

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH MEETING
OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

TAC SECRETARIAT
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
February 2001

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH MEETING
OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Table of Contents

	Page
SUMMARY	v
Opening Session	v
Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR	v
CGIAR Structure and Governance	v
External Programme and Management Review of CIAT	vi
Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies	vi
2001 Financing Plans	vi
Report from Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)	vi
Future Reviews	vii
2000 King Baudouin Award	vii
Future Meetings	vii
Other Business	vii
 RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS	 1
Opening Session (Agenda Item 1)	1
Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR (Agenda Item 2)	1
CGIAR Structure and Governance (Agenda Item 3)	3
External Programme and Management Review of CIAT (Agenda Item 4)	6
<i>TAC Commentary on the CIAT EPMR</i>	8
Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies (Agenda Item 5)	12
<i>TAC Commentary on the Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies</i>	14
2001 Financing Plans (Agenda Item 6)	16
Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) (Agenda Item 7)	 17

	Page
Future Reviews (Agenda Item 8)	17
2000 King Baudouin Award (Agenda Item 9)	18
Future Meetings (Agenda Item 10)	18
Other Business (Agenda Item 11)	18

ANNEXES

- Annex 1: List of Participants**
- Annex 2: Agenda**
- Annex 3: List of Documents**

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

TAC 79

IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria: 25-29 September 2000

REPORT OF THE MEETING

SUMMARY

Opening Session

The meeting was opened by TAC Chair, Dr. Emil Javier, who welcomed the TAC Members attending and noted in particular the presence of the Chairs, respectively, of the Centre Board Chairs' Committee and Centre Directors' Committee; the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR; several Centre Directors General and Board Chairs; External Review Panel Chairs; observers from Bangladesh, Germany, Italy, and Nigeria; and staff of the CGIAR and TAC Secretariats. Participants were also welcomed by the Director General of IITA, Dr. Lukas Brader. The report of TAC 78 was adopted without amendments. There were no matters arising from the report of TAC 78. The agenda for TAC 79 was adopted without amendment.

Mr. von der Osten reported on major developments in the CGIAR since MTM'00 highlighting the change in CGIAR Chairmanship, the selection process for the CGIAR Director, developments in Co-sponsor membership and finance, and the steps to be taken at ICW'00 to complete the process for developing a new CGIAR vision and strategy and structure and governance.

Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR

Pursuant to the Group's request at MTM'00, TAC finalized its recommendations on the new CGIAR vision and strategy taking into account comments received from CGIAR Members. TAC 79 discussed and prepared the Committee's final report, *Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR*, consolidating the previous draft and the companion paper on strategic options tabled at the Dresden meeting. The Committee's deliberations benefitted from interaction with the CBC and CDC Chairs, CGIAR Members, Centre Directors and other observers attending TAC 79. The report will be presented to the Group by the TAC Chair at ICW'00.

CGIAR Structure and Governance

In response to the Group's request at MTM'00, the Committee developed a paper entitled, *TAC's Views on Implications of the New CGIAR Vision and Strategy for Structure And Governance*. It attempted to identify the structural requirements of programmes for the efficient and effective attainment of CGIAR goals. The paper took into consideration and commented on proposals on structure and governance submitted by the CBC/CDC and other

stakeholders. TAC's deliberations also benefitted from the results of the July/August 2000 electronic consultation on structure and governance which it had commissioned to RIMISP. The paper will be presented by the TAC Chair to the meeting of the Oversight Committee's Synthesis Group, 4-8 October 2000, United Kingdom, and made available to CGIAR Members at ICW'00.

External Programme and Management Review of CIAT

The report of the Fifth EPMR of CIAT was discussed in plenary session in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Ronnie Coffman (USA), the Chair of CIAT's Board of Trustees, Dr. Lauritz Holm-Nielsen, and the Director General of CIAT, Dr. Joachim Voss. Dr. Coffman summarized the main findings and recommendations of the review. Drs. Holm-Nielsen and Voss presented the response of the CIAT Board and management to the review. In general, CIAT concurred with the overall analysis of the EPMR and the bulk of the Panel's recommendations. Following TAC's plenary discussion of the review report and further consideration in the working group, TAC prepared a commentary on it with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat. The review report and TAC's commentary will be presented to the CGIAR at ICW'00.

Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies

The report of the TAC Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies in the CGIAR was presented by the Panel Chair, Dr. Donald Duvick (USA), who highlighted its major findings and recommendations. The review examined the balance of instruments and procedures currently employed in plant breeding by CGIAR centres, with a view to assessing whether breeding programmes and associated research could be made more efficient and effective. The focus was on the extent to which appropriate biotechnology and bioengineering techniques were being used as effective support to more conventional breeding practices. Following plenary discussion of the review report and further consideration in the working group, TAC prepared a commentary on its findings and recommendations. The report and TAC's commentary will be presented to the CGIAR at ICW'00.

2001 Financing Plans

TAC reviewed the 2001 Financing Plans prepared by the CGIAR Centres and assessed their implications for CGIAR priorities and strategies, consistency with Centres' Medium-Term Plans, conformity with the 2001 Research Agenda approved by the Group at MTM'00, and the programmatic implications of potential financing gaps. TAC prepared a report to the Finance Committee certifying that the 2001 Financing Plans for all Centres were broadly congruent with the approved Research Agenda and re-emphasizing some of the broad concerns which it had raised in its initial analysis of the 2001 Research Agenda. The report will be made available to ICW'00.

Report from SPIA

The Chair of SPIA, TAC Member Hans Gregersen, reported on the implementation of SPIA's work programme since the integration of IAEG into TAC in January 2000, highlighting progress made in assessing the impacts of the CGIAR in the areas of germplasm improvement, integrated pest management, environment, poverty alleviation, and scientific capacity strengthening and partnerships. The report also treated the evolution of SPIA's role

within TAC. The Committee took decisions to integrate more closely the priority setting, evaluation, and impact assessment functions of TAC by improving its coordination of these activities.

Future Reviews

The Committee considered progress in the implementation of the Fifth EPMR of IITA and the Fifth EPMR of CIP. It also discussed plans for an overall review of the evaluation process within the CGIAR, selective reviews of Systemwide programmes, and a review of the CGIAR's strategy for training and capacity strengthening.

2000 King Baudouin Award

The Committee considered centre submissions for the King Baudouin Award 2000 in the light of the criteria established at TAC 74 and made a decision on the winning submission to be announced at ICW'00. The Committee prepared a commentary on the selected submission.

Future Meetings

TAC reconfirmed dates and venues for the following meetings:

TAC 80	ICARDA, Aleppo	26-30 March 2001
TAC 81	CIFOR, Bogor	24-28 September 2001
TAC 82	CIP, Lima	March 2002

Other Business

The Committee heard a report from Dr. Adel El-Beltagy, Director General, ICARDA, on the INRM Meeting held in Penang, Malaysia, 21- 23 August 2000. TAC Member Richard Harwood, who also attended that meeting, supplemented Dr. El-Beltagy's presentation. The Committee considered other items raised during the course of the opening session.

