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International Centers Week
and Consultative Group Meeting
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Washington, D.C.

Informal Summary of Proceedings

1. The seventh International Centers Week and the fifteenth meeting of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research were held at the headquarters of the World Bank in Washington, D.C. on November 6-10, 1978. The Chairman, Mr. Warren C. Baum, presided over the meeting of the Consultative Group. The plenary sessions at which Center Directors made presentations were chaired by Mr. Baum, Dr. Bommer, Dr. Cummings, Mr. Mashler and Mr. Yudeiman.

2. Attached is the Informal Summary of Proceedings. Annexes consisting of the List of Participants and Center Directors' presentations are also attached.
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WASHINGTON, D.C.
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INFORMAL SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

1. The seventh International Centers Week of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) was held at the headquarters of the World Bank in Washington, D.C. from November 6-10, 1978. The meeting was attended by representatives of 25 members of the Consultative Group, by Chairmen, Directors and assisting staff of the international agricultural research centers and other programs supported by the Group and by a number of observers. A representative of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) was present as a member of the Group for the first time. A list of participants is attached as Annex I.

2. In addition to the plenary sessions of International Centers Week, there was a meeting of the Consultative Group and a number of other meetings, including one of Center Directors, an informal one of Chairmen of Center Boards of Trustees, one of donors to the International Center of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE). There were also meetings of the Executive and Program Committees of ICARDA and of the ICARDA and IBPGR Boards of Trustees.

Plenary Sessions

3. The plenary sessions of November 6, 7 and the morning of November 8 were given over to presentations of programs and budgets for 1979 (or 1979/80) by the international centers. These presentations were of three types: (a) a full length presentation covering various aspects of a center's program and budget followed by discussion by the members of the Group; (b) a briefer presentation with shorter discussion; and (c) very brief mid-term reports from those centers halfway through a biennial budget period. Full length presentations were made by the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT), the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR), the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) and the International Potato Center (CIP); shorter presentations by the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), the International Livestock Center for Africa (ILCA) and the West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA); and brief mid-term accounts given by the International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases (ILRAD), the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT) and the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI). Texts of these presentations are attached as Annex II to this summary. Reports were also presented by the Directors of three institutions not funded by the Group -- the Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center (AVRDC), the International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC) and the International Center of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE).
4. In opening the proceedings, the Chairman of the Consultative Group, Mr. Warren Baum, outlined the program of work for the rest of the week, drawing attention to changes that were occurring in the Group's activities and noting that as the Group matured, so the choices facing it became more difficult. For example, impatience to solve urgent problems had to be balanced by the recognition that agricultural research was a slow process that had to be planned on a long-term basis. There were difficult problems connected with the balance between raising agricultural development and helping the poorest farmer. While existing activities clearly needed long-term support, the Group should, nevertheless, recognize that other activities might in time prove as deserving. A way had to be found of ensuring the most efficient use of the Group's resources without overburdening the centers with too much auditing and review. He drew the Group's attention to the fact that decisions made in the course of the week could have far-reaching implications for the future. He also noted some changes in the conduct of the Group's business. First, that the Chairman of TAC would report on each center's program immediately after the center's presentation of its program, and secondly, that the Group would be asked to give explicit approval to each center's budget request.

Full Presentation by CIMMYT

5. CIMMYT's presentation was introduced by the Chairman of its Board, Dr. Virgilio Barco, and made by its Director, Mr. Haldore Hanson. [The text is in Annex II]. Commenting on CIMMYT's program, the Chairman of TAC, Dr. Ralph Cummings, congratulated Mr. Hanson on the many achievements made during his term as Director. He said TAC noted with approval the development of CIMMYT's cooperative arrangements with other centers while stressing the importance of keeping such arrangements under careful review. TAC was satisfied that this was the case in CIMMYT's cooperation with ICARDA in the Middle East. TAC supported CIMMYT's efforts to improve its long-term planning. While strongly supporting CIMMYT's initiative in setting up policy seminars, TAC recommended that this should be approached as an experiment at this stage and should be funded as a special project rather than as part of the core budget.

6. The Executive Secretary, Mr. Lejeune, pointed out that the distinction between activities suitable for core funding and those suitable for special projects was not always clear cut. Activities which were not part of a center's mandate, or were short-term, experimental or country-specific would normally be suitable for special funding.

7. A speaker expressed reservations about the practice of starting new projects with special project funding and then subsequently incorporating them into the core program. He felt that if a new program was worth doing, it should be part of the core from the beginning.

8. A speaker, while noting the importance of influencing policymakers, drew attention to the high cost of the seminar approach and pointed out that it might be applied to many other commodities. He felt the need for a broad examination of the value of such seminars.
9. A speaker, noting that donors found it helpful to have scientific information given in annual presentations, went on to ask whether CIMMYT was exploring other means of pest and disease control other than through breeding programs. Mr. Hanson emphasized that in fact CIMMYT was using a variety of different approaches to disease and pest resistance. He quoted the example of a CIMMYT multi-line which had finally been released in India.

