FROM: The Secretariat

August 12, 1977

An International Service
for National Agricultural Research

1. Under the Chairmanship of Dr. Treitz and Dr. Pino, an informal meeting of representatives of donor agencies was held in Munich last April to discuss possible methods of meeting the urgent need of helping developing countries to strengthen their national research systems. The consensus of those at that meeting was that an essential function can be performed by an international service with the task and purpose of strengthening national agricultural research in developing countries.

2. The outcome of that meeting was a request by those attending it that this matter be put on the agenda of one of the meetings of the CGIAR in 1977.

3. Attached for the information of members are a letter from Dr. Treitz to the Chairman of the Consultative Group transmitting that request, a letter from the Chairman in reply and a paper on the subject of "An International Service for National Agricultural Research."

4. This paper has been commissioned by Dr. Treitz on behalf of those attending the Munich meeting and is provided to Members of the Consultative Group for their information at his request.

5. This matter will be considered by TAC at its meeting in September, and the Chairman of TAC will accordingly report to the Group as part of the discussion of Item 10 on the Provisional Agenda of the Consultative Group meeting.
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CG Members
Center Directors
Many members of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) believe that special and sustained efforts are needed to help developing countries achieve the capacity for more effective planning and conduct of agricultural research. Meeting informally at Munich in April 1977, they decided to ask the CGIAR to consider the establishment of a mechanism to help focus such efforts and mobilize technical and financial resources for them.

The Munich participants also asked that this paper be prepared to facilitate consideration of the matter by the Group. The paper presents background material and a justification for the establishment envisaged at Munich. It also indicates how the mechanism might work and suggests—illustratively and subject to further study—how it might be organized and what it might cost.

I. The Service in Outline

1. The mechanism could be called the International Service for National Agricultural Research.

2. The Service would work with developing nations in several stages. In the short term, it would help a country to analyze needs for agricultural research, and would seek to recruit any needed outside technical and financial support for a program of action to meet these needs. It would assist in drawing up the program, and would help to design organizational arrangements for carrying it out. In the long term, the Service's experts would participate in the execution of the program and in the evaluation of progress and results. An integral part of the program would be guidance and training to develop leaders and skills for the self-sustained growth of the country's capacity to plan and carry out agricultural research.

3. Agricultural research, in this proposal, is understood to include both technical research and its interaction with the process whereby research results reach producers and the needs
of producers become known to the research system. Agricultural research also is understood to include the study of socio-economic factors (especially the needs of small farmers), to provide an understanding of the complex of non-technical elements within which the research program must be shaped and within which production and consumption take place.

4. The proposal to establish the Service grows out of six years of experience and discussion among members of the Consultative Group, in the Group's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and in the research institutions sponsored by the Group.

5. The Service would be unusual, if not unique, among the enterprises supported by the CGIAR. It would be directly concerned with national agricultural research in developing countries, not international research. It would not itself conduct research; it would offer technical assistance to organizations charged with the conduct of research. While its efforts could be expected primarily to reflect the need for more food production in the developing world, they would extend to non-food commodities as well.

6. The proponents of the Service believe that it should have international legal status, and should be self-governing, non-political and completely professional in character. An outstanding organizational feature of the Service would be that it would have a relatively small headquarters staff managing a much larger staff in the field. The core budget would be relatively small; the cost of field operations would be borne not by the Service but by the governments being helped and by interested third-parties -- international organizations, bilateral donors and private institutions.

7. Nothing quite like the International Service for National Agricultural Research has existed before, although the International Agricultural Development Service established by the Rockefeller Foundation in several respects provides a valuable model. The new organization to some degree would have to invent its own operating methods and administrative structure as it gained experience. This illustrative paper, however, rests on a premise that effective and significant work could be done by a senior staff of about 17 scientists and administrators, on a core budget which at full operating tempo would reach about $2.4 million a year (in 1977 dollars). Taking into account the reimbursement the institution would receive for its services, the net funding needed for its core budget might be on the order of $1.2 million a year.
II. The Need for Agricultural Research

8. It is well recognized that agricultural research is the foundation for increased agricultural production and rural development.1/ Agricultural research creates and diffuses technical innovations (and contributes to related institutional and managerial innovations) in agriculture. The innovations increase agricultural output by increasing returns to factors of production, by improving product quality, by introducing new products, and by reducing the risks and encouraging the initiative of the producer. Investment in successful agricultural research is thought to bring among the highest returns of any type of investment in agricultural development.2/

9. Many sources of agricultural technology exist throughout the world. They can be grouped into (1) research systems in developed countries, (2) international research organizations (including those of the CGIAR system), (3) cross-country networks concerned with specific commodities or functional problems, (4) regional or inter-country research programs concerned with the problems of particular regions or groups of countries and (5) research systems of the less developed countries themselves.

10. These kinds of activity do not operate in isolation, but in various sorts of correspondence with each other. Each to some extent depends on or is able to benefit from the work of the others. As one authority has put it, an agricultural development program needs to be based on "a substantial, highly integrated research program, directly connected to farm problems at one end and to... foreign efforts at the other."

11. Of all research activities, the most important to a developing country are likely to be those of its own national research system -- that system being taken to include national governmental research organizations, provincial or regional governmental organizations, agricultural colleges and agricultural departments of general universities, and private research activities. The capacity of such systems to develop technology consistent with physical and cultural endowments has been described as the single most important variable accounting for differences in agricultural productivity among nations.3/

12. National research generates its own innovations; it cooperates in various ways in international efforts related to

1/ The texts of footnotes are contained in Appendix A.
its own needs (for instance, by testing plant materials developed elsewhere); and it adapts the innovations of others so that they become useful in the national or local ecological and socio-economic setting. It is primarily through national systems that the results of research, of whatever origin, effectively reach the farmer in developing countries; it is chiefly through national adaptations that the results of research, of whatever origin, become most useful. In studying the spread of modern wheat and rice varieties, for instance, CIMMYT and IRRI have found that the degree of adaptation of the technology to a particular agro-climatic zone is perhaps the most important factor controlling the extent of adoption. In the view of the experts who reviewed the operations of the CGIAR system in 1976, it is clear that every food-deficit, low-income country with appreciable agricultural potential needs a strong agricultural research program.