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Opening Session (Agenda Item 1)

1. The TAC Chair, Dr. Emil Javier, opened the meeting of TAC 79 by welcoming the nine TAC Members present and acknowledging apologies received from Usha Barwale Zehr, Michael Cernea, Elias Fereres, Cyrus Ndiritu, and Vo-Tong Xuan. He then noted with appreciation the presence of the Chairs, respectively, of the Centre Board Chairs Committee and Centre Directors Committee; Alexander von der Osten, representing the CGIAR Secretariat; several Centre Directors General and Board Chairs; External Review Panel Chairs; observers from Bangladesh, Germany, Italy, and Nigeria; and staff of the CGIAR and TAC Secretariats. The Director General of IITA, Dr. Lukas Brader then extended his welcome to participants. The report of TAC 78 was adopted without amendments. There were no matters arising from the report of TAC 78. The agenda for TAC 79 was adopted without amendment.

2. Mr. von der Osten reported on major developments in the CGIAR since MTM'00, noting in particular the change in CGIAR Chairmanship from Ismail Serageldin to Ian Johnson which had occurred in July 2000. The selection process for the post of CGIAR Director had been completed and a final choice by the Chairman was pending. UNEP had confirmed its resignation as a CGIAR Co-sponsor but would remain a Member. UNDP had reconfirmed that strong efforts would be made to solve the financial problem affecting its contribution as Co-sponsor. The working group chaired by Alexander McCalla would propose a longer term CGIAR financing strategy at ICW'00. The process for developing a new CGIAR vision and strategy and structure and governance was nearly complete. It would culminate in meetings of the Synthesis Group and Consultative Council in October, followed by the Group's consideration and decision-making at ICW'00. The latter would be organized around the theme "Charting the CGIAR's Future - Reshaping the CGIAR's Organization". Major issues would include the CGIAR's vision and strategy, structure and governance, frontier science, and global public goods. CGIAR financing for 2000 was expected to be on the order of \$335-340 million, which was within the financing plan target. The outcome for 2001 could not yet be forecast with precision but major problems were not anticipated. Support for the CGIAR by the World Bank's Executive Directors continued to be strong. Finally, the CGIAR Secretariat had experienced a budget cut of 8 percent in 1999, resulting in a reduction in staff and the outsourcing of some activities.

Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR (Agenda Item 2)

3. At ICW'99, TAC was asked to lead an exercise to develop a new vision and strategy for the CGIAR. Following broad consultation with stakeholders, the Committee drafted a new vision, goal, and mission for the CGIAR towards 2010 and a proposed research agenda to implement it. TAC's proposals were endorsed at MTM'00 and the Committee was requested to finalize its views taking into account comments received from the Members. TAC 79 discussed and prepared a final report, *Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR*, consolidating the previous draft and the companion paper on strategic options tabled at the Dresden meeting. The Committee's deliberations, as reflected in the synthesis of the final report provided below, benefitted from interaction with the CBC and CDC Chairs, CGIAR Members, Centre Directors and other observers attending TAC 79.

4. The report proposed that the CGIAR address the problems of global poverty and food insecurity through agricultural research which would continue to contribute to sustainable productivity increases in global food supplies and improved management of natural resources. In view of trends in poverty, population, natural resources, science, and legal and regulatory environments, TAC recommended that the CGIAR's future research strategy address the needs of the poor in the more favoured environments while, at the same time, tackling the more complex problems of poverty in marginal and hard areas. This would require more accurate targeting of people's needs and assessing how CGIAR-supported research could meet those needs. Major regions with a high incidence of poverty, notably extensive areas within South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, would receive high priority. The persistent and heterogeneous nature of poverty in these areas, the often degraded state of their natural resources, and the weakness of their institutions required a more concerted research and development effort by civil society, the private sector, national governments, the international development community, and the CGIAR.

5. The above considerations provided the rationale for TAC's recommendation that the CGIAR adopt as its *vision*, a food secure world for all; its *goal*, to reduce poverty, hunger and malnutrition by sustainably increasing the productivity of resources in agriculture, forestry and fisheries; and its *mission* to achieve sustainable food security and reduce poverty in developing countries through scientific research and research-related activities in the fields of agriculture, livestock, forestry, fisheries, policy and natural resources management.

6. In operationalizing the proposed strategy the CGIAR, with its comparative advantage in international agricultural research, should seek to complement the efforts of other organizations working in rural development and related sectors, particularly those of health, education, nutrition, infrastructure, environment, and social and economic policy. The System's research priorities should be focused on improving the livelihoods of the rural and urban poor. This would require not only ensuring continued yield and productivity gains of staple food crops, trees, livestock and fish, but also customizing agricultural technologies to optimize income and employment generation in the rural sector. It would require that the CGIAR address new issues of nutritional food quality and biosafety and develop more integrated approaches to natural resources management (NRM). Since the scientific, institutional and policy outputs generated by the CGIAR would, by themselves, be insufficient to achieve its mission, the System should work more closely with other elements of the development community in determining its research priorities and ensuring the dissemination of its research outputs.

7. The report identified seven planks to guide implementation of the CGIAR's future strategy: (a) reaffirmation of the goal of sustainably reducing poverty, hunger and malnutrition of people in developing countries; (b) mobilizing new developments in social, biological and physical sciences and bringing them to bear on the causes of poverty and food insecurity that had proven intractable in the past; (c) giving highest relative priority to developing a concerted approach to address the needs of people in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia where poverty was concentrated and growing; (d) adopting a regional approach to research planning and implementation in order to address the heterogeneous nature of the causes of poverty and food insecurity in different regions and to integrate regional with global priorities in international agricultural research; (e) giving increased emphasis to seeking new types of partners and using new forms of partnership to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of problem identification, research, and dissemination of research outputs for poverty reduction and food security; (f) adopting a task force approach to addressing major, clearly identifiable problems where there was an opportunity for impact and/or where there

were intractable problems that needed a concerted approach by multiple actors and agencies within and beyond the CGIAR System; (g) strengthening the role of the CGIAR as a catalyst, integrator and disseminator of knowledge within the overall global agricultural research system.

8. Finally, the report outlined a future research agenda for the CGIAR consistent with the proposed new strategy. TAC followed the System's current practice of prioritizing activities and allocating resources in terms of the five logframe outputs: germplasm collection, characterization and conservation; germplasm improvement; sustainable production systems through integrated NRM; socioeconomic and policy research; and enhancing institutions. Within each of these categories, a number of new research or research-related activities and themes were identified as warranting priority and recommendations were made to reduce or phase out others.

9. The Committee's report on the new vision and strategy will be presented to the Group by the TAC Chair at ICW'00.

CGIAR Structure and Governance (Agenda Item 3)

10. At MTM'00, in the context of endorsing TAC's proposals for a new CGIAR vision and strategy, the Group requested the Committee to assess the implications of these proposals for the future structure and governance of the CGIAR according to the procedure decided at ICW'99. In response, TAC 79 developed a paper entitled, *TAC's Views on Implications of the New CGIAR Vision and Strategy for Structure And Governance*, for consideration by the Oversight Committee's Synthesis Group. In preparing it, TAC took as its point of departure the Group's injunction that "form follows function". Its proposals on structure and organizational design were, therefore, developed with a view to identifying the structural requirements of programmes for the efficient and effective attainment of institutional goals. The paper took into consideration and commented on the proposals on structure and governance submitted by the CBC/CDC and other stakeholders. TAC's deliberations also benefitted from the results of the July/August 2000 electronic consultation on structure and governance which it had commissioned to RIMISP.

