However, there could be a clearer correlation between project and mission objectives. Allocating scarce resources against these projects - particularly when their benefits were social, environmental, and not necessarily easily quantifiable - placed a premium on transparency in the priority-setting process. The Panel assessed CIFOR's projects in terms of its two broad mission themes: poverty alleviation and environmental protection. Projects were partitioned in terms of contributions to: (a) increasing livelihood security and forest use and management options for poor rural peoples (poverty alleviation/food security focus); and (b) improving the management of forests for their global, national, and regional environmental services and goods (environmental protection and urban poverty alleviation focus). In the Panel's view, there was need to articulate the specific linkages more transparently with a view to improving project prioritisation. The Panel also felt it would be desirable to identify, address, and allocate resources to cross-cutting themes.

7. The Panel examined all of CIFOR's outputs and tried to assess impact, but the Centre had only been in existence for five years and there was no prior review against which to judge progress. Insufficient time had elapsed to have achieved major impact, particularly from the Centre's international public goods. Outputs in terms of information, publications, training, and partnerships were judged to be good, although more refereed publications would be desirable; partnerships might be streamlined to achieve more concentrated impact. Senior staff, management, and Board members had had a major impact on the international policy debates on forestry conducted by the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), e.g., in identifying and prioritising future needs, developing information services in support of those needs, and allocating scarce resources more efficiently.

8. In terms of governance and management, the competencies of the Board could be slightly expanded in terms of familiarity with the CGIAR System and industrial forestry. The timing of the annual Board meeting did not appear to permit it to have much input to selection and planning of programmes. Two or more meetings per year were, therefore, recommended. There was also concern over the role of project leaders; this in turn was linked to performance appraisal and remuneration. Additionally, a plan for staff succession was needed and the mix of disciplines might need to be changed.

9. Dr. Sayer presented CIFOR's response to the review, noting it had been conducted in a thoughtful and professional way and was perceived by CIFOR staff as having been a useful and constructive exercise. He then commented on each recommendation and highlighted areas of agreement and disagreement.

10. The Panel had recommended that CIFOR evolve its current grouping of research activities into a framework linking more closely and clearly its research activities and their outputs to CIFOR's mission. CIFOR had recognized deficiencies in the mission statement early on but could not modify it for legal reasons and felt it would not be useful to do so. In any case, the statement was sufficiently broad to encompass CIFOR's programmatic objectives, and on these the Panel, Centre, and Board were in agreement. The Panel recommended CIFOR develop a more

formal, transparent and systematic priority setting process that included an explicit set of criteria for (a) judging exclusion or inclusion, appropriateness to the mission, cost-effectiveness, international public goods contribution; and (b) setting priorities. Dr. Sayer noted that, in fact, such criteria were being used and included: improved understanding of the influence of extra-sectoral policies on forest resources; policies and technologies to achieve better management of natural forests; policies and technologies to achieve sustainability and expanded productivity of plantation forests on degraded or low-potential sites; policies and technologies to improve biodiversity conservation; policies to improve local institutional arrangements for forest management; understanding of patterns of change of forest resources at regional and global levels. CIFOR recognized the need to institute formal between-project resource allocations and anticipated that this would be easier when the number of projects was reduced.

11. The Panel's recommendation on partnerships had affirmed that selection of partners should include those from outside traditional forestry or agricultural research services. Actually, CIFOR's record in this area was excellent. The Centre had developed a very broad range of partnerships with people who hitherto had had few links with formal forestry research or the CGIAR. The Panel had further suggested that the effectiveness of existing partnerships be increased rather than seeking new ones. This was consistent with CIFOR's intention to devote more effort to a smaller number of ecoregional foci so as to reduce the transactions costs of working with a large number of partners in many sites.

12. On outreach, the Panel had concluded that a "separate training unit is required". However the Board and management believed that at its present size CIFOR's current approach to outreach was optimal; establishment of a separate unit created the risk of reducing the quality of training and professional development opportunities that arose through research collaboration.

13. The recommendation that the Board meet at least twice a year was agreed and would be implemented immediately. One meeting each year would be scheduled to allow the Board to provide substantive input to the programme of work and budget and the annual rollover of the medium-term plan. The recommendation to expand the Board's competencies had also been endorsed and was being implemented.

14. The suggestion of a more rigorous selection process on an annual basis for renewal of Board members was felt to be too prescriptive; it was decided instead that members should have no automatic right to a second three-year term. In some cases individual members might be asked to stay on for a period of less than three more years, if this better fit the Board's projected profile.

15. The Panel had suggested that a more comprehensive planning system was needed to accommodate staff departures, recruitment and career development. While management recognized that CIFOR was likely to experience a relatively high turnover of international staff, given the unpredictability of staff departures, planning for staff replacement had inevitably to be opportunistic.

16. One issue not captured fully in the review report related to CIFOR's partnership style. The Panel's comments on the performance-appraisal system made no reference to the difficulties of

developing and applying assessment criteria in situations where most research was carried out in collaboration with partners. CIFOR was working with partners on ways to more effectively evaluate the work of both individual scientists and project teams.

17. The Chair then asked Dr. de Vaccaro, chair of the TAC working group on the CIFOR review, to report on the group's deliberations. Dr. de Vaccaro expressed TAC's gratitude to the Panel Chair and members for producing a comprehensive and critical review report. She then posed a number of questions to the Panel Chair and Centre Director. Was there scope for greater complementarity between CIFOR and ICRAF and were there gaps in coverage of the forestry continuum? Recognising the difficulty of quantifying forest outputs, what concrete steps could be taken to address this important issue? Dr. Maria Fernandez Martinez asked what changes or improvements the Centre could make to link its projects more closely to its mission. What could be done to improve the role of project leaders, particularly in the area of multidisciplinary research? What was CIFOR's most important scientific contribution to date? Dr. Michael Cernea asked whether CIFOR was practising state-of-the-art methods and focusing on key variables, including the social sciences. Finally, what was the follow up to the report within the Centre and what feedback had there been from staff?

18. In response, Dr. Burley thought that CIFOR and ICRAF could collaborate and complement each other in such areas as biodiversity, environmental benefits, soil and water, climate, social benefits, employment/income generation, diversity of diet, and the like. On the measurement issue, he observed that although there were good *ex-ante* and *ex-post* evaluation systems for agriculture, the same was not true for environment. Even highly specialized agencies like the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPPC) had not yet come to grips with environmental indicators. This tended to constrain priority setting which, in the last analysis, was a judgement best made by the combined expertise of the Board and Centre. In terms of how to improve its impact, CIFOR had already taken a key step by bringing together biophysical and social scientists to achieve more interdisciplinarity in its work. On improving the role of project leaders, a clearer delineation of responsibilities and of resources to meet them could help. CIFOR's most important achievements included its intellectual contributions to the CSD/IFF (Inter-Governmental Forum on Forests) process; publicizing interdisciplinarity in forestry research; land use policy planning; and recognizing the participatory nature of forestry. On the quality of CIFOR's science, the Panel noted in its report that the majority of research (all but one or two projects) was of a high level; the social science staff was regarded as being at the top of their respective fields. The Centre distinguished between economic science and other social sciences.

19. Dr. Sayer added that CIFOR had identified a number of gaps in its work such as forests and carbon cycles and watershed issues, but no major gaps were apparent. On priority setting, he noted that the issues identified by the IFF based on a consensus of 140 countries provided CIFOR with a compass for identifying priorities and allocating resources. Perhaps the Centre's most important global priority and, hence, potential impact was in developing a holistic view of forest systems. More specific impacts were tailored to the needs of specific constituencies linked to the CSD/IFF processes which required specific outputs. The latter included natural forest management research, research on devolution of forest management to local levels, and criteria and indicators work. Two outstanding achievements of the Centre were: (a) its innovative work

on extra-sectoral influences on structural adjustment in forests which was helpful to decision-makers who determined macroeconomic and agricultural infrastructure policies as they affect forests; and (b) its work on non-timber forest products which had yielded generalizations from a large number of case studies. An area of great potential impact was CIFOR's work on criteria and indicators for social and biophysical sustainability. Finally, the review report had been shared with the staff and debated; groups of staff were following up on programmatic recommendations.

20. Following additional questions and clarifications, the Chair drew the discussion to a close, thanking Dr. Burley and the members of the Panel for their report, and Dr. Sayer for his presentation. After further consideration and discussion in the working group, TAC offered the following commentary prepared with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat, to supplement the Panel's report.

### TAC COMMENTARY

21. *TAC expresses its thanks to the Chair, Dr. Jeffery Burley, and members of the Panel that conducted the First External Programme and Management Review of CIFOR for a constructive and forward-looking report. The Panel's report is analytical and positive about the future role and importance of the Centre. It was discussed at TAC 75 in the presence of the Panel Chair and the Director General of CIFOR, Dr. Jeffrey Sayer.*

22. *TAC is pleased to note the remarkable progress that has been achieved in all aspects of the Centre's work since its establishment in 1992. The Committee commends the Board, management and staff for this substantial achievement.*

23. *TAC agrees with the findings of the Panel, and, in general, endorses the recommendations made in the Panel's report. The Committee is pleased to note that the Board and management of CIFOR are in broad agreement with the Panel's findings, and that the Centre has already taken action to implement them all, even though it has some reservations about the rationale underlying two of the recommendations. The Committee offers the following commentary, prepared with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat, to supplement the Panel's report.*

#### Linkage Between CIFOR's Research and its Mission

24. *The Panel has recommended that CIFOR should evolve its current grouping of research activities into a framework that links more closely and clearly its research activities and their outputs to CIFOR's mission and to the broad thematic needs implied by it. The Panel has also recommended that CIFOR should develop and implement an organizational arrangement that would secure the above linkage, facilitate a transparent mode of priority setting and resource allocation, as well as underpin good management processes. Despite the difficulty in accepting the methods proposed by these recommendations, CIFOR has accepted their objectives. TAC considers the recommendations to be timely, necessary, and appropriate as CIFOR lays its institutional roots for enhancing effective research management.*

### Quality of Science

25. TAC appreciates the Panel's extensive evaluation of the quality of CIFOR's programmes in terms of type of research, formulation of research activities, quality of inputs and methods, and published research outputs. The Committee accepts the Panel's conclusion that CIFOR scientists are doing pioneering research and have produced many high quality publications. However, TAC would like to have seen a more explicit discussion on the quality standards of the research per se in terms of soundness of theory, use of up-to-date methodology as well as policy relevance. It is more effective when the quality of science practised is discussed with explicit reference to the state-of-the-art, in terms of the underlying theory and methodology, and whether the methodologies are in step with progress in other comparable advanced research centres. While TAC understands the Panel's positive sense on such themes, it encourages CIFOR to take these elements into account as it develops further its own quality assurance mechanisms and processes.

### Social Science Research in Forestry

26. Discussions at TAC 75 gave attention to the importance of CIFOR's sociological and economic research, and the need to evaluate these two areas distinctly, not only collectively as "socioeconomic research". CIFOR management rightly feels that large gains can be achieved now by exploring in depth the social, institutional, associational and tenurial dimensions of forestry. The quality of social-anthropological research and economic research was not distinctly and specifically analysed by the Panel. TAC recommends that CIFOR expand the set of relevant social variables, to include determinants of collective action; patterns of social organization in forest activities, etc. This is relevant for CIFOR's research on devolution, smallholder forestry, and forestation of marginal lands.

### Impact Assessment

27. TAC appreciates the fact that CIFOR has not been in existence long enough to have had any major impacts in terms of its mission. The Committee, therefore, concurs with the Panel that only some of CIFOR's activities can be expected to have already had direct impacts on the well-being of people or on environmental protection. However, it would have been useful to TAC to know how CIFOR proposes to empirically measure the intermediate and ultimate impacts of its work. The Committee believes that although impact assessment in forestry research is still subject to considerable methodological debate in the international arena, the Centre should take a more proactive stance on the matter. TAC would also expect the Centre to pay particular attention to developing its impact assessment methodology, despite the long-term nature of CIFOR's research and impact pathways.