III. National Research System in Developing Countries

13. The national systems and programs for agricultural research in the developing countries vary widely in form and effectiveness. Gross differences in the amount of resources available exist between such nations as India and Nepal, Brazil and Barbados, Nigeria and Niger. Developing countries differ not only in size and financial resources, but in agro-climatic conditions, trained manpower and priorities of governments. Differences in approach also are dictated by disparities in knowledge of different crops important in different countries: more is known about rice, for example, than about cassava.

14. Effective national agricultural research systems exist in some developing countries and are being created in others. On the whole, however, of all the potential sources of agricultural technology, agricultural research systems in the low-income countries, not surprisingly, are the weakest. This handicaps these countries both in developing technology themselves and importing and adapting it from others. They face the additional handicap, as is well known, that much of the agricultural technology of high-income nations of the temperate zone is unsuited to the low-income countries of the tropics.

15. While the research opportunities and problems facing tropical countries are no less challenging and promising than those in the temperate zones, expenditures on research systems are markedly lower. The less developed countries, with well over half the world's population, account for less than one-quarter of expenditures on agricultural research.
16. Low expenditures are an index of many other weaknesses in the agricultural research efforts of many developing countries. The World Food Conference in 1974 took note of shortcomings in physical facilities: "Poor physical facilities inhibit both output and reliability of research.... While there are usually a considerable number of 'farms' variously labeled as experiment stations, seed farms, livestock breeding farms, these tend to be of inadequate size, the experimental fields have not been laid out to minimize soil variability, water supplies are uncertain, laboratories and offices are inadequate, field machines and laboratory equipment are deficient and transport is limited."

17. An even more serious deficiency, it can be said, lies in the shortage of trained manpower in national agricultural research systems. In a paper of 1975, the Secretariat of TAC noted that, as compared with developed countries, developing countries had "only half as many researchers per dollar of (agricultural product) and those generally tend to be trained to a lesser standard." Seventy per cent of research institutes in developing countries, at the time of that paper, had less than 10 professional workers, and more than half had less than 5.

National programs not infrequently are directed by relatively junior and inexperienced scientists.

18. Poor planning and organization handicap national agricultural research systems in many countries. In some a tendency survives from the colonial era to create independent institutes for research in single commodities (mainly commodities of interest in the world market); for this and other reasons, in some countries there is an extreme fragmentation of institutions and responsibilities for agricultural research among a multitude of ministries, departments and semi-autonomous agencies.

19. In these circumstances, effective communications and understanding among research directors, development planners and ministerial administrators, not easy at best, become extremely difficult. Agricultural research is not well aligned to national needs and priorities; comprehensive programs are not formulated or carried out; and important subjects such as farming systems, soils and non-technical restraints are neglected. A further, crippling consequence of the lack of a coherent administrative structure is a weakness of links between research efforts and producers.

20. At the root of deficiencies in national agricultural research systems in the past has been the low priority given to these systems by national governments and by development
assistance organizations. Expenditures on agricultural research by governments of developing nations rose in the 1960s and into the 1970s to a total of about $355 million in 1974, but they rose at a declining rate: the annual pace of increase from 1959 to about 1970 appears to have been in the neighborhood of 15 per cent; from 1971 to 1974 it was only 6 per cent.

21. At the same time, international development assistance of national research systems, in real terms, apparently fell: external funding for national research systems, from about $55 million in 1959, reached only to about $70 million in 1971 -- not enough to compensate for inflation over the same period. A reason sometimes given for the decline is that research results were not sufficient to encourage donors. But external aid also had severe deficiencies. It was given on a small scale and often for projects of doubtful technical merit; and it often was so scattered that it was likely to have little impact. (An international team visiting an Asian country in the mid-1970s found more than a dozen donors supporting 18 different and quite unintegrated agricultural research projects.)

22. At the end of the first Development Decade, national agricultural research systems were not being given adequate attention either by the governments of developing countries or by the international community. The prospects for support of national agricultural research systems, however, have markedly improved in the 1970s.

23. Inspired by the success of modern varieties of wheat and rice in the 1960s, an international commission of development experts, headed by Nobel Prize winner Lester Pearson of Canada, late in 1969 endorsed agricultural research as a meritorious object of financial assistance from institutions which previously had preferred projects of a more tangible nature. The largest aid donor, the United States Agency for International Development, broadened its policies to include support for international agricultural research in 1969; the second largest conveyor of development funds, the World Bank, made its first loan for a national agricultural research program in 1971. As further evidence of heightened world-wide interest, governments of developed countries, multilateral institutions and private foundations combined to establish the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research in 1971.

24. While many of these efforts were directed at international agricultural research, their ultimate aim was to strengthen national systems of production. They led to a
greatly heightened interest in national systems for agricultural research, both as a topic in their own right and as a leading subject on wider agenda, such as those of the World Food Conference in 1974 and the FAO general Conference of 1975.

IV. The CGIAR and National Agricultural Research

25. The Consultative Group has fully shared in this rising interest. Although the Group was established to create and support international agricultural research programs, it has had to be concerned with national systems, and this concern has increased.

26. The prime objective of the CGIAR is to identify and support the special international or regional efforts required to meet the needs of developing countries not met by existing activities, including those of national systems. To serve this purpose, the Group must be informed about the work going on in national systems. And for the work sponsored by the Group to have practical effect, it must find its way to agricultural producers, at least in part through the door of national research systems.

27. As the activities of the Consultative Group system have expanded, the system has increasingly tried to strike a balance between the central research interests of international agricultural research Centers, usually contained in their core programs, and the response of the Centers to particular needs of national systems, usually given by the Centers in the form of participation in outreach or special projects in individual developing countries. In the system's search for balance, the trend has been toward a rather more modest view than may once have been held of the direct impact which the Centers can have on the requirements of national agricultural research systems.