11. The Committee partitioned the structural implications of the new vision and strategy into two categories: (a) those deriving from the strategy's functional requirements, and (b) those implying changes in the organization of production and delivery of specific programme outputs.

12. In functional terms, TAC saw the strategy's people-and-poverty focus as requiring a CGIAR whose programmes operated more efficiently and effectively to address the goals of poverty reduction and sustainable food security. Among other things, this implied the need to institutionalize the mapping and diagnosis of poverty for purposes of setting research priorities, allocating resources, and assessing the impact of CGIAR outputs.

13. Given the strategy's heightened priority to sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, there was also need to develop institutional capacity for comprehensive assessment of constraints to technology diffusion and adoption in widely differing environments, particularly marginal and hard areas characterized by a high incidence of poverty. The strategy's emphasis on regional planning processes required bottom-up procedures for priority setting involving national and regional institutions and development agencies.

14. The strategic premise that the CGIAR should bring the best available science to bear on problems of the poor implied the need to consolidate certain kinds of research activities, particularly those lacking in critical mass and/or more efficiently outsourced to advanced research organizations. Wherever appropriate, the System would need to function increasingly through innovative partnership arrangements that facilitated the global mobilization of science relevant to the CGIAR's goals.

15. To respond rapidly and more efficiently to problems of high priority requiring exceptional levels of cooperation, the CGIAR needed more flexible institutional arrangements – specifically, task forces – to complement the present centre model. Finally, to play a catalytic role as knowledge broker in the field of food and agriculture, the CGIAR would have to rely increasingly on virtual forms of organization based on the new information and communication technologies.

16. TAC identified two key organizing principles which it believed were implicit in the new strategy: (a) the focus on poverty reduction meant that research needed to be organized primarily along regional lines given the heterogeneous nature of poverty in different regions; and (b) the CGIAR needed to position itself globally in order to be able to harness advances in science relevant to its mission given the rapid pace and globalization of scientific innovation. These two principles had enjoined the System to move toward a more regionally focused approach to organizing science for poverty reduction and food security while maintaining a global focus on major commodities and problems. It was necessary to exploit potential complementarities between regional and global programmes through mutually re-enforcing linkages and governing mechanisms that ensured System-level priority setting, oversight, and accountability.

Organizing for Impact on the Poor in High Priority Areas

17. The regional approach required a more decentralized System structure with clear regional responsibilities devolved to certain centres. TAC saw at least two options for initiating regional programming working through interested centres and their partners: (a) a planning exercise, identifying the optimal number of priority regions and specifying the approaches appropriate to each, or (b) a pilot approach starting with one or two regions and incrementally extending to others on the basis of experience. The Committee preferred the second option, given the uncertainties involved as well as the need to mobilize additional resources. Likely initial sites were identified as Western sub-Saharan Africa and Central America.

Organizing for the Advanced Sciences and Technologies

18. Developments in the biological, physical, and social sciences had major implications for the way in which future CGIAR research was organized. In particular, advances in the area of crop improvement warranted closer inter-centre collaboration and consolidation of certain research activities. Given the many actors in the biological sciences in both public and private sectors, opportunities could best be exploited by expanding and strengthening the CGIAR's partnerships, notably with advanced research organizations. In structuring such research, the efficiency and effectiveness of centre programmes would continue to involve linking the development of new enabling technologies with their utilization. Thus, use of task forces would be preferable to creation of separate structures to exploit major new developments in such areas as genomics and bioinformatics. Advances in the areas of GIS,

management of information, intellectual property, and technology transfer policies, among others, also posed structural issues of significance for the System's performance.

Structural Implications for Programme Outputs

19. TAC identified a number of needed structural changes to permit the more efficient and effective production and delivery of the CGIAR's five logframe outputs. Among these were the need for:

- stronger inter-centre coordination in certain areas of germplasm collection such as database development, in-situ conservation methodologies, and international negotiations;
- more concerted approaches in specific areas of research associated with germplasm improvement, notably, in genomics and bioinformatics;
- comprehensive regional programming for the improvement of "non-mandate" crops assessed as having regional priority;
- a global mechanism to address issues of livestock health and nutrition and greater integration of livestock production systems research with other components of NRM;
- closer linkages between fisheries research with policy and NRM research on the specific issues of common property and open access;
- greater disciplinary integration of regionally-focused NRM research programmes, drawing upon advanced global science using virtual means;
- continued decentralization of policy research and, over time, more of it undertaken at the regional level, particularly in the areas of poverty mapping and impact assessment;
- most institution strengthening activities to be undertaken at the regional level;
- a global programme to deal with science policy issues and agricultural knowledge management across the System.

System Governance

20. TAC's analysis of the implications of the vision and strategy for future System governance reaffirmed the principles of donor sovereignty, centre autonomy, independent scientific advice, a non-political nature, consensus decision-making among Members, and an informal organisation of stakeholders. To improve System performance the Committee recommended, *inter alia*, that mechanisms (e.g., task forces) be created to facilitate rapid response to change and induce concerted approaches to cross-cutting issues. Priority setting should be decentralised to better meet national and regional needs, while maintaining System-level oversight to ensure the production of international public goods.

21. TAC also provided commentaries on options for System governance proposed by key stakeholders. While it found elements of EIARD's proposed "unified centre" compatible with the vision and strategy, the Committee did not endorse this concept since forming such a centre would involve legal difficulties and major disruption of research, and thus significantly adversely affect the System's productivity and impact.

22. With respect to the “federation” model proposed by the CBC/CDC, TAC saw great merit in its potential for improving coordination of inter-centre activities, public awareness, science advocacy, and provision of central services. However, the Committee believed that, to ensure transparency and accountability, the functions of priority setting, resource allocation, and monitoring and evaluation should be performed by governance mechanisms structurally separate from a federation entity.

23. TAC’s paper on structure and governance will be presented by the TAC Chair to the meeting of the Oversight Committee’s Synthesis Group, 4-8 October 2000, Sonning, U.K., and made available to the Group at ICW’00.

External Programme and Management Review of CIAT (Agenda Item 4)

24. The report of the Fifth EPMR of CIAT was discussed in plenary session in the presence of the Panel Chair, Dr. Ronnie Coffman (USA), the Chair of CIAT’s Board of Trustees, Dr. Lauritz Holm-Nielsen, and the Director General of CIAT, Dr. Joachim Voss.

25. Dr. Coffman briefly summarized the main findings and recommendations of the review. The Panel found that while CIAT had continued to work on problems of crops and natural resources of major importance to the poor in Latin America and elsewhere in the tropical world, it was substantially a regional centre having only recently increased modestly its core resources deployed outside Latin America. CIAT had yet to meet fully its global mandate in genetic resources conservation as reflected in its genebank which needed serious upgrading. The Centre’s natural resources management research showed progress in incorporating participatory methods into biophysical research and in embedding NRM in local ecological and social realities. But the opportunity for strategic NRM research had not been exploited satisfactorily. While CIAT had also made progress in integrating its germplasm and natural resources management research, effective integration was yet to be achieved and required the appropriate research framework, methodologies, and processes.