### Outposting and Partnership

28. TAC shares the Panel's concern about CIFOR's plans for field placement of scientists, leading in some cases to an internationally recruited scientist working in isolation. The Committee agrees with the Panel that fewer field stations each with a cluster of scientists will help to better promote the CIFOR culture at field sites, as well as in forging effective collaboration with partner institutions.

### Relationship with ICRAF

29. The Panel notes, as in the ICRAF review, that although the formal relations established between CIFOR and ICRAF are cordial, the amount of programmatic co-operation and joint involvement has been less than optimal, considering the potential complementarity of the talents and interests involved. TAC agrees with the view that CIFOR and ICRAF need to develop the relationships and mechanisms that allow them to complement and supplement each other where possible and share responsibility where their interests overlap. Some five years ago the Directors General of the two Centres undertook a study of their complementarities within the context of the Alternatives to Slash and Burn Programme. Since then, both Centres have established regional presence but regional research and partnership strategies have yet to be explicitly defined. The Committee recommends that CIFOR and ICRAF undertake a joint strategic planning exercise at the earliest possible date to (a) define opportunities for collaboration; and (b) agree upon an MOU that would ensure complementarity and operational effectiveness.

### Governance and Management

30. TAC strongly supports the Panel's recommendation that the Board should play a stronger role in setting the research agenda and in programmatic and financial oversight. TAC notes the favourable response of the Board to this proposal.

#### **b) ICRAF EPMR**

31. Dr. Jochen Heuvelodp, Panel Chair of the second ICRAF EPMR, presented the Panel's report highlighting the major findings and recommendations. TAC considered the report in the presence of the Vice-Chair of ICRAF's Board of Trustees, Dr. Maria de Lourdes de Freitas, and ICRAF Director General, Dr. Pedro Sanchez, who presented, respectively, the responses of the Board and Centre.

32. Dr. Heuvelodp briefly summarized the main findings and recommendations of the review. ICRAF was found to be a well-functioning Centre, with high quality scientific research programmes, both at headquarters and in the regions, and an efficient management system. The Centre had created for itself a strategic position within the international agroforestry research community, established a dynamic research programme at headquarters and in the regions, introduced a project-based matrix management structure, and fostered a wide array of partnership commitments. It had established a visible field presence in Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia where agroforestry was now regarded as a type of land use practice requiring serious attention from research, extension and academic institutions. Since entering the CGIAR System in 1991, ICRAF had become a major force in research and development in agroforestry.

33. ICRAF's global and regional programmes had evolved rapidly since the last EPMR, addressing key needs and important topics. There was good evidence that the programmes were producing useful outputs with prospects for substantial impact in the near future. ICRAF's activities were consistent with its own mission and goals, and the CGIAR goals. Its regionalized planning and priority setting processes were consistent with its decentralized matrix structure, and

both of these were evolving. To give direction to their development and provide a coherent framework for preparation of the MTP, the Panel had recommended that ICRAF update its Centre-wide strategy and prepare regional strategies. This should improve the correspondence between ICRAF's programme outputs and regional needs, as well as the generation of international public goods that related to achieving its goals.

34. ICRAF's research strategy necessarily involved partnership with national programmes. While commending the Centre for fostering a collaborative approach to addressing key agroforestry issues, the Panel suggested that particular attention be paid to encouraging partnerships with national programmes that were mutually reinforcing, and remained sensitive to the capacity strengthening needs of scientists in those programmes.

35. ICRAF's governance and management functions had become more complex since it joined the CGIAR System. While in general the Board was well led, effective and took its responsibilities seriously, the Panel concluded that the Board should increase its programme oversight.

36. Finally, ICRAF needed to find the right balance in its research and development activities to satisfy multiple constituencies. The Centre was well positioned to meet this challenge and to contribute to poverty alleviation, food security and environmental protection and enhancement. The Panel fully endorsed continued, strong CGIAR support for ICRAF. Dr. Heuveldop closed by thanking the Panel members, the Board, management and staff of ICRAF, and the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats for their contributions to the review.

37. The joint response of the ICRAF Board and management was delivered by Dr. Sanchez and Dr. de Freitas. Dr. Sanchez began by thanking the Panel for the quality of its work. He emphasized that the review had documented ICRAF's transformation from an information council to a research centre able to deliver quality research relevant to the CGIAR's goals. He was gratified by the Panel's endorsement of the Centre having created both a programme and a development division. The Centre and Board agreed with all but one of the Panel's recommendations (see below). However, there were resource implications for at least five recommendations. These included new or increased work on vegetative propagation and nursery management, marketing and value-added activities, dissemination methodologies, management training courses, and the visiting scientist programme. ICRAF would factor these suggestions into its annual priority setting exercise, recognising that owing to resource constraints trade-offs would inevitably need to be made.

38. ICRAF agreed with the Panel's recommendation on the need for a new strategy at both the Centre and regional programme levels. This exercise had already begun. The Panel's suggestion that the strengths and weaknesses of ICRAF's regionalization strategy be evaluated had also been initiated. An in-depth analysis of partnerships, also recommended, was now underway. Dr. Sanchez closed by expressing ICRAF's appreciation for the positive outcome of the review.

39. Dr. de Freitas presented, on behalf of the ICRAF Board, the latter's views on recommendations pertaining to governance and management. Recommendation 9 (a) on strengthening the Board's oversight of programme had met with the Board's full agreement.



Mechanisms and procedures were already in place to address this task. The Board also fully supported Recommendation 9 (b) regarding instituting formal procedures for commissioning CCERs and considering their results. Recommendation 10, which would restrict initial contracts to three to five years with the possibility of renewal and without the current ceiling of 10 years, did not meet with Board approval. The Board and management felt the 10-year ceiling was key to ensuring renewal of the scientific acumen of the Centre staff and a more appropriate time horizon for research and development for agroforestry. Details of the Board's position on these recommendations were provided in its written response of 29 July 1998 to the review.

40. The Chair then asked Dr. de Vaccaro, chair of the TAC working group on the ICRAF review, to report on the group's deliberations.

41. Dr. de Vaccaro expressed TAC's gratitude to the Panel Chair and members for producing a comprehensive and critical review report. She then posed the following questions to amplify TAC's understanding of the Panel's evaluation and recommendations. (a) While the report made reference to the ICRAF-CIFOR interface, it would have been helpful to identify more explicitly potential areas for co-operation and complementarity: did the Panel have views on any gaps which should be of priority to the System as a whole? (b) TAC shared the perception that there was need for a long-term, strategic framework. In this context, was there scope for developing greater mutual compatibility between headquarters and regional programmes and, if so, how could this be achieved? How would regional strategic plans evolve, relate to the Centre's global strategy, and affect resource allocation across regions? (c) Both CIFOR and ICRAF shared a problem in measuring the impact of forestry research (e.g., on poverty). Did the Panel have suggestions on how this measurement problem could be addressed? (d) How would the Centre resolve the potential conflict between the formation of a new development division and the CGIAR's criterion of the international public goods nature of the CGIAR Centres? Finally, the working group wished to thank the Panel for flagging the issue of growth in restricted funding and the need for full cost recovery of overhead.

42. Dr. Fernandez Martinez expressed the working group's concern regarding the formulation of guidelines that ICRAF was developing for priority setting for vegetative propagation and nursery management. Input to the process from farmers was needed to ensure ownership and impact. Citing the working group's observation that the Panel had made general reference to gaps in cross-cutting aspects of ICRAF's programme, Dr. Cernea requested more specific information on this evident deficiency. He also asked for the Panel's view on the quality of the social science in ICRAF's work. To what extent did ICRAF research cover the basic social and cultural variables that influenced farmer behaviour in the forestry sector? How had staffing in the social sciences evolved at the Centre? What had been the follow up to the review report within the Centre and its regional programmes in terms of staff discussion and feedback? Finally, why was it necessary to recommend that the Centre's 1993 strategy be updated and that senior scientists participate in training? These would appear to be routine functions rather than basic issues for a centre review.

43. On the question of the ICRAF-CIFOR interface, Dr. Heuvelink responded that the two Centres complemented one another in a number of ways; specific areas of cooperation included non-timber products, social forestry, fuelwood, and fuelwood plantations. With regard to

perceived programmatic gaps, he observed that while CIFOR was engaged in dryland zone activities, ICRAF was restricted from doing so only in Africa. Consideration should be given to working in dry zones in Latin America and Asia as well. On strategic planning, the Panel felt that the 1993 plan was obsolete because it had been developed during a period of expansion; the Centre was now in a consolidation phase and needed to focus on the strategic relationship between its headquarters and regional programmes. Regional strategies needed a generically global element to ensure the production of international public goods, particularly as a portion of the Centre's unrestricted funds was allocated to the regions. On assessing impact, Dr. Heuveldop emphasized the desirability of measuring income generation derived from the consumption and/or marketing of trees. This consideration underlay the Panel's recommendation that ICRAF move into marketing research. ICRAF's current approach was to measure the trade-offs between agronomic/economic benefits, social impacts, and environmental impacts. However, much methodological work lay ahead to develop capacity for impact analysis. On the question of the development division possibly becoming an extension service, the Panel found that the division's work was research-driven and largely strategic in nature, addressing such issues as how agroforestry technologies and policies were adopted. As for the guidelines for priority setting, the Panel was satisfied that advisory and review processes were in place to ensure that priorities were determined in a practical, demand-driven way involving intensive co-operation with farmers. With respect to specific gaps in ICRAF's programme, a very quick evaluation was needed of the regionalization process with a view to streamlining it; the partnership programme lacked practical guidelines; training needed to be more formalized; marketing and production research needed to be more closely linked. Finally, the Panel was impressed with the quality of ICRAF's social science research; however, there was need for a much more multidisciplinary approach to this work.

44. TAC Members then raised a number of additional questions. Dr. Usha Barwale Zehr asked what criteria and mechanisms the Centre used in assessing the success of its partnerships. Dr. Alain de Janvry inquired about the nature of ICRAF's relationships with NGOs both in terms of research and diffusion. Were there lessons for the CGIAR? Dr. Elias Fereres asked what new scientific development(s) produced by ICRAF impressed the Panel most. Also, in agroforestry systems, which commodities offered greatest potential over the next 30 years in terms of expanding agricultural production and improving human welfare? Finally, Dr. Cyrus Ndiritu commended ICRAF for the mutuality which had characterized its partnership arrangements with national programmes, particularly the regional services it had rendered to ASARECA.

45. On the question of ICRAF's scientific contributions, Dr. Heuveldop cited, *inter alia*, the high quality of its work in the areas of natural resources management, carbon sequestration modelling, and GIS. On partnership guidelines, an operational paper was needed to specify division of labour with respect to decision-making, types/levels of interaction, devolution, and the like. With regard to partnerships, ICRAF's experience in agroforestry was highly relevant to other centres working on integrated natural resource management. As to work in the dry zones, there was certainly a need for ICRAF to do so, both with respect to populated and, as yet, unpopulated areas. The latter would require a preventive strategy to protect their ecological systems before population pressures degraded the natural resource base.

46. Dr. de Freitas addressed the matter of ICRAF's relationship with CIFOR by drawing attention to the fact that the former's work was more multidisciplinary and, therefore, often related to several ministries, whereas the latter's was more specific to forestry. Recommendations for collaboration between the two Centres needed to be evaluated in terms of the political complexities which they posed.