28. As a consequence, the Centers have been encouraged to put restraints on activities which would involve them too actively in national research and production programs. Another consequence is that the members of the Consultative Group and their Technical Advisory Committee have been led to search for additional means of strengthening the capacity of national agricultural research systems.
Help to National Systems

29. From the beginning, TAC has emphasized the importance of support for national agricultural research and extension. In its early meetings, the Committee and its Chairman observed that outreach efforts by the international Centers were "a vital part of the total operation (of the CGIAR system).... Both CIMMYT and IRRI had so far achieved a great part of their success because of their close involvement with national research organizations in national programs....11/ Recognizing the importance of the end use of research, application by the farmer, special links with extension and training need to be established....12/ The need to have training programmes designed to improve the supply of national leaders for research and extension was... essential....13/ The work of any Center, established or new, must be effectively linked with the needs of developing countries in order to get its results translated... into expanded agricultural productivity14/."

30. TAC early expressed its concern that support for international Centers should not divert the interest of donors from national activities. The Chairman cautioned that "if donors merely supported a central activity without also picking up outreach activities, possibly through special projects, this could be a fatal mistake....15/ Money for a central institute... could even be a poor investment if no strong national effort existed to back it up.16/" To get the full benefit of the work of the CGIAR system, there had to be a "transfer mechanism" which included "stronger national programmes."17/

31. TAC had its first full-scale discussion of strengthening the capacity of national agricultural research systems in 1973, as part of the review of a paper by its Chairman on international priorities in agricultural research. It was remarked that the role of the CGIAR system was only temporary, with the objective of "identifying and helping to fill immediate and urgent gaps in technical knowledge affecting the developing countries. Unless the scientific capacity of these countries can be strengthened to enable them to move ahead, the ultimate aim... of helping them to achieve self-sustaining technical growth is likely to be far removed and the Centers will have to continue indefinitely....18/ Despite these and other observations underlining the significance of national agricultural research system, TAC by 1973 was feeling "considerable concern that national research was receiving insufficient attention compared to support going to international Centers."19/
32. At the meeting of the Consultative Group during International Centers week in the summer of 1974, many donor representatives indicated a readiness to do more for national research. They "emphasized the vital importance of strengthening national research programs. It was pointed out that only a limited amount of funds could be made available for this purpose through the collective arrangements of the Consultative Group. Many donors, however, had bilateral funds available which could be used to support outreach programs carried out by the Centers in individual countries." 20/

33. Donors, in fact, seemed to be quite willing to respond to requests for support of special projects involving cooperation between national programs and international Centers. They saw in these projects not only a way of spreading Center technology but also of keeping Centers in touch with practical problems and needs best encountered in the field. By 1976, one-fifth of the current expenditures of the international Centers was accounted for by outreach or special projects. 21/ The CGIAR also began to finance expenditures in core budgets for Center headquarters "personnel concerned with management of outreach and for scientists standing by at headquarters to be available for outreach assignments." 22/

34. As TAC and CGIAR members grew more familiar with the day-to-day operations of the Centers, in fact, the Group began to be wary lest the Centers overextend themselves in assistance to national programs, to the detriment of their vocation for research. TAC saw a danger "especially at those Centers with rather a broad mandate, that outreach activities... might become overdeveloped to the detriment of research. 23/" "Centers could be overburdened, and their function could become more one of extension than of long-term research." 24/

35. Donors, as the CGIAR Review Committee later put it, tended to be ambivalent about outreach activities. They were eager that the Centers not become too ingrown in their research; but they did not want the Centers to deploy their resources too widely, causing their programs to become unbalanced and their efforts to be dissipated over too broad a range of activities. 25/

36. Outreach programs and special projects have indeed become a major concern of the Centers. In 1978, according to Center projections, three out of every 10 senior scientists in the CGIAR network will be working away from their own headquarters. While many of these Center scientists working with national programs are accumulating data and experience that will be fed back for the benefit of core programs, some are not; and the activities in which they are engaged put a substantial claim on the time and attention of the Centers.
37. The matter ultimately was examined by the CGIAR Review Committee. The Committee agreed that extensive involvement in national programs could divert a Center from its research mission and place an undue burden on its management. The Committee felt that some Centers were proceeding in the "belief that they have a global mandate not just with respect to research but a global mandate to raise national production of their commodities all over the low latitude world...We believe that to be a mistake."26/

38. In its final report toward the end of 1976, the Review Committee concluded that "as a general rule" the primary purpose of Center cooperation with National programs should be research to advance the central mission of the Center," and suggested careful guidelines within which the Centers might feel justified in modifying the rule.27/ The pronouncement of a group of European donors in 1977 on the same subject was emphatic. Meeting informally in June, they "agreed unanimously that the activities of Centers have to concentrate on research." 28/

39. In the meantime, the realization had grown that the CGIAR system, in any case, did not address the problem of strengthening national agricultural research capacity in all its aspects. There were, it was noted in TAC, "numerous agricultural research problems of national or local importance not being covered by... any international Center."29/ These not only included the study of commodities outside the scope of the Centers, but involved other matters which the centers could reach only with difficulty or not at all.

40. An important example were socio-economic investigations needed to identify the kind of technical research required to help provide a basis for agricultural development planning and investment in a particular country. Within TAC, the comment was made that "the studies on which information for national planning had to be based must in most cases be undertaken within the national environment where the direct influence of international institutes would generally be marginal."30/ The talents of the Centers, outstanding and unique as they were, did not necessarily fit into the matrix of a national government's ideas about rural development.31/ The assistance offered by Center outpostings to developing countries was not always of as high quality as the Center's work on its own campus.32/ To seek to overcome the weaknesses of national agricultural research systems in all respects, and throughout the less developed world, was a task far too large for the Centers to undertake.33/
41. The Centers themselves began to feel the strain of undertaking what developing countries (usually abetted by donors) were asking them to do. By 1977, both CIP and IITA were looking for other institutions to which they could refer requests for assistance to national agricultural research programs.

Looking for a Mechanism

42. TAC's consideration of what to do about strengthening the capacity of national agricultural research systems had led it to three conclusions by 1973: first, TAC itself could not entertain applications for support of national research projects; second, the Consultative Group, as a group, could not be asked to support national systems financially (unless they happened to contain elements integral to the core programs of international institutes); and, third, strengthening of national research capacity would largely have to be done with assistance from bilateral and international agencies rather than through the CGIAR as a group.