26. In terms of the quality of CIAT’s work, the Panel found the Centre had exemplary programmes in such areas as integrated pest management, forage improvement, participatory research, land use, GIS tools, and biotechnology. It had productive collaborative relationships with advanced research institutes, NARS, and other partners. CIAT had become a hub of the agricultural research establishment for the Latin American region, while maintaining international presence and impact. It had combined a core long-term agenda consistent with its mission and mandate with a realistic involvement in the current research market as represented by its “research park”.

27. CIAT had made major improvements in leadership, administration, and finance during the period under review. The Centre had rebuilt its financial integrity, implemented a major downsizing without labour problems, remodelled its performance appraisal system, significantly improved staff participation, increased training and development opportunities for all staff, re-engineered a number of its support services, and reduced the operational cost of both research projects and support units. A remaining challenge was the redesign of its financial information systems, processes and procedures to facilitate project budget monitoring and reporting.

28. In programmatic terms, the Panel recommended, *inter alia*, that CIAT:

- give urgent priority to obtaining necessary funds to comply fully with the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme on upgrading CGIAR genebanks and, further, that its Board and Management ensure the upgrading was successfully completed within five years;
- develop appropriate policies and protocols to manage the conservation, exchange and use of clones, sequences, probes, transgenic organisms, and associated information generated through its biotechnology research;
- commit, secure and provide sustained and adequate support to the Centre's global and regional commodity research responsibilities;
- assure the Africa Bean Programme of long-term sustained funding to safeguard continuity and the ability to expand into promising areas such as forages;
- develop a rigorous overall research approach to NRM with greater integration among projects and a framework clarifying the functional relationships between them;
- develop a rigorous and coherent research plan for the Hillsides Project;
- document its experience in integrating research on germplasm, natural resources, and social science by assessing the impact of its past integration efforts on target areas and populations;
- carry out an analytical review of its extensive partnership experience to derive lessons for itself and other CGIAR institutions
- ensure that its research strategy for NRM be explicitly cumulative in nature;
- develop further its "entry point" model to help identify optimal entry points for its NRM research projects.

29. The Chair thanked Dr. Coffman for his presentation and recognised Drs. Holm-Nielsen and Voss who presented the response of the CIAT Board and management to the review. In general, CIAT concurred with the overall analysis of the EPMR and the bulk of the Panel's recommendations. It shared the Panel's view of the need to fully integrate its germplasm and natural resource management research and would further utilize the ecoregional reference sites toward that end.

30. On specific recommendations of the Panel, the Centre:

- agreed there was need to accelerate upgrading of its germplasm collections and would update its 1996 plan for doing so to meet SGRP requirements;
- noted that a system for assembling, characterizing, and storing "new genetic resources" was planned and that IP policy would specifically include transgenic organisms;

- would take steps to improve CIAT's current IP policy and develop mechanisms to facilitate effective access to the IP of others;
- affirmed its commitment to research on beans, cassava, rice and tropical forages and the optimal allocation of unrestricted resources to these commodities;
- would monitor advances in technology to modify the nutritional characteristics of staple food crops but make no significant research expenditures unless IP issues were clarified;
- had taken steps to ensure continued allocation of unrestricted and restricted resources to the Africa Bean Programme;
- would vigorously pursue greater integration of its NRM projects through development of a new strategic plan;
- had put in place clear plans for the Hillside Project which were being implemented under new project management;
- had launched a major inter-project effort to assess impact in the ecoregional reference sites where genetic and natural resources research had been integrated;
- had initiated planning for the recommended analytical review of partnership experiences to be carried out in 2001;
- would ensure the cumulative nature of its NRM research by deploying research competencies across and within projects and maintaining centre-wide strategic databases;
- would further develop the "entry point" model based on analysis of tradeoffs between alternative commodities and land use options;

31. Following its plenary discussion of the review report and further consideration in the working group chaired by TAC Member Alain de Janvry, TAC offered the following commentary with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat.

TAC COMMENTARY

32. *The Report of the Fifth External Programme and Management Review (EPMR) of CIAT was discussed at TAC 79 in the presence of the Panel Chair, Ronnie Coffman, the Chair of CIAT's Board of Trustees, Lauritz Holm-Nielsen and the new Director General of CIAT, Joachim Voss. TAC expresses its appreciation to Dr. Coffman and the Panel that conducted the review.*

33. *The Panel's assessment of the Centre is, overall, positive. CIAT has achieved much over the last five years. The Panel highlighted in the report the major achievements and impacts of CIAT's research programmes, commending in particular the work in integrated pest management, forage improvement (*Bracharia* sp.), the Africa Bean Programme (successfully integrating NRM and commodity research using participatory methods), land use and geographic information systems, and biotechnology. CIAT has built effective partnerships with emerging public and private regional consortia in rice and cassava, e.g.,*

FLAR and CLAYUCA, offering a potential model for other CGIAR centres. Of notable importance has been the Centre's interactions with the public and private sector collaborators in the context of the 'Research Park'. A distinct change in the institutional culture of the Centre has occurred over the last five years, with a shift toward a new management style and a sounder financial situation. The Panel recognizes the leadership role of the previous DG and his management team in effecting this change, which created the right institutional environment for research. TAC applauds these achievements.

34. The Panel made 15 recommendations, 12 addressing research programme or research-related issues, two covering organization and management aspects and one relating to partnerships. Generally, TAC endorses the findings of the report and concurs with the Panel's recommendations. The Committee encourages CIAT Management and the Board, particularly the Programme Committee of the Board, to give special attention to some key issues highlighted by the Panel, e.g., genebank management and quality of NRM research, and to establish appropriate mechanisms to ensure high quality of science in these and other programmes. TAC offers the following commentary prepared with inputs from the CGIAR Secretariat to supplement the Panel's report.

Mission, Priorities and Strategies

35. The continuing relevance of the mission and mandate of the Centre is largely affirmed by the Panel. The Panel considers that CIAT has become a more open centre and is the hub of the research establishment for the region, while still maintaining international presence and impact. TAC shares this view and particularly welcomes CIAT's innovative approach with the current research market as represented by its "research park" concept. This has the potential of creating externalities both ways. CIAT could institutionalize the process of information sharing and coordination with the private, public, and non-profit sectors by managing periodic roundtable meetings on new directions for research. This would allow all four sectors to maximize complementarities in agricultural research. TAC agrees with the Panel's assessment that CIAT's position in the research spectrum in relation to alternative suppliers should be reviewed on a continuing basis.

36. With respect to priorities, TAC would like to understand better the effectiveness of the Center's process of planning and priority setting currently used. Information conveyed indicates a certain degree of dispersion of efforts among the projects, with lack of continuity and cumulative impact (Recommendation 14). It is not clear from the Report whether future priority setting will be more effective in identifying sharply defined priorities. It is particularly important to observe how this process is responding to the focus on poverty, both systematically through data analysis (poverty mapping) and through active participation of their regional constituencies (including the poor) in priority setting.

37. The useful "principles of engagement" advanced by the Panel are commendable but should be complemented to account for the sustainability purpose that motivates much of the NRM work.

38. The Centre is in the process of developing a new strategic plan. TAC, like the Panel, believes this is the right time for CIAT to redefine its vision and develop a long-term strategy. This will also help the Centre in setting priorities and developing the appropriate and balanced research agenda.