47. Dr. Sanchez acknowledged that thus far ICRAF had yet to undertake an analysis of its partnerships but planned to do so; its general policy guidelines on partnerships would be improved once such an analysis has been completed. On NGOs, ICRAF has cooperated only with grass roots organisations genuinely interested in the farmers' problems. Work with confrontational NGOs was avoided. ICRAF's most significant scientific contribution to date, in his view, was the quantification of the competition for light, water and nutrients between trees and crops grown together; this fundamental breakthrough permitted predictable modelling of these variables and had transformed agroforestry into a hard science. As for the most promising commodities over the next thirty years, these were primarily trees that would produce high value-added, non-timber products (e.g., pharmaceuticals). ICRAF was pursuing this strategy for smallholder farmers as offering the greatest potential for increased incomes and improved welfare. On dry areas, the limitation on ICRAF's activities had been a Board decision; it was now under reconsideration.

48. The Chair drew the discussion to a close, thanking Dr. Heuveldop and the members of the Panel for their report, as well as Drs. de Freitas and Sanchez for their contributions. After further consideration and discussion in the working group, TAC offered the following commentary with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat.

### TAC COMMENTARY

49. *The report of the Second External Programme and Management Review of ICRAF was discussed at TAC 75 in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Jochen Heuveldop, the Vice-Chair of ICRAF's Board, Dr. Maria de Lourdes de Freitas, and the Director General of ICRAF, Dr. Pedro Sanchez.*

50. *TAC expresses its thanks to the Chair and members of the Panel for a constructive, forward-looking and positive assessment of the future role and importance of the Centre. At the same time, the Panel's report clearly highlights the central issues and challenges facing ICRAF.*

51. *The Committee is pleased to note that ICRAF has worked hard and diligently at transforming itself into a well managed research institution, and that it has become a major force in research and development in agroforestry.*

52. *TAC endorses, in general, the recommendations of the Panel, and notes that ICRAF has responded favourably to nine of the ten, and has already taken steps towards implementing them. TAC encourages wide discussion of the report at the Centre in order to pursue the potential for collective reflections by Centre staff on the messages of the EPMR. TAC offers the following commentary, prepared with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat, to supplement the Panel's report.*

### ICRAF's Strategic Plan

53. TAC agrees with the need for ICRAF to develop its research programme in the context of a clearly elaborated vision of the future needs of agroforestry within a holistic natural resource management framework. The Committee welcomes the Panel recommendation that ICRAF review and update its Strategic Plan, develop both strategic and medium-term plans for each of the Programmes and Regional Offices, and use these as the basis for annual planning. The Committee notes that ICRAF is in the process of decentralising greater authority and control to the Regional Offices while maintaining cross-regional programmatic linkage through global thematic programmes. However, it shares the Panel's view that effective support from the Research and Development Divisions at headquarters for the regional activities will be important in ensuring that ICRAF maintains a cohesive vision and "programme of action". In this regard, TAC strongly encourages ICRAF to ensure that its regional strategies will provide the building blocks for updating its Centre-wide strategy.

### Quality of Science

54. TAC appreciates the Panel's detailed review of ICRAF's research management in terms of quality of inputs, problem formulation, methods and implementation, and outputs. The Committee is pleased to note that despite ICRAF's recent rapid growth, the Centre has developed a sound research programme. Nevertheless, the Panel has highlighted that ICRAF faces the challenge of ensuring that its strategic research programme keeps in step with the more applied on-farm research. In this regard, TAC strongly supports the Panel's recommendation for an increased effort in research on propagation and postharvest technologies, because of their high potential contribution to the goals of the System.

55. TAC noted the Panel's assessment that mechanisms for monitoring programme quality are in place. However, in assessing programme quality, TAC would like to have seen a more explicit discussion on the quality standards of the research per se in terms of soundness of theory, use of up-to-date methodology and policy relevance. It is more effective when the quality of science practised is discussed with explicit reference to the state-of-the-art, in terms of the underlying theory and methodology, and whether the methodologies are in step with progress in other comparable advanced research centres. TAC also felt the need for a stronger Panel and ICRAF analysis of the presence and quality of the Centre's sociological research, in view of the major importance of sociocultural variables, and tenurial, institutional and distributional arrangements, for group-based and smallholder agroforestry. The discussions at TAC 75 emphasized the importance of sociological and economic research and the need to evaluate the contributions of these two areas distinctly rather than collectively as "socioeconomic research". TAC encourages ICRAF to take these elements into account as it further develops its own programme orientation and quality assurance mechanisms and processes. As well, the Committee would have preferred the Panel to identify whether ICRAF has achieved or is on the path of achieving any major scientific product regarded, in terms of its quality, as a major breakthrough.

### Impact Assessment

56. ICRAF expects its activities to have impacts at the global, national, community and farmer levels. The Panel concluded that ICRAF's outputs and achievements are solid and in most part contribute directly to achieving its goals. The Panel found discrete examples of how ICRAF's outputs are beginning to translate into impacts. However, it would have been useful for the Committee to know how ICRAF proposes to measure the intermediate and ultimate impacts of its work at the different levels of aggregation. TAC believes that ICRAF should take a more proactive stance on the matter and pay particular attention to defining its impact assessment strategy.

### Partnerships

57. The extent of ICRAF's partnerships is impressive and TAC is pleased with the analysis offered by the Panel regarding the balance, nature and quality of partnerships with NARS, other CGIAR Centres and other institutions. ICRAF views itself as a partnership-based, development-oriented research institute. Given ICRAF's mandate and future role in integrated natural resources management (INRM), there is no doubt that ICRAF will need to sustain a sizeable level of complex partnering, and the Panel has made two recommendations in this area both of which are endorsed by TAC.

58. TAC agrees with the Panel that for ICRAF to position itself as a global and regional contributor of agroforestry expertise to INRM research, other CGIAR Centres and international institutions need to be involved as partners. In this regard, TAC notes that ICRAF is the convening Centre for two Systemwide Programmes but also participates in eight other Systemwide Programmes. The Panel did not analyse what benefit ICRAF was deriving from participating in the latter but cautions ICRAF against further commitments to Systemwide Programmes, unless the intended activities fit directly within the framework of ICRAF's strategy and MTP. TAC considers this to be sound advice.

### Relationship with CIFOR

59. The Panel notes, as in the CIFOR review, that although the formal relations established between ICRAF and CIFOR are cordial, the amount of programmatic cooperation and joint involvement has been less than optimal, considering the potential complementarity of the talents and interests involved. TAC agrees with the Panel's view that ICRAF and CIFOR need to develop the relationships and mechanisms that allow them to complement and supplement each other where possible and share responsibility jointly where their interests overlap. Some five years ago the Directors General of the two Centres undertook a study of their complementarities within the context of the Alternatives to Slash and Burn Programme. Since then, both Centres have established regional presence in which regional research and partnership strategies have yet to be explicitly defined.

60. TAC recommends that ICRAF and CIFOR undertake a joint strategic planning exercise at the earliest possible date to (a) define opportunities for collaboration; and (b) agree upon an MOU that would ensure complementarity and operational effectiveness.

### Development Division

61. *The Panel report points out that ICRAF is evolving into an institution that gives explicit and equal emphasis to the research and development activities needed to ensure that the results are put into use as rapidly as possible. ICRAF has taken several steps to operationalize the research-to-development continuum, including the establishment of the Development Division. The Panel report places a strong emphasis on the need to focus on producing international public goods. With respect to those related to development activities pursued by ICRAF, the Panel has recommended research on dissemination methods and techniques, as well as market development research and strategic planning for value added activities. TAC supports the recommendations that are consistent with the need for ICRAF to avoid being drawn into purely extension type activities, and emphasizes the Institute's potential in evolving policy recommendations for governments. More attention should be paid by ICRAF to the social and institutional strategies that must match technological recommendations in agroforestry. The Committee agrees with the Panel that there is a need to draw on experiences from around the world in these development-oriented activities and to do selected research in the area. This research should also be linked with the carrying out of constraint and needs analysis with partners to define alternative dissemination pathways and approaches.*

### Governance and Management

62. *The Panel points out that ICRAF's governance and management functions are now more complex, and has recommended that the Board should strengthen its programme oversight by becoming more proactive in setting its agenda as well as institute a formal procedure to schedule and commission Centre Commissioned External Reviews. TAC endorses this recommendation which should improve the effectiveness of the Board in discharging its due diligence functions as well as its communication with management and staff. TAC notes the favourable response of the Board to this recommendation.*

### **First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP) (Agenda Item 3)**

63. Dr. Jaap Hardon, Panel Chair of the First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP), presented the Panel's report highlighting major findings and recommendations. TAC considered the report in the presence of Dr. Geoffrey Hawtin, SGRP Programme Leader and Director-General of IPGRI, the convening Centre; Dr. Joel Cohen, Chair of the ICWG-GR; and Dr. Jane Toll, Coordinator, SGRP Secretariat. Drs. Hawtin and Cohen presented the respective responses of SGRP and ICWG-GR.

64. Dr. Hardon stressed the complexity of reviewing SGRP given the number and diversity of its stakeholders and the varying interests and viewpoints involved. The review Panel itself reflected various disciplines and a diversity of views. The resulting report was, therefore, not to be considered the final word on SGRP but rather a contribution to the ongoing debate within the CGIAR on how the System might position itself in a more unified way on genetic resources

issues currently being negotiated at the inter-governmental level in various fora - i.e., the Convention on Biological Diversity, FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, and World Trade Organisation.

65. In addressing the role of the CGIAR in genetic resources, the Panel distinguished between conservation in the narrow sense (i.e., collecting materials for the future to avoid genetic erosion) and the broad sense (i.e., evaluating the characteristics of genetic resources for crop breeding purposes). The CGIAR's breeding programmes currently contributed to GR conservation in both senses given the extensiveness of centres' collections, but the balance lay more on the breeding side. A key question, then, was whether the System wished to maintain its current position or to expand its role and take the lead in GR conservation narrow sense, thereby increasing the long-term relevance of its collections to the international agricultural research community. The Panel recommended the latter approach. Its adoption would require a Systemwide programme with a unified strategy and much more research on the extent of genetic erosion with a view to identifying priorities for conservation. As well, stronger central governance would be needed; the Panel offered a number of options in this regard and also suggested creation of a number of regional GR conservation centres working closely with national/regional programmes. In this scenario, CGIAR Centres would take responsibility for their respective regions. A stronger Systemwide programme with a broadened mandate was seen as more likely to attract donor support.

66. Dr. Cohen, speaking on behalf of the ICWG-GR, recognized the need for a strengthened SGRP. The Working Group had indicated in its written response to the review report that it had reached a large measure of agreement on most of the Panel's recommendations. Dr. Cohen noted that of the review's eighteen recommendations, six addressed ongoing activities of the centres; five would add new activities ranging from policy analysis to gender analysis to participatory plant breeding; two dealing with the development of SINGER had financial implications; and five others addressed issues such as assessment, strategy and structure. Thus, the report reflected the difficulty of balancing the major functions involved in addressing the broader GR agenda versus opportunities for project collaboration with SGRP. Clearly, the SGRP and ICWG-GR needed to develop a strategy and an agenda to address the issues posed by the review. The Working Group placed emphasis on strengthening its own capacity in the areas of science, policy and genomics and on sharpening the focus of its projects to permit more efficient selection among alternatives.

67. Dr. Hawtin, speaking for SGRP, noted that while the review Panel was to be commended for coming to grips with a range of issues, the complex nature of SGRP's functions meant that coverage of the Programme was inevitably incomplete. TAC may wish to take this into account in conducting reviews of other Systemwide programmes. While agreeing that centres had generally endorsed the response of the ICWG-GR to the review, the response itself was quite general as centres held diverse institutional views. As Chair of the CDC, Dr. Hawtin reported that there was a large measure of support for the response of the ICWG-GR, but it was not unanimous. One concern was the review's very strong concentration on crop genetic resources, with less attention to animal, forest, and aquatic genetic resources and *in situ* management of GR. The relative priority to be given to improving genebank management had to be weighed against the broader System level goals recommended by the review Panel. Speaking for IPGRI,

Dr. Hawtin commended to TAC the written commentary of his Board of Trustees on the review report. It stressed the need to distinguish between governance of the CGIAR's genetic resources research agenda which needed oversight by a higher level, representative body able to deal with issues of policy and strategy at the System level, and the programme function of SGRP/ICWG-GR as a means of coordinating specific inter-centre activities. Finally, Dr. Hawtin emphasized the CGIAR's need to develop a vision of its role vis-à-vis that of other stakeholders within a global system of genetic resources; a global dialogue with this objective in mind should precede decisions on GR governance, division of labour, resource allocation, and the like. SGRP planned to sponsor a stakeholders' dialogue on this question in the coming year.