43. TAC's early conclusions about what the CGIAR could not be asked to do, however, did not lay the matter to rest. The Chairman reminded the Committee that "there could be a variety of approaches to meeting research needs" and that "it was not necessary to think of everything in terms of a particular form of international institute." Members felt that it still might be incumbent on the CGIAR, if not to contribute funds directly, "to enlist and coordinate support ... (for national research programs) in a more systematic way." The problem was complicated, however, by the many variations in national agricultural research capacities and organizations and by the consequent need for assistance at many levels.

44. The Chairman made a tentative suggestion in 1973: although the matter seemed to fall outside TAC's competence, the Committee might be able to help by fielding traveling missions in cooperation with the regional offices of international organizations to look at country establishments and needs; these would be "mobile teams which could offer advice and identify needs for help in strengthening national systems."

45. Neither of the positive ideas offered in these early discussions of TAC achieved any concrete expression. Donors were interested in the possibilities of coordinated effort, and in 1974 supplied information about their respective activities in individual countries; but neither the TAC Secretariat nor the CGIAR Secretariat was able to carry the matter any further. Members of TAC thought well of the idea of mobile teams, but no definite proposal emerged for consideration by TAC or the CGIAR.
46. Following the discussion of the priorities paper of 1973, strengthening of national research capacity became a continuing item on the agenda of TAC. In the Committee's 9th meeting (1975), it was acknowledged that FAO, UNDP, the World Bank and bilateral agencies were providing some short-term guidance and some operational assistance to national agricultural research systems. It was questionable, however, whether these efforts were sufficient, and it was thought that new approaches were desirable.

47. The Chairman felt that "more should be done to expedite building national research capacities, and that some more precise instrument than anything existing at the moment ought to be created to do this." Some research advances, it was suggested, might be made by a cooperative network of national organizations and international agencies; but an open question about this type of mechanism was how to provide a sufficiently strong focal point and how to find leadership for it. The Secretary drew attention to suggestions that had been made at an informal conference of CGIAR members meeting at Bellagio, Italy, for creating "some kind of new internationally supported organization" to provide advisory services to help countries determine priorities, allocate resources to research and improve research organization and management. No decision followed, and in the next meeting of the Consultative Group, the Chairman of TAC was unable to make any specific recommendations on this score.

48. TAC returned to the subject at its 11th Meeting (October 1975) with the help of a magisterial review by its Secretary of the question of how to assist in the development of national agricultural research capacity. He identified the following elements as being necessary for an effective attack on the problem:

a. Identification of major priorities to be met in national agricultural research programs.

b. Provision of personnel and arrangement of finance needed to fill gaps in national research systems.

c. Analysis of manpower and training requirements in national agricultural research systems, and knowledge of where training could best be undertaken.

d. Identification of need for, and referral of national systems to, sources of kinds of research not embraced by the national agricultural research systems.
themselves: for example, basic biological research, of studies of needs for complementary structures such as credit facilities, marketing, and so on.49/ 

49. The Chairman admonished the Committee that it must "come to grips with the problems of identifying the needs and mobilizing the resources to strengthen national research." He felt that if national systems were to be built up, it had to be with the help of some kind of service. Members believed that "if such a service was to be effective, it would have to have a link with TAC and bilateral donors"50/; but no specific organizational formula was proposed to or adopted by TAC. 

50. In 1976, a revised draft of the TAC paper on "Priorities for International Support to Agricultural Research in Developing Countries" declared that TAC was "unanimous in attaching the highest priority to helping to build national research capabilities."51/ Once more the Committee questioned whether the resources being committed to the task were sufficient. 52/ 

51. The Chairman feared that "the whole subject would collapse for lack of proper attention if the present (Consultative Group) system did not develop a more careful policy in support for national research, and if FAO -- which was the major international agency in the field -- was not encouraged to devote more resources to helping national systems. If the CG took a negative attitude, this would certainly endanger the value of ... international research. On the other hand if it were to agree to take on the financing of national research, it would probably involve difficult and complex management problems."53/ 

52. Again, however, no specific proposal emerged. The Chairman feared that his Committee could do much more, although he promised that it would continue to study the matter. In any case, the question of the proper relationship of the CGIAR system to national agricultural research was one of the topics to be studied by a group of experts which was appointed to study the system during 1976.54/ 

53. In November 1976, the Review Committee made its report. The Committee acknowledged that "strengthening national research program is a topic of concern to many... bilateral and multilateral agencies, and there is widespread recognition that this critical issue does not receive nearly the emphasis it deserves." The Committee felt, however, that "the magnitude and geographic dispersion of needed support for national research programs is so overwhelming that it would overburden the CGIAR."
54. The Committee therefore believed that the Consultative Group should not, at least for the time being, "adopt direct support of national research programs as an additional major activity" (underlining supplied). It recommended a 3-year moratorium on "major" new activities, but did not preclude continuing exploration by TAC of additional activities. 55/ The door was not quite shut on initiatives to strengthen national agricultural research capacity.

V. A New Initiative

55. During a discussion in TAC in 1976, the Secretary of TAC had remarked that "most of the donor nationals and donor institutions were now strongly concerned with how to help build national programmes.... What... was delaying them was that neither TAC nor anyone else had come out with clear lines for action. Somebody had to stick their neck out and say, 'Well, let's try it this way.'"56/

56. In fact, donors themselves had begun searching for a way. Their vehicle was a series of informal meetings of which the first, held in Bellagio, Italy, in 1969, had led to the establishment of the CGIAR. In March 1974, at the sixth of these meetings (Bellagio VI), donors began to turn their attention to the question of directly strengthening national agricultural research. Donors expressed anxiety that their own bilateral assistance to national agricultural research activity was not sufficiently coordinated: more information about each other's projects as well as about national research establishments themselves, would be useful. When more information had been obtained, a conference of interested parties might be held to decide on further action.

57. Such action might include the establishment of an international service to advise developing countries on research organization and management and on the allocation of resources to priority needs. It was suggested that perhaps an international corps of scientists might be established from which developing countries might draw to fill gaps in their own organizations. Finally, better identification of training requirements was urgently needed.57/ These ideas were passed along to TAC (as noted above in paragraph 47) without further action.