Quality and Relevance of Science

39. As the Panel points out, CIAT has strong programmes in a number of key areas including: IPM, forage improvement, land use and GIS, biotechnology and participatory research. With respect to participatory breeding and farmer research committees, i.e., CIALs, CIAT is at the forefront of new methodologies for the generation and diffusion of technological innovations. The approach is important in helping customize technologies (varieties, systems) to the heterogeneity of conditions of smallholders, and hence for a greater impact of technological change on poverty reduction. Attempts at integrating productivity enhancing research with NRM research lies at the core of CIAT's research methodology, as reflected in its organizational chart. While this has not been successful everywhere yet, the Africa Bean Programme is an outstanding example of successful integration.

40. The quality of science is rated as high for the three main scientific areas: physical, biological and social. While TAC does not put into question the judgement of the distinguished Panel of Experts, the Committee would have liked to see more concrete and consistent evidence supporting the Panel's conclusion about science quality. Typical indicators to assess science quality in research institutes have not been applied by the Panel. For instance, there is little characterization of the publications output, and there is no systematic analysis of the overall publication record of CIAT over time and across directorates, disciplines and projects. TAC encourages the Centre to compile the related information and make it accessible to its stakeholders and TAC.

41. Assessing the quality of the social sciences contributions is made difficult by the fact that most social scientists are placed within projects and many are outposted from the Centre. As such, the output of these scientists cannot be distinguished from that of the team as a whole if they fundamentally play a service function (e.g., help define research objectives, manage participatory processes, write training manuals, etc.). It remains, however, important that criteria be defined for the performance evaluation of these and indeed all scientists in terms of the quality and relevance of their own science, as no scientist can be held individually accountable for the performance of the group where he or she works. TAC encourages the Centre to develop performance indicators for these scientists and to do a systematic review of their performances.

42. This review and others have impressed upon TAC the need for developing specific standards based on common principles for measuring the quality of science and overall performance of the Centre. EPMP teams are highly variable in the depth and rigour used with respect to analysis of quality of science at the centres. Oftentimes, this is assessed more as expert opinions than through verifiable quantitative and qualitative indicators. TAC intends to revisit this issue over the next several months and in early 2001 convene a small working group meeting to establish indicators for assessing quality of science.

43. The participatory research model conceived and developed by CIAT (CIAL) has successfully spread to a number of countries in Latin America. The current focus is on the institutionalization and scaling up of CIALs. TAC agrees with the Panel that while there is preliminary evidence on the benefits from CIALs, CIAT should systematically and rigorously investigate the effectiveness of these and indeed all participatory methods. Uncovering best practices in each context should be an important research undertaking for CIAT in helping make the methodology widely applicable and in facilitating impact assessment. CIAT's proposed comparative analysis of the CIAL approach across different watersheds in Central America could provide this opportunity.

44. *Striking the right balance between commodity and NRM research is critical for the Centre and is at the heart of CIAT's mandate and research programme. The Panel correctly identified the current main dilemma characterizing CIAT's research: a rising role for NRM research, but with insufficiently well-defined methodology and uneven results, and a decline in commodity research, with a consequent slowdown in outputs--when it has been the mainstay of CIAT research. TAC endorses the recommendations that result from this observation: Recommendation 5 that calls for a renewed commitment to the Center's regional and global commodity responsibilities; Recommendations 8 and 14 that call for an urgent definition of a rigorous overall and cumulative methodological approach to NRM research; and Recommendation 9 on the need for a rigorous and coherent research plan for the Hillside Project. In TAC's view, providing a satisfactory answer to these recommendations lies at the heart of the challenge that the new DG must face in the years to come. With the accumulated experience at CIAT, and recent progress in the System as a whole in formalizing research methodologies to integrate productivity and NRM research (the CGIAR INRM Workshop at Penang), TAC is confident that rapid progress can be made on this front and urges the new DG to take this on as a priority concern.*

45. *Integrating the social sciences into this balance between commodity and NRM research is a fundamental part of the challenge. A well-managed social science programme has fundamental contributions to make to these two lines of research, in particular through participatory approaches. Social science work in commodity and NRM research needs to be formalized, engagement in development activities methodologically designed as rigorous action research, and research results submitted to peer reviews and widely disseminated.*

46. *Agro-industries development and post harvest research that can add value to smallholder crops and help create effective demand for their products are welcome initiatives that fit squarely with the System's refocusing on poverty. Close engagement with NARS and with development partners in these activities is also most welcome as part of effective regional development initiatives. CIAT's experience with agroindustry projects in cassava is quite convincing. The experience, however, indicates that more systematic ex-ante coordination seems to be needed to clearly delineate the relative responsibilities and needs for coordination among partners involved, and a rigorous methodology for action research is needed to extract international public goods lessons from the experiences.*

47. *As pointed out by the Panel, the theory of "entry points" in NRM research is indeed a provocative contribution that needs to be further explored and formalized (Recommendation 15). For instance, improved cultivars in the Africa Bean Programme have proved effective in linking strong productivity gains in crops with introduction of new NRM practices. TAC observes that a broader approach will often be needed to create more powerful entry points. This includes institutional innovations to internalize the benefits of NRM investments to the benefit of the entity, often the household, that makes these investments. Watershed-level transfer arrangements between households benefited by investments in conservation practices and those incurring the costs of investments, redefinition of property rights for instance over water, e.g., the Sukamajri project in India, joint ventures between "head-enders" and "tail-enders" in irrigation canals, and markets for environmental services (as in Costa Rica for carbon capture) can be effective for this purpose. These institutional arrangements should be added to the instrumentation of entry points, and rigorous analysis of gains, costs, and risks introduced. Social scientists in the corresponding teams have a fundamental role to play in helping identify and analyze these mechanisms.*

Management and Governance

48. The Panel identified a number of major improvements made in the area of institutional management since the last review. The role played by the previous DG and his management team in establishing a strong corporate culture deserves special recognition. The core values of transparency, fairness, participation, service orientation, cost-consciousness and output-based performance, is what in the Panel's view allowed CIAT to "rebuild its financial integrity, to significantly reduce its administrative costs and to implement a major downsizing without labour problems". TAC applauds these major institutional change accomplishments and concurs with the Panel's assessment that they played a key role in contributing to the overall achievements at CIAT during this period.

49. The Panel's assessment of CIAT's governance was brief and, for the most part, comprehensive. The Panel did not comment on the mechanisms in place to ensure that the Board is adequately performing two key functions: self-assessment, and evaluating the DG's performance. Overall, however, TAC is pleased to see that there is a harmonious and productive relationship between Management and the Board. TAC agrees with the Panel's suggestion that the Board needs to refocus its attention on resource allocation and monitoring the implementation of agreed projects.

Impact

50. TAC is pleased to note the major effort and investment by CIAT to document the impact of its research and notes this activity ranks first on the list of priorities on the social science research agenda. There are a number of areas where CIAT has clearly had significant impact from its research: the bean programmes in Tanzania, Peru, Bolivia, and Honduras, the IPM effort on whitefly, the agro-industrial development work, and the forage and cassava germplasm improvement programmes. CIAT has documented the rates of adoption and, in most cases, rates of return on investment for these and other research activities. It is not clear whether differential effects (on poor vs. non-poor, on producers vs. consumers) and other non-income impacts from the new technology have been considered.