68. The Chair thanked the Panel for a pointed, far-reaching review with specific observations and recommendations. He noted that four of the review recommendations dealt directly with the functions of SGRP; seven with its mandate, which had implications for division of labour and finance at the System level; and seven with broader CGIAR themes. Especially noteworthy was the Panel's identification of the need for improved decision-making within SGRP, common GR guidelines for centres, a common CGIAR position at the global level, and maintaining an appropriate balance between the demands of the world community and the specific needs and requirements of the centres. Dr. Winkelmann then invited comments on the review report from members of the TAC working group on the SGRP review.

69. Dr. Barwale Zehr observed that the report did not clarify the precise role of SGRP within the CGIAR. Judging from how the Programme's resources were allocated, the information function seemed dominant (34%), whereas policy formulation (0.0%), representation (1.0%), and public awareness (3.0%) appeared to have much lower priority. She also took issue with Recommendation 2 of the report on provision of GR materials in post-disaster situations. The centres themselves routinely respond to such disasters. SGRP should play a strategic role in proactively predicting disasters and prescribing preventive measures.

70. Dr. Keiji Kainuma reiterated the working group's observation that only four of the review report's recommendations dealt directly with SGRP's functions, while the rest treated genetic resources policy and management issues at the System level. The need for a higher level body, broadly representative of the System as a whole, to deal with such issues should be carefully examined. However, the alternatives for GR governance at the System level should not be limited to the two options proposed in the review report. He endorsed the Panel's view that the CGIAR needed to address the changing policy environment affecting GR at the global level; this could no longer be seen as a technical issue; it was increasingly political. While agreeing with Recommendation 12 on more balanced allocation of SGRP resources to plants, trees, animals, and aquatic resources, he did not think the CGIAR had a comparative advantage on micro-organisms as there were well established alternative suppliers.

71. A number of other TAC Members contributed the following points to the general discussion of the SGRP review. Dr. de Janvry felt the report raised a number of important issues but did not propose specific solutions. In view of funding uncertainties, it would have been helpful to have prioritized the recommendations, suggesting alternative allocation options, sources of supply, partnerships, and/or institutional arrangements to meet SGRP objectives. Dr. de Vaccaro asked whether the review had assessed the value-added of SGRP beyond the



collaborative GR activities which centres normally undertook, i.e., was there sufficient justification for the Programme to continue?

72. In response, Dr. Hardon reiterated the Panel's view that its report was intended to initiate dialogue on the issues rather than to come to closure on them; thus, it avoided proposing specific solutions. On the question of value-added, prior to SGRP the centres had done a very credible job in collecting, conserving, and utilising genetic diversity and in promoting a global system involving national genebanks. But the international and national policy environments affecting genetic resources had changed and now involved intense debates over political and economic issues. A significant achievement of SGRP was representation, in the person of its Programme Leader, of CGIAR interests at international fora where these issues were being negotiated. Secondly, while SINGER had contributed to greater sharing of GR information and documentation, it needed to become more than a multicrop documentation system by linking up with other networks and national genebanks to provide users with access to information on a per crop basis. On the issue of SGRP's sectoral coverage, the Panel recognized that the CGIAR's strength lay primarily in crop genetic resources. With regard to conserving animal, forest, aquatic, and micro-organism genetic resources, the CGIAR should not commit itself to more than it could deliver; indeed, this might discourage the efforts of other institutions, particularly at national level.

73. In the ensuing discussion, some Centre Directors stressed the desirability of greater CGIAR involvement in genetic resources conservation for the livestock, forestry, and fisheries sectors and for increased emphasis on managed ecosystem approaches, as reflected in CBD deliberations and decisions. Others emphasized the CBD's view that GR conservation was ultimately the responsibility of countries and that the CGIAR should rely on partnerships, networks, and international databases for sectors in which its contribution was constrained by limited resources. But the need for more science on these sectors was not disputed. With regard to intergovernmental policy negotiations and national legislation whose regulatory frameworks may restrict access to genetic resources for food security, there was consensus that the CGIAR should provide technical advice to underpin the principle of continued unrestricted access. SGRP had a role to play in this regard. However, the System should refrain from entering into political debates at the intergovernmental level.

74. The Chair drew the discussion to a close, thanking Dr. Hardon and the members of the Panel for their report, as well as Drs. Hawtin and Cohen for their contributions. After further consideration and discussion in the working group, TAC offered the following commentary prepared with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat, to supplement the Panel's report.

#### TAC COMMENTARY

75. *The report of the First External Review of the System-wide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP) was discussed at TAC 75 in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Jaap Hardon; Dr. Geoffrey Hawtin, Director-General of IPGRI, the SGRP Convening Centre; Dr. Joel Cohen, Chair of the Inter-Centre Working Group on Genetic Resources; and Dr. Jane Toll, Co-ordinator, SGRP Secretariat.*

76. TAC expresses its thanks to the Chair and members of the Panel for a thorough, candid, and thought-provoking review and assessment of SGRP's performance since its inception in 1994 as one of the CGIAR's System-wide programmes. It also wishes to thank SGRP and the Inter-Centre Working Group on Genetic Resources (ICWG-GR), as well as IPGRI for making available to TAC 75 their respective comments on the Review Report. In preparing its commentary, TAC also benefited from the views expressed by FAO and individual Centres.

77. The Review's terms of reference charged the Panel with assessing SGRP in terms of its role in positioning the CGIAR within the global genetic resources effort. The Panel was to evaluate the Programme's performance of its mandated functions, covering a broad range of topics including the policy environment for global genetic resources; the mission, strategy, governance, resourcing, and accomplishments of SGRP; and options for enhancing and strengthening the role of the Programme in the future.

78. In considering this Report, TAC is mindful that certain of the recommendations of the System Review to be considered at ICW'98 may affect the future governance of the CGIAR in various sectors, including that of genetic resources. Inasmuch as the recommendations of the SGRP Review also have implications for governance, TAC decided to focus its current deliberations only on those recommendations aimed at improving the performance of SGRP without reference to matters of structure and governance. Consideration of the Panel's recommendations on Centre and System level issues are therefore held in abeyance, pending the outcome of the discussion from the System Review. The Group will, of course, have the benefit of the Panel's recommendations on the latter issues when the Report is tabled at ICW'98.

79. Of the Report's 18 recommendations, Nos. 3, 8, 9 and 13 relate critically to the major functions assigned to SGRP:

*Recommendation 3: The Panel recommends that the SGRP should continue to monitor policy decisions at national, regional and global levels, as well as identify needs and opportunities arising from such decisions, so that appropriate actions can be taken by the CGIAR in a Systemwide fashion. In addition, the SGRP should be involved in the analysis of the consequences for developing countries of proposed and agreed policies.*

*Recommendation 8: The Panel recommends that the SGRP prepare a strategic plan with prioritized objectives and areas of research/activity.*

*Recommendation 9: The Panel recommends that a new SGRP structure be developed for achieving greater functional effectiveness and efficiency in Systemwide cooperation in GR activities in the CGIAR.*

*Recommendation 13: The Panel recommends that SINGER be made more user-friendly and user-responsive to a wider range of stakeholders.*

80. TAC wishes to endorse the above recommendations and in particular to emphasize the importance of SGRP's sharply defining its priorities and strategies in relation to its mission.

*While TAC acknowledges that a new structure might be needed for the Programme, the Committee reiterates its desire to revisit this issue in the light of possible changes in governance resulting from the System Review. In addition, TAC offers the following commentary to supplement the Panel's report:*

*81. SGRP's antecedents lie in the Group's earlier extensive deliberations on the need for System-wide co-ordination of genetic resources activities to enable the CGIAR to develop, adopt and take unified positions and actions on genetic resources issues at national, regional, and global levels. In light of the findings of the External Review on SGRP's performance thus far, TAC considers that the most urgent tasks requiring the Programme's attention and action are:*

- 1. To assist Centres in fulfilling their obligations as trustees of their respective ex-situ collections of agricultural, forestry, and aquatic genetic resources. This task involves improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of the following SGRP activities:*

*policy: development of policies and tools relating to the conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture in support of implementation of the FAO-CGIAR Agreements.*

*representation: development of technical and policy positions for purposes of appropriately representing the CGIAR in the various global fora dealing with issues of genetic resources for food and agriculture;*

*information: ensuring the widespread availability of accurate, up-to-date information on genetic resources for food and agriculture, especially as pertains to the in-trust collections;*

*public awareness: increasing awareness, especially among policy-makers, of the importance of conserving genetic resources for food and agriculture and of using genetic resources as a basis for development;*

*training: development of training programmes in the management of genetic resources for food and agriculture.*

- 2. To formulate a minimum standard for genetic resources facilities and a set of guidelines for upgrading the facilities so as to keep them at acceptable international norms.*

*82. TAC maintains its position that these tasks remain critical and should be implemented on a priority basis. It is especially crucial that all in-trust materials be kept in facilities meeting the standards of FAO's Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The need to upgrade such facilities should be identified wherever appropriate.*

*83. In light of the review's findings, TAC urges a more rigorous implementation of the mandated objectives of SGRP. The Committee agrees with the Panel's view that the Programme's present structure might not be conducive to achieving the desired results. In TAC's judgement, and pending the outcome of ICW'98's discussion of the System Review, careful*

*consideration should be given to having the priorities identified above carried out by IPGRI, with ICWG-GR serving as an advisory body to the Institute.*

#### **Centre Financing Plans 1999 (Agenda Item 4)**

84. The Chair introduced this item by reviewing the process by which TAC analysed centres' annual financing plans. Attention was given to the implications of the plans for CGIAR priorities and strategies, their consistency with the centres' medium-term plans (MTPs), their conformity with the substance of the 1999 Research Agenda approved by the Group at MTM'98, and the programmatic implications of potential financing gaps. TAC also scrutinized centres' proposals for new projects other than those endorsed in MTPs, with a view to assessing their consistency with the general criteria for CGIAR support to the Research Agenda. He then turned to Dr. Shey Tata of the CGIAR Secretariat for an overview of the 1999 financing plans submitted by centres.

85. Dr. Tata began by noting that all centres had submitted their financing plans to the CGIAR Secretariat by the 11 September 1998 deadline; analyses of the plans were then compiled and synthesized by the Secretariat and made available to TAC. Centres had provided comprehensive information; the project management mode had facilitated transparency. At MTM'98, the Group had approved the substance of centres' medium-term plans for 1999-2000, and, as well, funding of US\$ 335-345 million. The total investment proposed by centres for the 1999 research agenda was US\$ 367 million. Centres' investments were to be financed from their estimates of identified 1999 support (US\$ 342 million), sources as yet unidentified (US\$ 10 million) and estimated non-grant income (US\$ 15 million). Dr. Tata provided highlights of the proposed plans at the System level, i.e. in terms of centre shares of the CGIAR research agenda, investments in CGIAR activities, and investments in commodities and sectors.

86. The Chair thanked Dr. Tata for his presentation and for the CGIAR Secretariat's efforts in providing TAC with a consolidation of centres' plans. The Committee then prepared its report on the 1999 financing plans for consideration by the Finance Committee at ICW'98. TAC noted the general consistency of the 1999 financing plans with the Group's endorsement of the substance of centres' proposals at MTM'98. However, the Committee was concerned about the System's persistent relative underinvestment in livestock research and water management research and about shifting shares in the commodity portfolio compared to endorsed levels. The TAC Chair observed that in absolute terms virtually all commodities and centres were underinvested.