58. The Bellagio group convened again in June 1975 at Montebello, Canada for a meeting (Bellagio VII) organized under the title, "Strengthening National Agricultural Systems." The meeting was wide-ranging, comments were diffuse and strong consensus was hard to detect. On the subject of national agricultural research, however, it appeared to be the sense of
the meeting that participants continued to believe that some kind of special effort was needed.

59. The issue was raised of what kind of organization, if any, should be created to deal with requests from developing countries for help in strengthening their national research organizations. Suggestions were heard that if an international body were to be involved, this might take the form of (i) a United Nations Agricultural Research Program patterned after UNDP, (ii) a new consultative group, patterned on the CGIAR, (iii) an organization set up by the developing countries themselves, (iv) an organization set up by FAO, or (v) informal consortia of donors.

60. On the subject of whether it was feasible or necessary to establish a new mechanism for supporting national agricultural research programs, no consensus appeared; and there was doubt that the CGIAR system should shoulder the whole responsibility, since that might dilute the Group's resources to a point of reduced effectiveness. Conferees nevertheless thought that if there were any new international effort to strengthen national research institutions it must be closely integrated with the efforts of CGIAR, TAC and the international agricultural research Centers of the CGIAR systems.58/

61. Considerable interest was aroused at Bellagio VII, however, by the description of an organization then being established by the Rockefeller Foundation. This was the International Agricultural Development Service, incorporated under the laws of New York State in June 1975.

62. Several things about IADS seem particularly to have impressed the Bellagio group: the high quality of the scientists associated with the Service; the affinity between the Service and the CGIAR research network, arising from Rockefeller Foundation participating in both; and the operating method of the Service, calling for a small core staff and a large field activity, the latter financed on the basis of fees for service. Perhaps most impressive of all was the fact that someone had stuck his neck out and said, "Let's do it this way."

63. The Bellagio group was to have more time in which to ponder the example of IADS. In November 1976 the Rockefeller Foundation brought together a further meeting of the group, at which IADS once more arose as a topic. Some of the delegates to this meeting were surprised by the scope of activities contemplated by IADS; it was offering services throughout the
agricultural sector, whereas they had understood it would be specialized to give assistance to agricultural research. Many donors felt they would have difficulties in contracting with such an organization.

64. Following a recommendation of the meeting, IADS commissioned an independent survey to see what alternative forms of organization might make the Service more useful. The finding of the survey was that donors would be interested in a service specialized to assist national agricultural research and having international legal status.59/

65. In April 1977, the Bellagio group met once more at Munich. IADS presented it with ten different ideas about work which might quickly be initiated to accelerate agricultural advance in developing countries. Of the ten, one pre-eminently attracted the attention and support of the group. It was a proposal that "an international agricultural research and development service be created as a unit of the CGIAR, that it be given the mandate to cooperate with developing countries in the establishment and strengthening of national research and development (extension and training) programs, and that it be given the additional mandate of providing such other services as would promote the rapid emergence of strong and effective national systems."60/ The group adopted a statement of consensus, calling on the CGIAR to place on its agenda for early consideration the establishment of such a service. (The statement of consensus is attached as Appendix B.)

VI. The International Service

66. As discussed at Munich, it would be the purpose of the International Service to help developing countries to improve the capabilities of their national systems of agricultural research and research training and thereby to achieve self-sustaining growth in agricultural technology. It would not be the objective of the Service to help a developing country in the conduct of research as an end in itself.

67. The Service as envisaged echoes many ideas previously aired in the discussions of TAC, in the discussions of donors, and in the operations of IADS, among them that

It would not take the same form as enterprises sponsored by the CGIAR: it would be a service, not another international agricultural research center.
It would be an instrument for mobilizing and harmonizing bilateral and other assistance for the building of national agricultural research capacity in developing countries.

It would be an international mechanism, not identified with or dependent on any single country.

It would be part of the Consultative Group system.

It would have a small core operation and an extensive field operation.

In terms of finance, it would not represent a major new claim on the funds from which the CGIAR network is supported.

68. The Service's assistance would be given chiefly through the work of expert personnel in helping developing countries to identify agricultural research needed for agricultural development, and in helping to plan and administer national agricultural research systems to meet those needs. The Service's help to a developing country might also take other forms, such as the conduct of research seminars, arranging for the preparation of train-materials, or assisting a country to identify and obtain technical services for the planning of complementary structures (e.g., marketing systems) needed to give technology a greater impact on agricultural production and income.

69. On occasion, the Service might undertake special projects not intended to benefit a specific national system, provided that the value of these projects was clear and they could be run separately from the Service's normal operations. Activities to aid cooperation among national research systems of developing countries, for instance, might fall into this category.

70. The Service for the most part would act as the agent of the country being assisted, and would be under contract to the country. It is not the purpose of the Service to displace or substitute for other sources of assistance; it would act in cooperation with, and would help the country to draw on, other sources -- for instance, international agricultural research centers, bilateral aid organizations, centers for research in developed countries, and private sector activities. Potentially, one of the most valuable functions of the Service would be to help donors and a developing country to combine different flows of assistance in an effective way, and to preclude duplication and overlapping that otherwise might occur.
71. Developing countries of course differ not only in needs for agricultural research but in research capabilities and the capacity to make use of assistance. The operations in which the Service might engage would differ in size and complexity from one country to another. In some countries, they might be quite modest, to the point of comprising only a single project. In other countries, they might encompass the design and operation of a comprehensive national program for agricultural research, embracing objectives to be sought on provincial and regional as well as national levels.

72. The Service's cooperation would begin, it is expected, with the identification of the most significant agricultural research needs of a developing country. This first step would be carried out primarily by the Service's own permanent core staff. The Service at this point might be acting on its own account, or on behalf of a developing country, or on behalf of an interested donor or donor group acting in concert with the country.

73. Thereafter, the Service would assist in the detailed preparation of a program (or project) and in the management and review of the actual conduct of the program. It would do so after reaching an agreement with the developing country defining its responsibilities; and it would do so under contract to and as an agent of the country. The program would be carried out with financial resources provided by the country (often with the help of donors or lenders), with staff resources of the national system supplemented by outside experts recruited with the help of the Service, and with the Service's own core staff for support and oversight of country operations.