51. With respect to the quality of the impact assessment work, the Panel considers it a well-focused effort with a high level of professionalism. Here again, more evidence in support of the quality of this work would have been useful. Certainly, the substantial effort made by the CIAT team in generating and adapting methodologies for, say, NRM assessment, is commendable and should be encouraged further, but it is essential that mechanisms are in place to ensure consistent high quality products, e.g., through peer review. TAC notes the Panel has commented on the unevenness of the socioeconomic analysis, with respect to model specification, techniques and rigour, on this project. The Panel believes, despite the differences in rigour and content of the impact assessment studies at CIAT, that these studies point to a positive result with respect to the impact of past research activities of CIAT. TAC concurs with this assessment but still encourages the Centre to improve the rigour of and quality assurance mechanisms for this project.

52. The review report and TAC's commentary will be presented to the CGIAR at ICW'00.

Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies (Agenda Item 5)

53. The report of the TAC Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies in the CGIAR was presented by the Panel Chair, Dr. Donald Duvick (USA), who highlighted its major findings

and recommendations. The review examined the balance of instruments and procedures currently employed in plant breeding by CGIAR centres, with a view to assessing whether breeding programmes and associated research could be made more efficient and effective by using opportunities for synergies, outsourcing and centralization. The focus was on the extent to which appropriate biotechnology and bioengineering techniques were being used as effective support to more conventional breeding practices.

54. The review found that, generally, the conventional tools and techniques now in use at the centres were satisfactory and had produced crop germplasm well suited to the varied needs of centres' clientele. The new tools of biotechnology could beneficially supplement, but would not soon replace, present conventional plant breeding techniques. However, gains in effectiveness were possible using the new technological innovations. In particular, time saved by applying marker assisted selection (MAS) in breeding was likely to yield considerable benefits.

55. Centres had devoted substantial proportions of their plant breeding budgets and scientist-years to various aspects of biotechnology. While their effectiveness in implementing the new tools of biotechnology varied, progress had been generally satisfactory. Centres tended to acquire those new technologies with most promise of application to their specific crops and minimal requirements for expensive new equipment. The Panel noted that use of biotechnology as a tool in plant breeding would increase rather than decrease expenditures and requirements in overhead and personnel.

56. The review found that there was need for some improvement of synergies within individual centres as well as between centres and outside institutions. However, there was scope for gains in efficiency through increased Systemwide collaborations, consolidations (and possibly centralization) of some functions, particularly with regard to new technologies and discovery tools such as identification of markers, genomics and bioinformatics. Outsourcing to advanced research institutes (ARIs) via collaboration was widely practised by the centres, but might also be used as a substitute for in-house investments. Although good progress had been made in centres' relationships with national agricultural research systems, these needed to be updated continually because of the evolving diversity of NARS.

57. As intellectual property rights (IPR) would play an increasingly important role in establishing contractual relationships with all institutions, public and private, centres needed to develop and follow a common strategy to ensure security in accessing and protecting patentable materials, or materials covered by plant variety protection. Centres, acting in concert, could also give important assistance to NARS in development and implementation of harmonized biosafety regulations at the regional level.

58. The review made a number of specific recommendations, *inter alia*, that CGIAR centres should:

- collectively should support and use a data base system to enable systemwide integration and utilisation of agronomic, ecological and molecular data;
- develop a systemwide programme in bioinformatics to gain access to major gene discovery programmes based on expressed sequence tags (ESTs) and genomic sequencing;

- develop a systemwide programme or action plan to maximize use of genomics in breeding programmes and enhance centres' bargaining positions vis-à-vis public and private ARIs;
- develop a common policy for collaborative research with for-profit organizations, particularly those in developed countries, with regard to biotechnological methodologies;
- coordinate and/or inform each other of their actions in initial deployment of transgenic materials, taking into consideration country-specific regulations;
- follow common (i.e., systemwide) general policy guidelines for IPR to ensure access to protected or potentially protected materials, tools and technologies;
- evaluate the use of participatory plant breeding as an organic part of each centre's breeding programme and the future roles of IPR and biotechnology in PPB;
- perform *ex ante* cost/benefit analysis before initiating extensive new projects in germplasm improvement, in particular those that use the new technologies;

59. The Chair thanked Dr. Duvick for his presentation. Following plenary discussion of the review report and further consideration in the working group chaired by TAC Member Lucia de Vaccaro, TAC offered the following commentary.

TAC COMMENTARY

60. *TAC thanks Dr. Duvick and his Panel for producing this Systemwide Report, which is based on the findings of nine sub-reports. The Report covers the Terms of Reference most adequately and provides a balanced and sensitive treatment of the various issues discussed. The Report also gives timely input into the current effort to develop a new vision and strategy for the CGIAR, and its implications for structure and governance.*

61. *TAC notes with interest the main findings of the review: First, that the methodologies in use are generally appropriate considering the crops and widely variable needs of the beneficiaries. Second, there is limited scope for cost-saving in the immediate future by modifying the methodologies used or by substituting them with newer tools. Third, the research in biotechnology is problem driven and focused on areas where useful applications are expected in short to medium term. New biotechnology methodologies (e.g. doubled haploids, marker-assisted selection and genetic transformation) are presently in use in varying degrees. Fourth, the application of new biotechnological tools will add new, hitherto unattainable, value to breeding outputs and speed up their delivery. However, not only is there need to maintain and even expand investment in conventional plant breeding and the associated disciplines to take full advantage of new tools in the future, but the direct and indirect costs (e.g. in biosafety testing) of their implementation will be substantial at least in the initial stages.*

62. *The Panel finds that the main opportunity for increasing the effectiveness of plant breeding in the CGIAR is by improved collaboration across the Centres, on the basis of common themes (e.g. rice or apomixis), as well as utilisation of new methodologies. In the Panel's analysis there is also scope for increasing outsourcing and collaboration in biotechnology with institutes outside the CGIAR and, in some cases, for improving the*

communication between scientists in breeding and in biotechnology. The review has 23 recommendations, most of which relate to areas where there are opportunities for inter-Centre synergies. TAC agrees generally with the Panel's recommendations and has the following additional commentary.

63. Any consideration of the relative merits of the plant breeding tools must be related to the holistic poverty alleviation focus of the CGIAR. This requires careful definition of the traits, which are of most importance to poor producers (e.g. yield in terms of productivity, resistance to various kinds of stress) and consumers (e.g. yield as it affects affordability, nutritional quality, cooking time). This in turn affects the relative effort that can be justified on genetic compared with non-genetic methods of improvement and also the methods used in genetics. For instance, while Participatory Plant Breeding (PPB) is widely used in the context of taking producers' interests into account, TAC observes that the long term interests of poor consumers must also be represented.

64. TAC sees as particularly important the potential for increased effort in marker-assisted selection in speeding up the breeding processes. TAC agrees that there is need to bring the capacity in bioinformatics to adequate levels to meet the needs of each centre and to match with the expansion to new areas of research. The concerns in bioinformatics and data base management (linking agronomic, ecological and molecular data) are systemwide and should be shared among the Centres. TAC agrees with the Panel that the degree to which the centres engage in structural and functional genomics must depend on a case by case analysis of the probable costs and benefits taking into account the alternative sources of supply. Whatever the degree of involvement, the CGIAR research and breeding programmes must find ways to get access to relevant knowledge deriving from genomics research.