87. In particular, TAC noted potential shortfalls in research on banana/plantain, cassava in Africa, and yam which were apparently moving away from the desired trend or were already well below the 2000 target. The poverty-weighted priority the Group had assigned to these crops reflected their importance for the poor in sub-Saharan Africa as well as other regions of the developing world. The CGIAR's relative overinvestment in maize, rice, and wheat underscored the anomaly implicit in these financing trends and the need to rebalance commodity investments in accordance with MTP approved priorities.

88. TAC was also of the view that a more concerted strategy was needed to bring System resources into alignment with the Group's priority on water management research. The questions of where resources for water-related research were being allocated, for what purposes and with what effects, needed to be addressed. TAC suggested this issue be taken up by the IIMI EPMR; a broader study by TAC could also be warranted. Financing of livestock research was particularly deficient and warranted urgent attention. TAC recommended that support for such research be reviewed for purposes of increasing its profile within the CGIAR, especially in marginal lands and on issues of animal genetic resources. In the interim, the ILRI EPMR should take this matter into consideration as far as was practicable.

89. Apparent relative overinvestment in strengthening NARS at the System level was a matter of concern for several reasons. The Group's strategy had been one of looking to NARS as alternative sources of supply, implying a reduced investment in traditional forms of institution strengthening in tandem with an increase in management research-based service provided by ISNAR. While 1999 financing plans appeared to be inconsistent with this strategy, the apparent oversubscription at the System level could simply be due to centres' classification of research networks under this activity rather than research proper. Such issues should be resolved in the future as the System logframe and project-based reporting became operational.

90. Although centre financing plans were comprehensive and facilitated TAC's decision-making, the Committee noted that many centres included in their 1999 planning budget a component of "unidentified" funding, often of sufficient magnitude to cause concern in the event of a funding shortfall. TAC was unable to assess the programmatic implications of this component of centres' budgets in the absence of information provided by centres in their plans. The Committee therefore recommended that future financial plans identify likely programme changes in the event that unidentified funding did not materialize.

91. Finally, TAC reiterated its concern over the ever increasing share of restricted funding in centre financing plans which reduced the CGIAR's flexibility to address emerging issues on its research agenda.

### **TAC Study of CGIAR Commitments in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) (Agenda Item 5)**

92. Dr. Lucio Reca, Chair of the Panel that conducted the TAC Study on CGIAR Commitments in LAC, presented the Panel's report highlighting the major findings. Dr. Ernesto Samayoa (Mexico), a member of the study Panel, was also present. Dr. Reca's presentation focused on shifts in the roles of public and private sector organisations in agricultural research in LAC, with particular reference to their implications for national agricultural research institutes (NARIs) and regional/sub-regional networks. He also examined the interface between regional priorities and those of the CGIAR with a view to identifying opportunities for future collaboration between IARCs and NARIs.

93. At present, there was ample consensus among LAC's agricultural research systems on the value of CGIAR efforts in the region, particularly in the areas of germplasm development, preservation of biodiversity, and training. However, the visibility of the CGIAR in LAC was probably not commensurate with the importance of its contributions. LAC itself was endowed with a well developed set of public agricultural research institutions, some highly qualified in terms of human capital and physical infrastructure. These institutions were in a process of readjustment consequent to profound economic and technological changes in the region, notably, reforms stemming from the economic crisis of the 1980s which had reduced the role of the public sector and placed more emphasis on private initiative.

94. A trend of special significance for the CGIAR was that LAC scientific and technological advances were fostering the privatisation of large segments of new knowledge relevant to agriculture. Given the increased prominence of the private sector, public agricultural research institutions were generally experiencing reduced budgetary allocations, loss of qualified personnel, and more seriously, inability to recruit new staff with equivalent training. In many countries legislation dealing with intellectual property rights (IPRs) had recently been enacted. It was anticipated that this development would facilitate a new division of labour between different actors in the field of agricultural research. The dynamism and ability of the region to react to new institutional, economic and technological circumstances were illustrated by the creation of a regional financial mechanism (FONTAGRO) and a regional forum (FORAGRO), as well as a linking institution (FLAR) between NARIs and IARCs working on improved germplasm for rice.

95. Prospects for developing or strengthening constructive relationships between LAC institutions and CGIAR Centres were essentially good, provided such relationships were based on shared agendas (ownership) and a mutually satisfactory division of labour according to cost considerations and comparative advantage (partnership). There was an increasing awareness of the need to adapt to the new economic/technological environment by (a) designing new forms of cooperation between public institutions (NARIs/universities) as well as between public and private actors, and (b) linking with the array of regional/sub-regional networks to facilitate exchange of experiences and to accelerate the readjustment/integration process.

96. NARIs had been created in the 1950s and 1960s in the majority of medium and large LAC countries, the rationale being to finance the production of public goods for agriculture and to correct market failures in the sector. In budgetary terms, NARIs were currently the largest component of NARS in LAC despite the emergence of new actors: they still commanded some two-thirds of resources allocated for agricultural research in the region. While historically they had enjoyed considerable administrative and financial autonomy, the current trend was to curtail financial autonomy and finance these entities from other sources (e.g., Uruguay, Mexico, Colombia, Chile, Argentina). This change in the financing of NARIs was part of a wider process of adaptation to a new economic paradigm in LAC, the increasing participation of the private sector and universities in agricultural research, and widespread use of IPRs in such research.

97. Well-known regional and sub-regional institutional networks (e.g., IICA, CARDI, CATIE, and PROCIS) acted as sounding boards for new initiatives and were an important factor in: information sharing; networking, coordinating and promoting new activities; complementing and/or substituting for small national programmes; and cooperating with the CGIAR. They also

supplied high quality graduate training in agricultural sciences, were broadening their constituencies to include universities, NGOs, and the private sector, and were participating in the process of regional economic integration.

98. Generally, there was substantial congruence between CGIAR priorities (alleviating poverty, protecting the environment, improving food security) and national priorities. The alleviation of poverty in LAC had become largely an urban phenomenon, with 75 percent of total population living in cities. While 45 percent of the region's population was classified as poor, the urban poor accounted for 65 percent of all poor. Notable exceptions were countries like Bolivia, Guatemala, and Honduras where the rural populace was a large share of total population and poverty was highest in rural areas. However, in general, LAC differed from other regions of the developing world where poverty was largely a rural phenomenon. There was thus consensus in LAC that an important tool to alleviate urban poverty was to secure the supply of good quality food at affordable prices. This was an area in which the CGIAR had excelled through its important contributions to the efficiency and productivity of agriculture.

99. As fruits and vegetables had become the leading group of LAC agricultural exports, a trend likely to continue in both the public and private sectors, priority was being given to identifying and promoting such products. This strategy was enhanced by the region's wealth of biodiversity. Moreover, small farmers constituted an important source of production of such crops which were typically grown labour-intensively. As well, trade liberalisation had placed a premium on maintaining or increasing the competitiveness of agricultural production in traditional exports. Another frequently mentioned priority was the promotion of agro-industries and processed foods, with their potential for generation of non-agricultural rural income. A regional consultation conducted by FONTAGRO had also identified genetic improvement, postharvest technology, integrated pest management, and institutional policies as LAC priorities.

100. LAC research leaders believed the CGIAR should be more responsive to the region's needs and take better advantage of opportunities for cooperation through existing regional organisations. There was also consensus that the CGIAR should move "upstream" in its research and increase emphasis on programmes and projects aimed at making better use of opportunities offered by the new technologies to countries in the region. More intensive cooperation with regional mechanisms (IICA, PROCIS, CARDI, CATIE) would be desirable. Some NARIs had research capacity in areas on a par with IARCs. CGIAR operational strategies in the region should take full advantage of this circumstance. Fuller participation by LAC NARS in the definition of CGIAR regional priorities could help to shape future relations between the CGIAR and LAC.

101. In the area of natural resources management, the absence of a generally accepted research paradigm, institutional weakness, and economic disincentives constrained LAC countries investing in NRM research which, in any case, was perceived as lying outside the domain of the CGIAR's traditional partners, the NARS. Moreover, the prevailing economic paradigm favouring reduced government intervention militated against NRM activities which frequently required complex institutional mechanisms, regulatory frameworks and/or subsidies.

102. As for future collaboration, there was need to maximize complementarities between IARCs and NARS in the region, to increase the visibility of the CGIAR in LAC through high level policy dialogue, and to define carefully areas of common interest for NARS and IARCs, and to improve modalities for partnership, planning, operations, and evaluation.

103. The Chair thanked Dr. Reca for his presentation and opened the floor for questions from the TAC working group for this study, chaired by Dr. de Janvry.

104. In the ensuing discussion, a number of questions were raised and clarified concerning the degree of representativeness of the sample of countries upon which the study was based, the relative share of expenditure for agricultural research in LAC compared to other regions, and the trend in the quality of science in Latin America and the Caribbean. The working group generally felt the report should have been more explicit in recommending how specific problems might be collaboratively addressed by the CGIAR and LAC partners.

105. A number of broader issues were also raised. Dr. de Janvry maintained that alleviating urban poverty through lower food prices via increased productivity of commercial farming needed to be complemented by development of technologies targeted to the rural poor in LAC countries where they still constituted a majority of the population. For the CGIAR, the resource allocation issue was whether to invest in technologies that had direct or indirect effects on poverty reduction. In countries where urban and rural poverty coexisted, the CGIAR may well need to invest in both upstream and downstream research/diffusion to reduce poverty. With regard to the NRM research, it was true that high discount rates created disincentives to investment by governments in LAC. This was a policy issue that needed to be addressed by the international community which could provide complementary resources to induce NRM investments; the problem could not be postponed. Also, some NRM interventions, e.g., clarifying property rights, ensuring access to credit, required much less capital than others and should be pursued now to avoid the far more costly effects of irreversible environmental degradation.

106. Dr. Fernandez Martinez observed that the outputs of NARS research in LAC were often not shared with poor farmers or targeted to their needs. This issue had been widely discussed in the region and should be addressed by the CGIAR. She also stressed the heterogeneity of NARS in the Caribbean and the need to reflect in the report that, for example, while Cuba was strong in biotechnology research, its NARS, comprised of a broad range of research institutions, produced technologies targeted to the needs of poor farmers. Dr. Barwale Zehr stressed the need to tailor research to specific situations. It would be dangerous to rely on biotechnology alone; other, more conventional technologies would still be needed for poor farmers. Dr. Fereres asked whether LAC NARS were actually picking up biotechnology research and, if so, at what rate?

107. Dr. de Vaccaro maintained that the level of poverty in LAC was far greater than suggested in the report which had relied on 1994 data. More recent figures reflected dramatic increases in the proportion of poor people; e.g., in Venezuela 80 percent of the population were now classified as poor. Moreover, the gap between rich and poor had widened. Thus, the paradigm suggested by the study, if followed by the CGIAR, would permit poverty alleviation and natural resources management to "fall between the cracks." A critical analysis was needed of what the CGIAR



could do to address these issues case-by-case taking into account the heterogeneity of LAC's agroecology and the uneven strengths of its NARS.

108. In response to the comments and questions raised by TAC Members, Dr. Reca reiterated the report's recognition that care should be exercised in generalising about LAC countries' research capacities and needs. Yet the study sample had represented over half the countries in the region and approximately 80 percent of its research capacity. On the issue of direct vs. indirect approaches to poverty alleviation, the high value-added export strategy being pursued by many countries was a reality and a consequence of the region's new political environment. Foreign exchange earnings were financing imports of grain at affordable prices for poor consumers. A basic issue for the CGIAR was whether to change its portfolio mix to include tropical and sub-tropical fruits and vegetables, which served both domestic consumption needs and the region's export strategy. While in some countries there was a trend among NARIs to disengage from research aimed at alleviating rural poverty, in certain cases the needs of poor farmers were being addressed by other agencies through special programmes. The uptake of biotechnology was uneven owing to unresolved legislative issues regarding IPRs which would take time to sort out; however, prospects for increased uptake and the realisation of benefits from biotechnology in the near term were quite good. On the NRM issue, Dr. Reca reiterated that a liberalized political environment would continue to impede major investments in environmental protection; this was simply a political reality.