74. As an essential feature of programs to strengthen research capacity, the Service would assist efforts to train needed research scientists and technicians and some types of extension personnel. The Service's experts would help to design training programs and to recruit senior personnel for training activities; as already noted, the Service might be called on to arrange for the development of needed instructional materials. In addition, in cooperation with other organizations and institutions, the Service would aim to develop a capacity to refer developing countries to overseas universities and institutions that would best meet their needs for training of particular kinds.

The Scale of Operations

75. Adequate programs to strengthen national agricultural research systems require long-term commitments of personnel and
finance. The experience of the World Bank indicates that to develop and agree on a plan of action to strengthen national research capacity requires on the part of an assistance agency an effort of not less than 110 man-weeks, spread over several visits by expert missions and over a period of two or three years. The actual carrying out of the program, including the formation of new institutions or the reorganization of old ones, the training and seasoning of nationals and the completion of new physical facilities, would require from five to seven years of effort for the achievement of a significantly higher research capacity. The total effort in a developing country, then, might occupy from seven to ten years.61/ 

76. Pending requests from developing countries to development assistance organizations indicate that a demand exists for assistance of the kind the International Service would give; and the very creation and existence of the Service could be expected to arouse further demand. The limiting factor on research development is not likely to be demand or external financial resources, but the shortage of experienced professionals able and available to do the kind of work needed. It would be a significant achievement if the Service could respond annually to requests from three or four developing countries wishing to plan research programs and if it could thereafter cooperate in the implementation activities that would result. This is what is envisaged in this paper.

77. At the pace suggested, the Service at the end of three years would have built up to a level of pre-implementation activity in 10 or 12 countries a year; at the end of the Service's seventh year, the number of countries in the implementation phase might be reaching a plateau of from 15 to 17. In the meantime, countries would be completing the implementation of programs at about the same rate at which they began the cycle, which is to say three or four a year.

78. This level of activity might require staff time from the Service on the order of seven or eight man years for pre-implementation missions and for the supervision of work being done in actual program execution in the field. On the assumption that implementation typically would need six to eight contract employees working in each developing country being assisted, the number of contract employees in the field would reach a level in a range roughly from 90 to 140 after the Service's seventh year.
79. The core staff of the International Service would be a rather small group in which there might be considerable flexibility of assignment; and the group could be organized in many different ways. The functions and manpower required, however, are expected to be somewhat as follows:

80. A Director and a deputy would be responsible for the over-all direction of operations, for relations with donors and cooperating agencies, for policy in relations with developing countries, and for relations with the Service's governing board. The Director and his deputy should be well experienced in the organization and conduct of agricultural research.

81. A program unit would be responsible for operations in developing countries and for day-to-day relations with those countries. The unit would field its own missions in the initial phase of the program cycle, and would support and oversee the work later done in program preparation and implementation. Its needs for permanent staff might be met by eight highly experienced experts whose judgment and breadth of view would, on the whole, be more important than their detailed competence in specific disciplines.

82. The program unit should be able at relatively short notice to put into the field a reconnaissance team able to identify priority needs in a national agricultural research system. The range of judgment needed in the unit might be expected to cover the following fields:

(a) genetics and plant breeding (cereals, roots and tubers, forage crops, vegetables and tree crops).

(b) plant protection (pathology, entomology, virology; post-harvest protection and storage.)

(c) production systems (cropping systems, soils, water regimes, fertilizers, mechanization.)

(d) socio-economics (including both micro-and macro-economics as well as rural development.)

(e) physical requirements (architecture, engineering, research equipment.)

(f) animal science.

\[a/\] The figures in this section are notional, intended only to suggest orders of magnitude.
The composition of teams would differ, of course, from country to country and according to the stage reached by a mission in its work. The teams themselves should be led and, to the greatest possible extent, staffed by the Service's own core staff, although they might have to be supplemented by consultants for particular purposes.

83. A training unit would discharge the Service's responsibilities for helping to plan training activity; a member of the unit would join the country teams as necessary. Two persons experienced in manpower estimates, education and training would be needed for the unit.

84. A recruitment unit would be responsible for finding, and negotiating contracts with, the experts needed for operations in the field. The unit would require a chief and an assistant.

85. A unit of three could conduct the Service's administrative affairs. It would handle legal matters, including contracts with developing countries and cooperating institutions, would discharge the normal duties of a treasurer's office, including disbursement of funds and accounting, and would deal with procurement and office operations.

86. In this scheme, the Service would have 17 senior employees, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director and assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting staff, consisting mostly of stenographic and clerical personnel, might consist of about a dozen individuals.

87. Compensation and benefit levels of the Service's staff and of contract employees should be consistent with those of the international agricultural research system of the CGIAR. As in that system, it would not be easy to recruit qualified scientists for long-term expatriate assignments. The work and objectives of the Service would be well served if the organization were able to underwrite long-term employment for contract scientists, covering their compensation between assignments (during which time they might work at Service headquarters or otherwise be usefully engaged). This would enable the Service to give effect to the long-discussed idea of developing and
maintaining a career corps of qualified personnel for assistance to national agricultural research systems. It is proposed that the Service be given funds for this purpose; the cost would be charged more logically to the Service's core budget than to country contracts.

88. The annual rate of the Service's running costs by the beginning of its third year might be estimated roughly as follows (in 1977 dollars):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
<th>Cost 3</th>
<th>Cost 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core staff</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency, other</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,300,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thereafter, annual expenditures would be increased by the operation of the career fund.

89. The Service would rent its headquarters and would not need a construction budget. The only capital costs it is expected to incur would be for office equipment and furniture.

90. In the first three years, the Service's core and capital costs might be approximately as follows; a seventh year also is estimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Core operations</th>
<th>Capital costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 1</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 2</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 7</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91. Not all these costs would have to be borne from the Service's core budget. It is proposed that, once the Service had proceeded beyond the stage of problem identification in a developing country and had begun to take up the substantial

---

a/ At 30% of core staff. b/ At 80% of core staff. c/ At full core staff. d/ Including $400,000 of career corps expenditures.
work of actual program design and project preparation, the costs of any of its core staff engaged in this work would be reimbursed under a contract with the developing country or with another source of finance. On this formula, half or more of the costs of operations by the Service's core staff would be covered by the Service's contract income.