65. TAC appreciates the Panel's view on the obstacles associated currently with the development and farm level utilisation of transgenics but emphasises the value of recombinant DNA technology as research tool for understanding gene functions. TAC strongly agrees with the Panel that the CGIAR Centres must work in close partnership with NARS in developing appropriate biosafety protocols and in building public awareness. The associated research is typically of an international public goods nature and the investments are complementary to those of the private sector.

66. TAC reinforces the Panel's view that assessment of benefits and costs associated with the development and application of different types of tools should also guide the setting of research priorities. This should also apply to PPB, which, following such an assessment of its utility in each case, should be fully integrated with other plant breeding methodologies.

67. With respect to engagement in various areas of research and adoption of new methodologies, TAC concludes that the CGIAR System must be permanently poised to introduce new tools into its operations, as appropriate. This requires "hands on" expertise within the System to estimate benefits of introductions and well integrated research groups to put those tools into use without delay. The Centres must maximise the benefits from partnerships with advanced research institutions, including the private sector, and act as a bridge between these and the weaker NARS, in particular. The advancement of biological sciences increases the need for capacity building in the NARS.

68. TAC fully agrees with the Panel's view of the urgency of establishing coherent systemwide guidelines on intellectual property. TAC notes that the Centres are revisiting the guidelines on IP, adopted at MTM98. TAC expects the Centres to actively join in a common

debate on how to guarantee the access of their beneficiaries to the relevant technologies and products.

69. *With regard to the implication of this Review on the future structure of the CGIAR System, TAC draws particular attention to the Panel's view that successful genetic improvement depends on expert knowledge of the phenotype and growing conditions as well as access to the germplasm. This requires that a substantial part of the research must be retained at the regional level. Nevertheless the Panel identifies several themes that justify cross-centre treatment and TAC agrees that solutions, which stimulate collaboration, must be explored. TAC notes that the Panel did not recommend outright centralisation of any of the System's plant breeding research efforts and agrees that at least in the immediate future synergies should be fostered by other means. Channelling resources in Task Forces will be an appropriate approach in some cases.*

70. *TAC recognises the considerable amount of effective co-operation presently in place in the System in the overall area of plant breeding. Nevertheless TAC agrees with the Panel's main recommendation that the Centres should think of themselves as part of a functioning System and that greater collaboration within and between Centres is required. TAC would like to see a work plan to implement this recommendation and monitor future progress, with milestones, for consideration at TAC 80.*

71. The review report and TAC's commentary will be presented to the CGIAR at ICW'00.

2001 Financing Plans (Agenda Item 6)

72. TAC reviewed the 2001 Financing Plans prepared by the CGIAR Centres. Financial analyses of the plans had been compiled and synthesized by the CGIAR Secretariat and made available to TAC. The Committee assessed the implications of the plans for CGIAR priorities and strategies, their consistency with centres' Medium-Term Plans, their conformity with the 2001 Research Agenda approved by the Group at MTM'00, and the programmatic implications of potential financing gaps.

73. TAC prepared a report to the Finance Committee certifying that the 2001 Financing Plans for all centres were broadly congruent with the endorsed Research Agenda. Divergences by centre shares remain unchanged from the approved plan. Allocations to activities, undertakings, and outputs were also unchanged except that protecting the environment, improving policies, and saving biodiversity were now more nearly congruent with approved levels compared to the earlier proposals. Similarly, planned allocations to commodities and sectors remained roughly as proposed in March.

74. These trends prompted TAC to reiterate to the Group some of the broad concerns which it had raised in its March analysis of the 2001 Research Agenda. These included the continuing shortfall in investment in germplasm improvement at a time when new developments in molecular genetics offered opportunity to breed for traits to overcome yield and productivity constraints in favourable and less favourable environments, continued imbalance in the commodity crops portfolio paralleled by underinvestment in livestock research at a time when 2020 demand projections called for substantial production increases in the developing world, and relative underinvestment in water management research at a time when lack of access to fresh water was rapidly becoming a key constraint to global food production.

75. Finally, TAC drew the Group's attention to shortfalls in funding for Systemwide programmes. Given the heightened emphasis which the CGIAR was placing on inter-centre cooperation in the context of its new vision and strategy, the Committee believed that these programmes warranted stronger Member support.

76. TAC's report to the Finance Committee will also be made available to the Group at ICW'00.

Report from SPIA (Agenda Item 7)

77. The Chair of SPIA, TAC Member Hans Gregersen, reported on the implementation of SPIA's work programme since the integration of IAEG into TAC in January 2000, as well as on the evolution of SPIA's role within TAC. The Committee then took decisions to integrate more closely the priority setting, evaluation, and impact assessment functions of TAC by improving coordination among the three sub-committees responsible for these activities.

78. In introducing SPIA's report to TAC, Dr. Gregersen highlighted in particular the substantial progress made by the SPIA in assessing the impacts of the CGIAR in the areas of germplasm improvement, integrated pest management, environment, poverty alleviation, and scientific capacity strengthening and partnerships. The Panel had also been working actively with centres to help institutionalize impact assessment as a routine function within the CGIAR by, among other things, sponsoring a Systemwide workshop on best practice and developing a state-of-the-art paper on impact assessment.

79. In reviewing the evolution of SPIA within TAC, it was recognized that impact assessment and evaluation had three aspects: (a) *ex post* evaluation of performance, achievements and impacts to account for past use of resources and plan future priorities; (b) monitoring, evaluation and assessment to guide present activities and revise ongoing plans; and (c) *ex ante* assessment of expected impacts from research to help plan future activities. These three aspects fit into a broader dynamic evaluation cycle, in which the results of M&E continuously fed back into impact assessment and priority setting and, in this sense, provided information for planning future priorities, strategies and activities.

80. In discussing the evaluation and assessment cycle, TAC considered the structure and functions of SPIA within the overall framework of TAC. It was decided that: (a) TAC Members should have the opportunity to contribute to the review of SPIA studies; (b) TAC Members having a particular interest and expertise in an area being assessed might become more actively involved; (c) to ensure closer linkages between SCOPAS, SCOER and SPIA, the chairs of each would serve as *ex officio* members of the others; (d) TAC Members could suggest themes for SPIA reviews while the latter retained final say in choice of topics for assessment and of panels and reviewers for SPIA studies; and (e) TAC would be the first body to receive draft SPIA reports and would make commentaries and suggest modifications prior to final publication.

Future Reviews (Agenda Item 8)

81. The Committee considered and endorsed the report of SCOER on future reviews. The report detailed progress in the implementation of the Fifth EPMR of IITA, which was being chaired by Dr. Ken Cassman (USA). The review would be completed in 2001 and the review report considered by the Group at ICW'01. Planning and organization of the Fifth EPMR of CIP, which would be chaired by Dr. Ed Schuh (USA), was advancing; the Panel profile was

being developed in consultation with the Centre. The review would be implemented in 2001-2002 and the Panel's report considered by the Group at ICW'02. In view of TAC's responsibilities with respect to the CGIAR vision and strategy exercise, the Committee postponed the scheduling of the Fourth EPMP of ISNAR and the Fifth EPMP of ICRISAT until mid-2002. The Centres had been informed accordingly.