109. The TAC Chair again thanked Dr. Reca and the members of the study Panel for their efforts. After further consideration by the TAC working group for this item, the Committee recommended that the following actions, *inter alia*, be taken to complete the study:

- (a) broaden the database to take account of the views of small NARS;
- (b) establish how NARS and NARIs are addressing rural poverty and natural resource degradation, and the extent to which their agendas overlap those of the centres;
- (c) analyse the role of NGOs in terms of research and interactions with NARS/IARCs;
- (d) give additional attention to the extent of rural poverty and, in particular, its heavy incidence in some countries; and
- (e) amplify points about the limited investment of NARIs in NRM research.

110. A note prepared by Dr. de Janvry amplifying the above guidance would be shared with the Study Panel. A report on progress in completing the study would be made at TAC 76.

### **1998 King Baudouin Award (Agenda Item 6)**

111. The Committee considered submissions from seven centres for the 1998 King Baudouin Award. Following the criteria established at TAC 74, TAC selected ICRISAT's submission, "Pigeonpea Improvement at ICRISAT: from Orphan Crop to Pacesetter," as the winner of the 1998 Award. It then prepared the following commentary:

## TAC COMMENTARY

112. TAC considered the contribution to be outstanding because the work addressed the broad spectrum of plant improvement including taxonomy, disease resistance, hybridization, commercialization and sustainability. TAC prepared the following commentary on ICRISAT's work:

- (a) *Direct or indirect, actual or potential impact on resource-poor farmers and low-income people.*

113. *Pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan L. Millsp.) is a grain legume that contributes protein to the diets of an estimated 1.1 billion people around the world, cultivated on some 5 million ha globally. Its leaves are eaten by livestock and the woody stem serves as fuelwood for poor farmers. Women are often involved in its postharvest processing and marketing. Yet until the mid-1970s, the crop attracted little attention from either public or private sector research and development (R&D) programmes.*

114. *ICRISAT's first major impact in pigeonpea research was to help bring Fusarium wilt disease under control for millions of smallholders across semi-arid tropics especially India and Africa. Since the poorest farmers cultivated the most susceptible, long-duration plant types, targeting wilt resistance was a way to deliver research benefits to the most needy smallholders.*

115. *The impact of this research and development initiative in central India, the heart of the pigeonpea production zone, has been documented by ICRISAT economists. To date, the largest impact was generated by the line ICP 8863 released by ICRISAT in 1986. Its adoption in the northern part of Karnataka State, the primary target zone, increased from 5% in 1987 to almost 60% of the pigeonpea area by 1992/93. Gains included a stabilization of smallholder production, major expansion of crop area, and increased smallholder incomes. Smallholder enterprises became increasingly profitable as unit costs of production fell by 42%. The net present value of benefits from the research effort have been estimated at US\$ 62 million to date, representing an internal rate of return of 65% on the original research investment. An impact study of another line, ICPL 87, in central and southern India, found that the variety-management package already has a net present value of US\$ 120 million, and an internal rate of return of nearly 30%.*

116. *NARS in five countries - India, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania and Uganda - have now released the wilt restraint variety as well as others selected from landraces in ICRISAT's collection. Finally, on-farm trials of ICPL 88039, a short-season variety, show a yield advantage of 12% over much longer season materials, reflect increased yields of 12%. Its promising performance has generated strong demand from NARS in India, Sri Lanka, and Indonesia where its release is under consideration.*

(b) *Direct or indirect, actual or potential impact on sustainable production systems.*

117. *With the new short-season materials, pigeonpea has a potential niche within the rice-wheat systems of the Indo-Gangetic Plain. Spanning four countries in south Asia and home to approximately 260 million poor, this critical agro-ecosystem shows signs of instability apparently associated with the high-input, cereals-dominated cropping system introduced over the last two decades. While traditional varieties would delay wheat planting, extra-early maturing pigeonpea has sufficiently short duration to be harvested well in advance of the optimal wheat sowing date. As well, interviews with farmers in the Africa region revealed that well nodulated pigeonpea contributes to the nitrogen economy by fixing atmospheric nitrogen symbiotically, enhancing soil fertility, and better controlling soil erosion.*

(c) *Innovation Science*

118. *ICRISAT's advances in pigeonpea research include:*

- *the world's first pigeonpea hybrid variety, ICPH 8, which reached farmers' fields in 1991, henceforth disproving the assumption that hybrid systems were not achievable for food legumes;*
- *reduction of the maturation period for traditional varieties from 6–10 months to 3–4 months, permitting multiple cropping;*
- *resistance to the diseases Fusarium wilt, alternaria leaf spot, cercospora leaf spot, phytophthora stem blight, sterility mosaic, and powdery mildew; and to the podfly insect, Helicoverpa and Maruca pod bores, and the Clavigralla pod sucking bug;*
- *resistance to important abiotic stresses such as salinity, waterlogging, and drought, and so capitalizing on pigeonpea's ability to extract 2–7 times more iron-bound phosphorous (the most limiting nutrient across the semi-arid tropics) from typical Alfisol soils than maize, millet, sorghum, or groundnut;*
- *possibility of triggering a major geographic extension of the crop by facilitating diversification of existing cereal-dominated cropping systems by inclusion of a legume component.*

(d) *Partners and Collaboration*

119. *ICRISAT's work on pigeonpea has been characterized by an expansion of the scope and depth of its partnerships with NARS, IARCs, NGOs, the private sector, and farmers groups (particularly women), in Africa as well as in Asia. Examples include:*

- *sharing of the hybrid technology with the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) and 14 public and private seed companies in India in the late 1980s/early 90s; in 1989, a comprehensive hybrid pigeonpea development initiative was launched by ICAR involving nine of its centres;*

- *collaboration with Sri Lankan NARS with the support of the Asian Development Bank to design technologies that solve pigeonpea postharvest constraints;*
- *sharing pigeonpea technology with partners in Southern and Eastern Africa under the auspices of the African Development Bank;*
- *close linkages with such NGOs as World Vision, Care International, and Action Aid which have recently launched several pigeonpea-based development programmes in Asian and African countries;*
- *expansion of partnerships to CGIAR Centres, for example, by supplying pigeonpea germplasm to ICRAF for testing in agroforestry systems and to CIMMYT for testing wilt-resistant variety in Malawi and use of short-duration variety in rotation with maize to control Striga in Kenya.*

### Conclusion

120. *In summary, TAC concludes that ICRISAT has satisfied the award criteria in a holistic and compelling way. The science addresses characterization, conservation, taxonomy, and sustainability parameters of the crop. Disease resistance was enhanced. The programme was responsible for bringing hybrid legumes into commercial production. The spread of the hybrids, through partnerships, beyond South Asia to Eastern and Southern Africa and to some extent the Caribbean emphasizes the international public goods nature of the output. In subsequent years, plant height was reduced and, importantly, the growing season cut in half, all the while adding to yield potential. The shorter season varieties will bring the plant into new rotation, contributing favourably to sustainable cropping systems. These developments will well serve those now growing pigeonpeas and offer great promise for expanding its use.*

### **CGIAR Logframe and Activity Classification (Agenda Item 7)**

121. The Chair introduced this item by recalling TAC's purpose in developing a logical framework (logframe) for the CGIAR System, viz., to improve research planning, communication, and impact assessment by shifting from an activity/input to a project/output focus. The logframe paper tabled for TAC's consideration proposed such a shift. It emerged from a series of workshops and consultations convened in 1997-98 under TAC's auspices and with support from the Government of Germany and DSE. The proposed framework offered a higher degree of transparency in linking outputs to goals than in the past.

122. Dr. Winkelmann then turned to Dr. Uwe Nagel, who had facilitated the process by which the paper was developed, to introduce the scheme for TAC's consideration.

123. Dr. Nagel reviewed the logframe concept and the steps by which it could be implemented/adapted to the CGIAR's needs, highlighting its potential benefits to the System. He

noted that the System logframe was designed to incorporate Centre logframes. The logframe's overall effects were expected to be improved co-ordination, communication and management within the System and within Centres, as well as greater accountability to Members and other stakeholders. Other concrete benefits would be more effective monitoring of impact assessment and performance evaluation; strengthened priority setting by the System, Centres, and Members; simplified reporting of implementation and achievements; and greater efficiency in the delivery of research outputs.

124. Logframes would be put in place at both Centre and System levels specifying a hierarchy of overall/intermediate goals, purposes, and outputs. A detailed matrix providing a synopsis of the proposed CGIAR logframe was presented. It specified the CGIAR's overall goals in terms of poverty alleviation, natural resources protection, and sustainable food security. Contributing intermediate goals were identified in terms of increased productivity of resources in agriculture, forestry and fisheries and improvement in the sustainable management of natural resources. Purposes were specified in terms of the utilization of CGIAR outputs by NARS and other stakeholders. Outputs were identified in terms of products that contributed to germplasm improvement/conservation, sustainable production systems and natural resources conservation, improved policies and public management, enhanced performance of research institutions, and the like.

125. At each level in the logframe hierarchy of objectives, indicators would be specified to measure performance and/or monitor progress toward achieving planned goals. It was envisaged that indicators used at the System level would encompass those specified by centres at the project level; thus, they would necessarily be more abstract than Centre level indicators. Indicators for centre project logframes could measure both qualitative and quantitative dimensions and include criteria for gauging effects on users, beneficiaries, regions, and the like.

126. Dr. Nagel emphasized that the proposed System level logframe reflected the CGIAR's current research portfolio. Reclassification of projects to meet the new array of outputs was prerequisite to using the logframe as an instrument for management at the System level and planning at the Centre level; specification of indicators at the project level would also be necessary. Among the tasks ahead, Dr. Nagel singled out the need to: develop a system of monitoring and impact assessment once indicators and project milestones had been fully implemented; make reporting and budgetary procedures compatible with the logframe approach; and achieve complementarity between the logframe approach and the priority setting process. In adopting logframe, the CGIAR should follow the principles of simplicity, utility, efficiency, and flexibility.

127. The Chair thanked Dr. Nagel for his presentation and opened the floor for comments and questions by TAC Members.

128. Dr. Kainuma asked for clarification of the relationship between priority setting and the logframe: what was the precise sequence? Also, how would the measurement of results achieved at each level in the hierarchy be aggregated and, in turn, how would measures of centres' results be integrated into the System logframe? Dr. Barwale Zehr asked whether the logframe being proposed was consistent with those already in use by the centres and which centre logframes were

consistent with CGIAR goals. Dr. de Vaccaro observed that while the usefulness of the logframe for monitoring and impact assessment at the System level was clear, its utility at the Centre level was less obvious. She wondered whether centres regarded it as a useful tool.

129. On the relationship between priority setting and the logframe, Dr. Nagel responded that use of the logical framework presumed decisions had been taken on priorities. The logframe specified the hierarchy of objectives instrumental to achieving them, the causal linkages between objectives, assumptions about the internal and external environments, and indicators of success in producing planned outputs. On the consistency of logframes at Centre and System level, the process by which the CGIAR logframe was developed reflected broad congruence. However, Dr. Harwood noted that congruence between the previous CGIAR endorsed "activities" and the outputs specified in the logframe was high except in one case, natural resources management. This component was built into the production systems categories. Dr. de Janvry observed that since benefits of research often had a long time horizon, the logframe, with its emphasis on reporting outputs, may systematically under-report benefits in relation to costs. There was thus need to measure benefits post-hoc, bearing in mind the time lags involved. There was also need to ensure that the logframe was used not simply as an end-of-project reporting system, but as a learning process that provided feedback on implementation and the implications for planning and priority setting.