92. Under such an arrangement, the costs to be met by the Service itself would look somewhat as follows (in thousands of 1977 dollars):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Less contract income</th>
<th>To be found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 1</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 2</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 3</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 7</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93. If, after the third year, the number of countries (or programs) annually entering the program cycle remained constant, no additional burden would be placed on the core staff of the International Service in its work of identifying research needs. As countries (or programs) passed from identification into the longer period of preparation and implementation, however, the work of support and oversight of country activities would grow. By the Service's seventh year, the increment might require an additional three or four man-years of attention; but this probably could be supplied with the help of manpower from the service's career cadre of experts.

94. Taking into account the length of time required for preparation and implementation, it is clear that core expenditures on the order of $2 million a year by the Service imply a much higher investment in contract services in the field -- at a guess, from $12 million to $18 million a year -- to be supplied by developing countries with the help of grants and loans from multilateral, bilateral and other sources.

VII. Relation to the CGIAR

95. It is clear that a high degree of acceptance by developing countries and cooperating organizations would be essential to the success of the proposed International Service. The Service would gain that acceptance in part by a high level of professional capabilities in its staff. In addition, however, it would need to be non-political and free of excessive identification with or heavy dependence on any single country: it would have to be self-governing and have international legal status. In the words of the Munich conferees, "Such a service
could function most effectively if it were international and autonomous in character.... It should be created by an international group of interested governments and organizations; it should conduct its operations with a staff (recruited) internationally; and it should derive financial support for its core operations from an international group of governments and organizations."

96. There are several ways in which the Service could become international. One would be for all the participating governments to sign an international agreement establishing the Service, as was done in the case of the world-wide organizations of the U.N. system (and also, on a regional and somewhat less formal basis, in the case of the Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center). Another method would be to make the Service an adjunct of an existing international organization, as has been done with a number of institutions related to Unesco, WHO and the U.N. itself.

97. These and other approaches, however, do not appear to permit the quickness of action, the flexibility of operation or the close contact with donors that could be achieved by making the Service an instrument of the Consultative Group. The Munich conferees took the view that the best way to make the Service international would be to create it under the sponsorship of the CGIAR and for it to operate with the CGIAR framework. (In this case, the Service presumably would become international through an agreement signed for CGIAR by a member of the Group with another party -- for instance, a host government.)

98. What for a long time appears to have stood in the way of a positive recommendation that a service to national agricultural research be created by the CGIAR was a fear of two things: that the operation of the Service would put on TAC an impossible burden of reviewing many national program proposals, and that support of the service would deplete the resources of the CGIAR by draining off funds needed by the international agricultural research Centers.

99. The form of the International Service as now proposed seems to circumvent both these dangers. The review of the Service's operations by TAC and the CGIAR should not be particularly burdensome: presumably, it would not be different from the review of an international agricultural research Center or, to mention a perhaps more analogous case, the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources. That is, the review would be concerned chiefly with activities at the core: off-campus activities would be checked on a limited basis. The financial requirements foreseen for the core of the Service or not out of
scale with the other activities of the CGIAR system, and would derive donor support in considerable part from funds which donors are not able to use in direct support of the international agricultural research Centers.

VIII. Board and Site

100. If the CGIAR decided to proceed with the establishment of the International Service, two matters would arise, among many to be considered, that were of some special interest at Munich.

101. One had to do with the process of creating the Service. One prospect that attracted the support of the Munich conferees was that, in normal course, it would be the CGIAR or a CGIAR subcommittee which would name the initial governing board of the Service and would, by its action on the Service's charter, determine the criteria and method by which members of subsequent boards would be chosen. A point of special interest, it is now suggested, is whether a seat or seats on the board should specifically be reserved for a person or persons nominated by agricultural research institutions, including the international agricultural research Centers.

102. A second matter of interest at Munich was where the headquarters of the Service might be situated. Unlike the international agricultural research Centers, the Service does not have to be in any particular agroclimatic zone in order to do its work effectively; but many other factors would count in choosing its location — among them, for instance, convenience of travel both to developing and developed countries, availability of telecommunications, level of living costs, health conditions, quality of schools, availability of qualified local staff, and receptivity of the host country. Sites which could be envisaged would include cities in developed countries already reputed as official international centers (for example, Geneva, Vienna, The Hague, Rome), or sites in developing countries easily reached in international travel (for example, Mexico City, Rio de Janeiro, Bangkok).

103. The site chosen will have a particular significance for the Service's reputation for internationality. A site in an industrial country might identify the Service particularly with donors and facilitate cooperation with them; situated in a developing country, the Service conceivably could have a better chance to make a name as a partner of developing countries. While the Munich discussion obviously is in no way binding on
TAC or CGIAR, there was considerable discussion of the matter in Munich and a conclusion that perhaps should be noted for the record: that for the sake of a quick start, the Service should begin in a developed country, but that a later time consideration should be given to transferring the headquarters of the Service to a developing nation.
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At the invitation of the German Foundation for International Development, representatives of development assistance organizations met informally in Munich from April 25 to 28, 1977. The topic of the meeting was "New Approaches to Technical Assistance in Accelerating Agricultural Development." The participants had in mind the urgency of measures to increase agricultural productivity in the developing countries, particularly through the strengthening of national agricultural research. The group was aware of the many and extensive efforts being made in this direction by developing countries and by cooperating agencies including the FAO and other multilateral institutions, regional organizations and bilateral aid offices. Like many other groups which have considered various aspects of the world food situation, the participants at Munich felt that still more should be done on the level of national agricultural research. After three days of discussion, the meeting reached the consensus expressed in the following paragraphs:

"We believe that an essential function can be performed by an international service (such as the present International Agricultural Development Service) with the task and purpose of strengthening national agricultural research in developing countries. We see the service as operating in full cooperation with and supplementary to existing and related programs of the FAO and other organizations.

"The service we envisage would cooperate, on the request of recipient governments, in the planning and implementation of national agricultural research programs, and would help to create or strengthen national research institutions by various means. The service would help to provide a bridge between the work of the international research network of the CGIAR and national research programs; it would facilitate the interchange and dissemination of information on agricultural research; it would
aid cooperation among national research services; and it would promote and assist in the training of staff for national research enterprises.