82. By way of follow-up to a recommendation of the Third System Review, TAC, supported by SCOER, was organizing an overall review of the evaluation process within the CGIAR. In consultation with CBC/CDC, the CGIAR Secretariat and other stakeholders, a small working group meeting was planned for January 2001, with a view to reporting to MTM'01.

83. Building on the external reviews of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme and of the Ecoregional Programmes, TAC planned to carry out in 2001 selective reviews of two other Systemwide programmes, the SP-IPM and the ASB, and to work with ILRI in planning the centre-commissioned external review of the SLP. The Committee was in the process of consulting the centres involved.

84. During 2001, TAC also planned to commission a review of the CGIAR's strategy for training and capacity strengthening vis-à-vis the NARS, encompassing both an analysis of the CGIAR experience to date and lessons learned as well as documenting the impact of the CGIAR's efforts in this area. SCOER would work together with SPIA in planning and organising this joint evaluation and impact assessment study.

2000 King Baudouin Award (Agenda Item 9)

85. The Committee considered centre submissions for the King Baudouin Award 2000 in the light of the criteria established at TAC 74 and made a decision on the winning submission to be announced at ICW'00. The Committee prepared a commentary on the selected submission.

Future Meetings (Agenda Item 10)

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

TAC 80	ICARDA, Aleppo	26-30 March 2001
TAC 81	CIFOR, Bogor	24-28 September 2001
TAC 82	CIP, Lima	March 2002

Other Business (Agenda Item 11)

87. The Committee heard a report from Dr. Adel El-Beltagy, Director General, ICARDA, on the INRM Meeting held in Penang, Malaysia, 21- 23 August 2000. TAC Member Richard Harwood, who also attended that meeting, supplemented Dr. El-Beltagy's presentation. The Committee considered other items raised during the course of the opening session.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Emil Q. Javier

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

Alain de Janvry

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

Lucia de Vaccaro

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

Magdy A. Madkour

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

Joachim von Braun

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

Maria Antonia Fernandez-Martinez

Am Büchel 63
53173 Bonn
Germany

Hans M. Gregersen

College of Natural Resources
University of Minnesota
Room 115, Green Hall
1530 N. Cleveland Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
USA

Richard Harwood

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

Oumar Niangado

Delegation Foundation NOVARTIS Mali
BP E 1449
Bamako
Mali

Hirofumi Uchimiya

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

CGIAR COMMITTEES

Per Pinstруп-Andersen

Chair of CDC
Director General IFPRI
2033 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
USA

Kurt J. Peters

Chair of the CBC
Department of Animal Breeding in the
Tropics
Humbolt University Berlin
Philippstr. 13, Haus 9
D-10115 Berlin
Germany

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRES

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)

Joachim Voss

Director General
Apartado Aereo 6713
Cali
Colombia

Lauritz Holm-Nielsen

Chair, Board of Trustees
Senior Specialist in Higher Education &
Science & Technology
Human Development Department
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433, USA

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

Adel El-Beltagy

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

William Erskine

Acting Assistant Director General (Research)

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)

Lukas Brader

Director General
PMB 5320
Ibadan, Nigeria

Robert Booth

Deputy Director General

Other IITA Staff:

Dyno Keatinge
Robert Asiedu
Alfred Dixon
Richard Jefferson
Andzej Kilian

International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

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

Shirley Tarawali
IITA/ILRI
Ibadan
Nigeria

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Per Pinstrup-Andersen
Director General
2033 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
USA

West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA)

Kanayo F. Nwanze
Director General
01, B.P. 2551
Bouaké 01,
Côte d'Ivoire

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Chair CIAT EPMR

Ronnie Coffman
Associate Dean for Research
College of Agriculture & Life Science
Director, Cornell agric. Exper. Station
Cornell University, 245 Roberts Hall
Ithaca, N.Y. 14853 – 1902
USA

Gabrielle J. Persley

Consultant
45 St Germaines
Bearsden
Glasgow G61 2RS
United Kingdom

Chair Plant Breeding Review

Donald Duvick
Affiliate Professor
Department of Agronomy
Iowa State University
6837 N. W. Beaver Drive
P.O. Box 446
Johnston, IA 50131, USA

CGIAR OSERVERS

Bangladesh

Dr. Sheikh M. Erfan Ali
Member-Director (Crops), BARC
Eshon Waheed
Implementation Unit, TTT
Bangladesh

Germany

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

Italy

Paolo Sarfatti
Istituto Agronomico per l'Oltremare
Via Antonio Cocchi, 4
50131 Firenze
Italy

Nigeria

Olatunde A. Oloko
Director, Agricultural Sciences
Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural
Development
Nigeria

CGIAR SECRETARIAT

Alexander von der Osten
Executive Secretary, CGIAR
CGIAR Secretariat
TheWorld Bank
1818 H Street NW
Washington D.C. 20433
USA

Selcuk Ozgediz
Governance and Partnerships Team

Manuel Lantin
Science Adviser

Shey Tata
Financial Officer

TAC SECRETARIAT

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

Sirkka Immonen
Senior Agricultural Research Officer

Robert Bordonaro
Consultant

Ann Drummond
Documents Clerk

Guido Gryseels
Deputy Executive Secretary, TAC

Rosanna Corazzi
Secretary

Timothy Kelley
Senior Agricultural Research Officer

AGENDA

- Item 1: Opening Session**
- Item 2: CGIAR Vision and Strategy: Final Draft of Integrated Paper**
- Item 3: CGIAR Structure and Governance: Submissions of CBC/CDC and other Stakeholders, outcome of Email Consultation**
- Item 4: External Programme and Management Review of CIAT**
- Item 5: Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies**
- Item 6: 2001 Centre Financing Plans**
- Item 7: Report from Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)**
- Item 8: Future Reviews**
- Item 9: 2000 King Baudouin Award**
- Item 10: Future Meetings**
- Item 11: Other Business**

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	NUMBER/SOURCE
1	Draft Report of the Seventy-Eighth Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee	SDR/TAC:IAR/00/19
2	A FOOD SECURE WORLD FOR ALL: Toward a New Vision and Strategy for the CGIAR	SDR/TAC:IAR/00/14.1 Rev.1
3 (a)	CGIAR Structure and Governance: Submission of CDC/CBC and other Stakeholders	
3 (b)	Toward a New CGIAR Structure and Governance	SDR/TAC:IAR/00/23
3 (c)	CGIAR Structure and Governance: Outcome of the Email Discussion organized by TAC/RIMISP	
3 (d)	Implications of the CGIAR's 2010 Vision and Strategy for TAC's Role, Responsibilities, and Procedures *	SDR/TAC:IAR/00/20
3 (e)	Summary Report of NRM Meeting held in Penang, 24-25 August	
4	Report of the 5th EPMR of CIAT with Centre Board and Management Response	SDR/TAC:IAR/00/15
5	Review of Plant Breeding Methodologies	SDR/TAC:IAR/00/18
6	Summary of the 2001 Financing Plans Submitted by the Centres – An analysis by the CGIAR Secretariat	
7	Report from the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)	SDR/TAC:IAR/00/21
8	Report on Future Reviews	SDR/TAC:IAR/00/22
9	2000 King Baudouin Award – Summary of TAC Secretariat Synthesis *	

* for TAC Members only.