130. On the question of the logframe's utility at Centre level, Dr. Hawtin noted that although the CDC had not formally discussed this matter, informal discussions had conveyed the impression that most centres were quite happy with the logframe concept; some had been using the tool for programming independently of TAC's initiative. Thought should be given to the implications of the transition which the logframe implied for allocating resources from activities to outputs. Dr. Hawtin also stressed that the assertion that the System was shifting its paradigm from an input to an output orientation was an overstatement that could create an incorrect public impression. Dr. Reeves observed that, in principle, aggregating results from Centre to System level was feasible, but it remained unclear how the proposed logframe related to the priority-setting process. TAC needed to articulate this linkage more clearly in the proposed framework. Experience at Centre level suggested that the logframe had facilitated identification of outputs but not their prioritization (e.g., how to allocate resources across commodities). On the relationship between Centre and System logframes, a continued participatory process was urged to ensure congruence and increase the utility of the approach for centres. Finally, it was necessary to develop indicators to measure output performance at the System level; otherwise use of the logframe at this level for purposes of monitoring and evaluation would be quite limited.

131. The Chair brought discussion of this item to a close by noting there was need for follow-up by the Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies on the following points:

- logframes needed to be formulated in a way to capture the longer term benefits of impacts of research not immediately apparent from project outputs;
- the logframe approach should be seen less as a paradigm shift than a change from input to output reporting;
- steps to phase in the logframe over a specific period of time, perhaps using a dual system of reporting in the transition, should be formulated;

- outputs 3 and 4 of the logframe be consolidated;
- in implementing logframe, transactions costs should be kept to a minimum.

132. After giving further consideration to these suggestions, TAC adopted a number of amendments to streamline the logframe paper for presentation to the Group at ICW'98. It further agreed to propose to the Group that the vocabulary of the logframe be introduced into the CGIAR's Research Agenda in 2000 and become operational in 2001.

### **Future Reviews (Agenda Item 8)**

133. TAC heard the report of its Standing Committee on External Reviews (SCOER) on future reviews and took the following actions:

#### **a) ILRI and ICLARM EPMRs**

134. The EPMRs of ILRI and ICLARM were currently being implemented. The ILRI review was being chaired by Dr. Samuel Jutzi (Switzerland) and the ICLARM review by Dr. Hans Gregersen (USA). The reviews were moving forward as planned and the reports would be considered by TAC 76 in March 1999. With respect to ILRI, TAC endorsed the Committee's recommendation that the question of why livestock was apparently underfunded in the System be addressed by the review.

#### **b) ICARDA, IIMI, and WARDA EPMRs**

135. The EPMRs of ICARDA, IIMI and WARDA were being organized in consultation with the Centres involved. The timing of these reviews had been fixed tentatively, with ICARDA to be completed by August 1999 and the IIMI and WARDA reviews in early 2000. Panel profiles and short-lists of panel chairs were given initial consideration by TAC.

#### **c) CIAT, IITA and CIP EPMRs**

136. TAC endorsed SCOER's recommendation that the EPMRs of CIAT, CIP, and IITA be commissioned as planned during 2000.

#### **d) Review of Systemwide Programmes with an Ecoregional Approach**

137. The review of Systemwide Programmes with an Ecoregional Approach was to be chaired by Dr. Ted Henzell (Australia). The review was being supported by a desk study organized by the TAC Secretariat, to be followed by a main phase to be undertaken by a small panel. Dr. Ekkehard Kürschner had joined the TAC Secretariat as a consultant to undertake the desk study. The review would be conducted in wide consultation with various partners. TAC endorsed SCOER's recommended Terms of Reference for the review.

**e) Inter-Centre Review of Cereals**

138. TAC decided to defer this previously proposed review once again as there was no urgent need for it at this time and there were other topics of higher priority to be addressed.

**f) Incorporation of gender data in future EPMRs**

139. At the suggestion of the CBC, TAC considered how gender data could be incorporated into future EPMRs by making this dimension more explicit in the terms of reference of external reviews. The Committee saw the human resource management element as a natural part of the external review process and decided that specific reference would be made to the gender aspect in future reviews.

**g) SCOER working arrangements**

140. TAC noted the progress of SCOER's work programme which was focusing on mechanisms for improving the quality and the uniformity EPMRs in terms of panel selection, continued elaboration of guidelines for CCERs, generation of issues for review of Systemwide programmes, and of centre-specific issues for EPMRs.

**h) Consideration of review reports**

141. TAC shared SCOER's concern about the consideration of external review reports after they were completed and commented upon by TAC. The agendas of both MTM'98 and ICW'98 reflected diminished attention by the Group to external reviews. TAC decided to communicate this concern formally to the CGIAR and to recommend that review reports not be released to the Group without a TAC commentary.

**CGIAR Study on Marginal Lands (Agenda Item 9)**

142. The Chair called upon Dr. Kassam of the TAC Secretariat to report on the results of TAC's Strategic Study on Marginal Lands, commissioned in 1996 to assist the CGIAR in setting its priorities and strategies for poverty alleviation. The Study was conducted by a Panel led by Dr. Michael Nelson which produced a report entitled *Report of the Study on CGIAR Research Priorities for Marginal Lands*. Afterwards, it was decided to produce documentation in support of this report. As a result of this decision, three volumes were produced which were entitled (a) *The Study of CGIAR Research Priorities for Marginal Lands*; (b) *A Framework for Prioritizing Land Types in Agricultural Research*; and (c) *Rural Poverty and Land Degradation: A Reality Check for the CGIAR*. Volumes (a) and (b) were written by Ted Henzell in conjunction with the TAC Secretariat and volume (c) was written by Dr. Sohail Malik.

143. Dr. Kassam began by noting that international concern for the less-endowed areas seemed to have been driven by perceptions that research efforts of the CGIAR had done little for the poor in biophysically marginal lands, that most of the poor lived in these areas, and that they were a



cause and consequence of a downward spiral of resource degradation and deepening poverty. However, the study found that data on poverty incidence in countries with high and low proportions of marginal lands showed no evidence that poverty incidence was consistently greater in marginal lands than in lands with higher present use value. It also found little to support the view that the poor were the prime cause of resource degradation on marginal agricultural lands.

144. Inconsistencies and lack of data on the underlying site-specific forces driving the poverty process were such as to restrict their usefulness in guiding CGIAR strategy towards poverty alleviation on marginal lands. Instead, the Panel proposed the "marginal area" as their preferred unit of analysis for use by the CGIAR. The unit was defined by the presence of a high number of poor people who were subject to a relatively homogeneous set of conditions which explained why they were poor, e.g., deficiencies in institutions, policy, infrastructure, human capital, biophysical characteristics of the land, and the like.

145. The Panel recommended, *inter alia*, that the CGIAR should sharpen its strategic focus on poverty alleviation, particularly in setting priorities for research related to marginal rural areas. The centres should establish new forms of partnership to effectively address their role in a broader poverty alleviation strategy related to those who lived in marginal areas. Better mechanisms were needed for centres to be linked with partners in generating and interpreting improved scientific evidence on (a) the extent and magnitude of the impacts of agriculture, forestry and fisheries on the degradation or enhancement of natural resources and the consequences for production and food security; and (b) the linkage between poverty and observed resource degradation.

146. Following an extended discussion, TAC accepted the Panel's broad conclusion that available evidence did not support a primary focus on marginal lands as an effective method of addressing the CGIAR goals of poverty alleviation and protecting the environment; a further search of the literature along these lines was deemed unproductive. TAC identified instead four options for further work on the poverty issue: (a) to identify CGIAR success stories in marginal areas, identifying those factors, (e.g., technical assistance, access to credit), which complemented centres' research to enable poor farmers to adopt technological innovations in marginal areas; (b) to identify specific areas of poverty's concentration and map their agroecological characteristics (several institutions were already engaged in such work and TAC could prompt CGIAR Members to support their work); (c) to focus on selected areas as laboratories or experimental sites to undertake long-term, multidisciplinary data collection and analysis to identify key sectoral points of entry and policy instruments that might be used to reduce poverty; and (d) to identify and analyse the broad range of poverty's determinants, e.g., access to resources and technologies; availability of physical, human, and social capital; institutional and policy contexts; agroecological characteristics, with a view to creating a logical framework for balanced research priority setting and resource allocation to reduce poverty directly and indirectly.

147. TAC decided to conclude the Marginal Lands Study by preparing a synthesis paper for TAC 76 describing lessons learned and drawing inferences for data needed to make additional progress on this theme. Responsibility for ensuring preparation of the synthesis paper was delegated to the TAC working group which evaluated the Study, chaired by Dr. de Janvry. It was

agreed that the poverty theme would receive separate treatment and be taken up under Item 11, Other Business.

### **Strategic Issues (Agenda Item 10)**

148. The Chair opened this item by recalling that since at least TAC 73 the Committee had a number of strategic issues under consideration as part of TAC's ongoing work on priorities and strategies toward 2010. For purposes of the present discussion, three issues that had figured in TAC's previous deliberations were singled out with a view to formulating *modus operandi* to pursue them:

- (a) changes in the external environment, e.g., rapid advances in biotechnology and the impingement of intellectual property rights on agricultural technology development, and their implications for the CGIAR's portfolio of international public goods in 2010: how should TAC and the CGIAR respond to these changes?
- (b) the characteristics of the CGIAR Centres' working relationships with NARS and extent to which they were consistent with the best interests of the System; and
- (c) the characteristics and extent of partnerships more generally in the CGIAR and the degree to which they were congruent with the System's goals.

149. After discussing a number of possible approaches, it was decided that SCOPAS would take responsibility for developing modalities to pursue the 2010 issues. The issue of working relationships with NARS would be addressed by former TAC Member, Dr. Hans Gregersen, who would take up a consultancy at the TAC Secretariat to prepare an issues paper for TAC 76. On the partnership theme, the Chair reported that, in consultation with Dr. Selcuk Ozgediz of the CGIAR Secretariat, planning had begun to prepare a taxonomy of current partnerships within the CGIAR, an inventory of centres' partnerships partitioned in terms of the taxonomy, and a set of case studies based on the CGIAR's efforts. This work would involve professionals familiar with the technical studies of partnerships in other sectors, permitting evaluation of the CGIAR's experience in a broader context. When completed, the studies would form the basis of a series of discussions involving centres and partners to promote a better understanding of how to manage partnerships more strategically. Progress on the three strategic studies will be reported at TAC 76.

### **Future Meetings (Agenda Item 11)**

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

TAC 76	FAO, Rome	22-27 March, 1999
TAC 77	ISNAR, The Hague	20-25 September, 1999
TAC 78	IITA, Ibadan	27- 31 March, 2000

151. It was agreed that the schedule for TAC 76 would include a half-day visit to IPGRI.

## Other Business (Agenda Item 12)

- **Report of FAO**

152. Dr. Louise O. Fresco, representing CGIAR Cosponsor, FAO, reported on the 'FAO/Netherlands Conference on the Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land', 13-17 September 1999, Maastricht, which is being organized as part of the preparatory process for the Eighth Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, April 2000. Documentation on the purpose and scope of the conference had been circulated to TAC Members and Centre Directors. In particular, the CDC had been invited to contribute a synthesis paper on future development of agricultural technologies. A CGIAR presence at the conference would be welcomed. The TAC Chair thanked Dr. Fresco for her report and expressed TAC's desire to be involved, particularly in view of the proximity of the conference to the timing and venue of TAC 77.

- **Poverty Workshops**

153. The Chair briefly described the nature and scope of three forthcoming workshops relevant to TAC's strategic planning on the poverty theme, organized respectively by Grid Arendal (November 1998), CIAT (October 1999), and IFPRI. Poverty mapping was a major focus of each of these meetings. TAC had provided modest financial support to the Grid Arendal meeting. Dr. de Janvry was serving as a member of CIAT's steering committee. CIAT and IFPRI sought support from TAC for their meetings, given the Committee's ongoing interest in the issue. After careful consideration, the Committee decided that, as a matter of policy, it would not be advisable to provide financial support for centre activities independently of TAC's established procedures for priority setting and resource allocation. However, TAC might avail itself of a centre's comparative advantage by commissioning studies in which the Committee had a high priority interest.