"For the purposes of such a service, agricultural research would be considered to include some elements of extension, insofar as research-related activities of extension workers are involved and inasmuch as agricultural research involves a constant dialogue and interchange between research efforts and extension efforts. In addition, it is considered essential that agricultural research includes a socioeconomic component.

"We believe that such a service could function most effectively if it were international and autonomous in character, conducting its operations according to objective professional criteria. We believe that the service should be international -- that is, it should be created by an international group of interested governments and organizations; it should conduct its operations with a staff recruited internationally; and it should derive financial support for its core operations from an international group of governments and organizations. We expect, however, that by far the largest part of the service's operations will consist of special-project activities in individual countries financed if necessary with the help of specific donors.

"We believe that the best way for a service of the kind envisaged to become international is through the CGIAR, whose international character is well established. This would help establish the bona fides of the service, and would facilitate practical and effective relationships between the service and agricultural research institutions both in developing and in developed countries.

"The location of the service headquarters is important. Unlike the centers now under CGIAR auspices, this organization would not require
to be in any particular agro-climate zone. It should, however, have access to the communications facilities and other infrastructure necessary for the effective performance of its functions. It also is desirable that the service's location should reflect its international character. Initially, these two objectives might be met by locating the headquarters in a developed country well known as the host of international organizations; but later its transfer to a suitable developing country should be considered.

"We urge the CGIAR to consider, at the earliest possible opportunity, the establishment of such a service, and to place this matter on its agenda for one of its meetings in 1977, especially since the Technical Advisory Committee has expressed the judgment that the matter is one of highest priority."
Bonn
June 1, 1977

Mr. Warren Baum
Vicepresident
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
Chairman, Consultative Group on
International Agricultural Research
1818 H. Street N.W.
Washington D.C. 20433
U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Baum,

over the past two years the members of the CGIAR have expressed concern about the problem of accelerating national agricultural research and development. This matter has also been discussed on various occasions at Centers Weeks in relation to the role which the International Centers should or ought to exercise in strengthening national research systems. Similarly the TAC on behalf of the CGIAR has examined this issue in more detail.

Several informal meetings with donor agencies and developing countries have been held during the past three years at Bellagio and Montebello. Each of these meetings further confirmed the urgency of seeking new methods of helping developing countries to strengthen their national research systems.
From April 25 to 28, 1977 at the invitation of the German Foundation for International Development another informal meeting of representatives of donor agencies (see list of participants attached) was held in Munich with the purpose of discussion possible methods of meeting this urgent need which would be both professionally and administratively feasible.

During this conference the participants had been informed about the establishment of the International Agricultural Development Service, its governance, organization, structure and its operational procedures. After three days of discussion the participants of this meeting without committing the organisations which they represented reached the consensus expressed in the following paragraphs:

"We believe that an essential function can be performed by an international service (such as the present International Agricultural Development Service) with the task and purpose of strengthening national agricultural research in developing countries. We see the service as operating in full cooperation with an supplementry to existing and related programs of the FAO and other organizations.

"The service we envisage would cooperate, on the request of recipient governments, in the planning and implementation of national agricultural research programs, and would help to create or strengthen national research institutions by various means. The service would help to provide a bridge between the work of the international research network of the CGIAR and national research problems; it would facilitate the interchange and dissemination of information on agricultural research; it would aid cooperation among national research services; and it would promote and assist in the training of staff for national research enterprises."
"For the purposes of such a service, agricultural research would be considered to include some elements of extension, insofar as research-related activities of extension workers are involved and inasmuch as agricultural research involves a constant dialogue and interchange between research efforts and extension efforts. In addition, it is considered essential that agricultural research includes a socio-economic component.

"We believe that such a service could function most effectively if it were international and autonomous in character, conducting its operations according to objective professional criteria. We believe that the service should be international - that is, it should be created by an international group of interested governments and organizations; it should conduct its operations with a staff recruited internationally; and it should derive financial support for its core operations from an international group of governments and organizations. We expect, however, that by far the largest part of the service's operations will consist of special-project activities in individual countries financed if necessary with the help of specific donors.

"We believe that the best way for a service of the kind envisaged to become international is through the CGIAR, whose international character is well established. This would help establish the bona fides of the service, and would facilitate practical and effective relationship between the service and agricultural research institutions both in developing and in developed countries.

"The location of the service headquarters is important. Unlike the centers now under CGIAR auspices, this organization would not require to be in any particular agro-climate zone. It should, however, have access to the communications facilities and other infrastructure necessary for the effective performance of its functions."
It also is desirable that the service's location should reflect its international character. Its transfer to a suitable developing country should be considered.

"We urge the CGIAR to consider, at the earliest possible opportunity, the establishment of such a service, and to place this matter on its agenda for one of its meetings in 1977, especially since the Technical Advisory Committee has expressed the judgement that the matter is one of highest priority".

I am asking you on behalf of the group that met in Munich to place this matter on the agenda of one of the meetings of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research in 1977.

Sincerely yours
July 11, 1977

Dr. Werner Treitz
Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany

Dear Dr. Treitz:

Thank you for your letter of June 1, 1977, reporting on the informal meeting of representatives of donor agencies held in Munich in April to discuss the establishment of an international service for the purpose of strengthening national agricultural research in developing countries. You asked, on behalf of those who attended this meeting, that this matter be placed on the agenda of one of the meetings of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research in 1977.

As we discussed when you were here in Washington, I shall be glad to put this matter before the Group. To that end, I have forwarded your letter to the Chairman and Executive Secretary of the Technical Advisory Committee so that TAC may address itself to this question as soon as possible. I understand a specific proposal for the kind of institution discussed at Munich is being prepared, and as soon as this is received I shall send it to TAC for their review and recommendation.

TAC will be meeting in the week of September 7, and I would expect they will be able to include this subject in their agenda, and that the Chairman of TAC will be able to report at the Consultative Group meeting in the following week the outcome of their deliberation. We shall reserve a place on the Consultative Group's agenda for this purpose.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Warren C. Baum
Chairman
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