- **Poverty as a Strategic Issue in TAC's Priority Setting**

154. Taking as a point of departure a Note prepared by Dr. de Janvry, *How Can the CGIAR Best Fulfil Its Poverty Reduction Mandate?*, based on the deliberations of the Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies, TAC addressed the broader issue of poverty as an issue in setting CGIAR priorities and strategies for 2010. The Standing Committee was requested to develop a proposal, to be tabled at TAC 76, to integrate the poverty issue into TAC's 2010 exercise taking into account such variables as: the biophysical environment; financial, human and social capital; technological innovation; and policy and institutional contexts. SCOPAS should consult with the IAEG regarding the suggestion in paragraph 6 of the Note that centres be surveyed on the potential impact of advances in biotechnology on poverty reduction and the implications for allocation of research resources. SCOPAS may wish to consult with the centres identified in paragraph 7 of the Note, or other institutions, to ascertain whether there is opportunity for TAC to commission studies on the poverty theme relevant to its 2010 priority setting exercise.

- **Research Returns Redux: A Meta-Analysis of Agricultural R&D Evaluations**

155. The Committee considered the results of a TAC-supported study on rates of return to NRM research prepared by Dr. Phil Pardey, IFPRI. The Committee questioned its findings for methodological reasons, particularly the degree of representativeness of the research sampled by the study and the validity of its econometric analysis. A review note detailing these issues was prepared by a TAC working group. It was decided to share the note with Dr. Pardey and request that the study be revised and completed for TAC 76.

- **Workshop on Assessment of Organizational Impacts of ISNAR's PM&E Project, Washington DC, 4-6 August 1998**

156. The Committee heard a report on the above workshop by Dr. Fernandez Martinez who attended the meeting on behalf of TAC. The workshop's rationale was that as the CGIAR expands its impact evaluation work it was necessary to also assess the organizational impacts of CGIAR Centres on the R&D capacity of NARS. Strengthening such capacity was instrumental to ensuring that centres' research contributed to achievement of the System's broader social, economic, and environmental objectives. Methodologies being developed by ISNAR to assess organisational impacts were judged to be potentially useful to evaluating returns to the CGIAR's allocation of resources to strengthening NARS. However, as the project was in its early phase further refinement of its models, hypotheses, and data collection methods was needed before impacts could be verified.

- **Climate Change and Agriculture: CGIAR Research Relevant to Mitigation and Adaptation**

157. The Committee was briefed on this topic by Dr. Alison Withey of USAID who tabled a paper she prepared providing an overview of a larger inventory she had compiled of CGIAR Centres' activities related to climate change mitigation and adaptation. The purpose was to provide baseline data for an assessment of System strengths in climate-related research with a view to facilitating formulation of a strategy for such research in the future. TAC considered the inventory a valuable input to its work on priorities and strategies and to that of the Inter-Centre Working Group on Climate Change convened by ICRAF. The Committee considered various approaches to addressing the issue of climate change in the context of the CGIAR's overarching goals. Options ranged from encouraging centres to draw more explicit technical and policy inferences from their climate-related research as input to the work of such specialized bodies as the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPPC), to exploring whether the CGIAR's Research Agenda should incorporate climate change either as an explicit component of the Environment undertaking or as a separate undertaking in its own right. TAC considered this as a strategic issue with significant implications for resource allocation. It would be taken up by TAC 76. In the meantime, the Committee identified the next steps to be taken to refine and analyse the inventory. A TAC Member would also participate in the activities of the ICWG-CC and keep the full Committee informed of developments.

- **NGO-TAC Interactions**

158. The TAC Chair reported on an interaction which he and Dr. Miguel Altieri, Chair of the CGIAR/NGO Committee, had had with three NGOs - CESA, GIRA, and SAED - in the Patzcuaro, Michoacan, Mexico area in August 1998. This was part of an effort to identify cases which exemplified opportunities for fostering stronger links between IARCs and NGOs and/or NARIs and NEOs in research. The discussions there indicated the belief that NARIs would withdraw more and more from research aimed at poor farmers, implying a larger role for NGOs in cooperation with centres in (a) systematically identifying farm level needs for elements of technologies, (b) framing efficient research procedures, and (c) shaping technologies for farmers.

159. A parallel report was made on an NGO-TAC interaction at CIAT involving Dr. Altieri and Dr. de Vaccaro in May 1998. Meetings were held with FIDAR, ILAMA, RAPALMIRA, and CIPASLA and members of the CIAT and IPGRI senior staff. With regard to partnership opportunities, some 10 percent of Colombia's 500 NGOs were thought to be sufficiently strong to be candidates for collaborations with centres. As the size of public sector R&D in Latin America continued to decline, the role of NGOs would become more important, particularly in research related to *in situ* conservation of germplasm. While there were opportunities for scaling up successful centre-NGO collaborative projects, it was cautioned that any TAC proposals to the Group should refer to the criteria for selecting candidate projects. Such criteria should be consistent with those used in TAC's priority setting generally, notably the international public goods dimension, among others.

- **System Review**

160. The Committee was briefed by Dr. Harwood on discussions of the CGIAR System Review which took place in Washington, DC, on 22 September and which he attended on behalf of the TAC Chair.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

### MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Donald L. Winkelmann**

Chair,  
Technical Advisory Committee/CGIAR  
355 East Palace Avenue  
Santa Fe  
New Mexico 87501  
USA

**Michael Cernea**

6113 Robinwood Road  
Bethesda  
Maryland 20817  
USA

**Maria Antonia Fernandez-Martinez**

Promenade de l'Europe 3  
1203 Charmilles  
Genève  
Switzerland

**Elias Fereres**

Director  
Instituto de Agricultura Sostenible (CSIC)  
Alameda del Obispo, s/n, Aptdo 4084  
14080 Cordoba  
Spain

**Richard Harwood**

Crop & Soil Sciences Dept.  
260 Crop & Soil Sciences Building  
Michigan State University,  
East Lansing,  
Michigan 48824  
USA

**Alain de Janvry**

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

**Keiji Kainuma**

Vice President, BRAIN  
3-18-19, Toranomon  
Minato  
105-0001 Tokyo  
Japan

**Magdy A. Madkour**

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

**Cyrus Ndiritu**

Director, KARI  
P.O. Box 57811  
Nairobi  
Kenya

**Lucia de Vaccaro**

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

**Usha Barwale Zehr**

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

**COSPONSORS**

**Louise Fresco**

Director  
Research, Extension and Training Division  
FAO  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy

**INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES**

Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

**Jeffrey Sayer**

Director General  
P.O. Box 6596 JKPWB  
Jakarta 10065  
Indonesia

Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT)

**Timothy Reeves**

Director General  
Lisboa 27  
Apartado Postal 6-641  
06600 Mexico  
D.F. Mexico

**Wally Falcon**

Chair, CBC and Chair, BoT  
Director, Institute for International Studies  
Stanford University  
200 Encina Hall  
Stanford, CA 94305-6055, USA

**Claudio Cafati**

Deputy Director General, Administration and  
Finance

**Prabhu Pingali**

Director, Economics Programme

**Gregorio Martinez**

Government and Public Affairs Officer

**David Hoisington**

Director, Applied Biotechnology Centre

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

**Adel El-Beltagy**  
Director General  
P.O. Box 5466  
Aleppo  
Syria

International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF)

**Pedro Sanchez**  
Director General  
P.O. Box 30677  
Nairobi  
Kenya

**Maria De Lourdes De Frietas**  
Vice Chair, ICRAF BoT  
Rua Custodio Serrão 14, Apto 401  
22.470.2230 Rio de Janeiro  
Brazil

International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)

**Geoffrey Hawtin**  
Director General and Chair CDC  
Via delle Sette Chiese 142  
00145 Rome  
Italy

**Jane Toll**  
Coordinator, Systemwide Genetic Resources  
Programme

International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR)

**Joel Cohen**  
Chair, ICWG-GR  
P.O. Box 93375  
2509 AJ The Hague  
The Netherlands

**CGIAR MEMBERS**

France

**Jean Mamy**  
INRA  
route de Saint-Cyr  
F78026 Versailles cedex  
France

South Africa

**Siphiwe Mkhize**  
Director  
National Department of Agriculture  
Private Bag X250  
Pretoria 0001  
South Africa



USA

**Christine Bergmark**

Science Advisor, Bureau for Research &  
Development, USAID  
RRB 2.11-083  
Washington, D.C.  
USA

**Alison Withey**

AAAS Fellow, USAID  
RRB 3.08  
Washington, D.C.  
USA

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

**Jeffery Burley**

Director, Oxford Forestry Institute  
University of Oxford  
South Parks Road  
Oxford OX1 3RB  
UK

**Jaap Hardon**

Centre for Genetic Resources  
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries  
P.O. Box 16  
6700 AA Wageningen  
The Netherlands

**Jochen Heuveldop**

Institute for World Forestry  
University of Hamburg  
Leuschnerstrasse 91  
21031 Hamburg  
Germany

**Jens-Uwe Nagel**

Institute for Agricultural Extension and  
Communication Sciences  
Humboldt University Berlin  
Luisenstr. 53  
D1-00 Berlin  
Germany

**Lucio Reca**

8360 Greensboro Drive  
Apt. 126  
McLean, VA 22102  
USA

**Ernesto Samayoa Armienta**

PIEAES, AC  
Blvd. P.E. Calles y California  
Cd. Obregon, Sonora  
Mexico

## **CGIAR SECRETARIAT**

**Manuel Lantin**

Science Adviser  
World Bank  
1818 H Street NW  
Washington D.C. 20433  
USA

**Shey Tata**

Financial Officer

## **TAC SECRETARIAT**

**Shelleemiah Keya**

Executive Secretary, TAC  
SDRC – FAO  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome  
Italy

**Amir Kassam**

Senior Agricultural Research Officer

**Robert Bordonaro**

Resource Person

**Jane Garrioch**

Secretary

## **OFFICE OF TAC CHAIR**

**Barbara Harrelson**

Personal Assistant  
355 East Palace Avenue  
Santa Fe  
NM 87501  
USA

## **AGENDA**

- Item 1: Opening session
- Item 2: External Programme and Management Reviews
- Item 3: First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme
- Item 4: Centre Financing Plans
- Item 5: TAC Study of CGIAR Commitments in Latin America and the Caribbean
- Item 6: King Baudouin Award
- Item 7: CGIAR Logframe and Activity Classification
- Item 8: Future Reviews
- Item 9: CGIAR Study on Marginal Lands
- Item 10: Strategic Issues
- Item 11: Future Meetings
- Item 12: Other Business

## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	NUMBER/SOURCE
1	Draft Report of the Seventy-Fourth Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/16
2	External Programme and Management Reviews:	
	• Report of the First EPMP of CIFOR	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/5
	• Report of the Second EPMP of ICRAF	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/15
3	Report of the First External Review of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/17
4	Centre Financing Plans	CGIAR Centres
5	CGIAR Commitments in Latin America and the Caribbean	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/18
7	Proposed Logical Framework for the CGIAR System	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/19
8	Future Reviews Progress Report	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/22
9	• Report of the Study on CGIAR Research Priorities for Marginal Lands (Study Paper No. 1)	SDR/TAC:IAR/96/18.1
	• The Study of CGIAR Research Priorities for Marginal Lands (Study Paper No. 2)	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/20
	• A Framework for Prioritizing Land Types in Agricultural Research (Study Paper No. 3)	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/20
	• Rural Poverty and Land Degradation: A Reality Check for the CGIAR (Study Paper No. 4)	SDR/TAC:IAR/98/11 Rev. 1
11	Climate Change and Agriculture: CGIAR Research Relevant to Mitigation and Adaptation	USAID