10. In answer to a question, Mr. Hanson reminded the Group that CIMMYT now had 58 arrangements with universities and other research centers under which they conducted basic research work for CIMMYT.

11. In response to another question, Mr. Hanson emphasized the close cooperation between CIMMYT and FAO, as for example, for gathering basic facts in the countries in basic research work for CIMMYT.

12. Responding to a speaker who had questioned CIMMYT's success in establishing triticale as a food crop, Mr. Hanson thought that despite triticale's superiority in many respects, it was being resisted because it did not meet quality standards for cereal grains and through basic conservatism on the part of some government. However, he gave the example of one developing country which was promoting triticale strongly. Although CIMMYT did not take any particular position as to the use to which its crops were put, nevertheless, they were concentrating their efforts to get triticale released in competition with bread wheats so that it could be judged on the basis of its performance.

Full Presentation by ICRISAT

13. The Chairman of ICRISAT's Board, Dr. Bentley, in introducing the presentation, outlined some of the preliminary conclusions of the recent TAC Quinquennial Review. He was pleased to note the general endorsement that the Panel had given to ICRISAT's activities. The Panel had noted the need for ICRISAT to make plans for long-term activity in Africa, but had recognized the special difficulties of working in that region. The Panel had commended ICRISAT for its programs of international internships for research fellows and of research scholarships and Dr. Bentley felt there was a need for further expansion in this direction. The lack of adequately qualified staff could become a serious constraint. He was pleased that the Panel had recognized the peculiarly complex and difficult nature of ICRISAT’s mandate. Dr. Swindale then presented ICRISAT’s program. [The text of Dr. Swindale's presentation is given in Annex II.]

14. Dr. Cummings drew the Group's attention to the Secretariat's commentary on ICRISAT's program and budget and the supplement that had just been issued as a result of changes in ICRISAT's budget arising from preliminary recommendations of the TAC Quinquennial Review. TAC had long taken the position that at least some of ICRISAT's work outside of India should be incorporated into the core program. This was particularly true of the activities in Africa, and TAC had asked the Quinquennial Review Panel to
pay particular attention to long-term plans for that part of ICRISAT's activities. He reported the Panel's conclusion that ICRISAT still needed to prepare a detailed long-term plan for African activities. He noted the Panel's reservations about ICRISAT's proposal to fund consulting scientists through the core budget, and he was pleased to report ICRISAT's decision to remove two of the three proposed posts from the current budget proposal.

15. In answer to a question about ICRISAT's effectiveness in reaching the poorest farmer, Dr. Swindale emphasized the great value and importance of the village-level studies. ICRISAT's work in intercropping would be of particular relevance to the small farmer. While he was the ultimate target of ICRISAT's work, the immediate client was the national scientist.

16. A speaker drew attention to the great influence of India in ICRISAT's work and to the fact that so far it had been difficult to apply it successfully in Africa. Dr. Swindale, while concurring with the Review Panel's recommendation for a flexible approach to developments in Africa, felt that ICRISAT should have at least one experimental station completely under its own control.

17. In answer to a speaker who had noted that watershed management work implied getting control over a number of parcels of land in different ownership, Dr. Swindale reported that ICRISAT had had some success in doing so within the traditional cultural and land tenure system of the Indian village.

18. A speaker noted the importance of fodder and livestock in small farming systems. Dr. Swindale stressed that although ICRISAT would abide by its Board's decision not to work directly on animals, nevertheless, the value of fodder was fully taken into account in designing research strategies.

19. In answer to a question, Dr. Swindale stressed that ICRISAT's village-level studies were being carried out in three totally different environments. He recognized that the situation in Africa was much more complex, and for this reason ICRISAT had engaged two consulting economists to look at the available data very carefully.

Full Presentation of IBPGR

20. The program and budget of the IBPGR were presented by the Chairman, Mr. Demuth. [The text of his presentation is in Annex II.] In giving TAC's comments, Dr. Cummings outlined the functions of the IBPGR, emphasizing their unique character within the CG system. He noted that the Board had made some changes in its plans during the past year. One such change was the proposal to include forest genetic resources, and both TAC and the Board were considering the best way to handle this question. He commended the proposal to change the computerized information service being developed at the University of Colorado into a project for providing technical assistance. However, TAC had not yet had the opportunity of examining this program in detail. He mentioned that the Board would be subject to a Quinquennial Review in the spring of 1979. The terms of reference for this review had been circulated to members of the Group. Questions which the review might address could
include the future of the Colorado program and the success of the Board in stimulating national programs of collection. The review would also examine the organization and structure of the Board and its staffing. TAC endorsed the Board's 1979 program and would review the 1980 program after considering the report of the Quinquennial Panel.

21. A speaker drew attention to the Board's statement that it saw its life as being essentially limited, and queried what would happen when the Board withdrew from a particular activity. He thought perhaps this would be addressed by the Quinquennial Review. In reply, Mr. Demuth cited the example of rice, where a genetic resources network had been established and an action program formulated under the leadership of IRRI. The program was being carried out satisfactorily with some assistance from the Board, but it seemed unlikely that the Board's participation would be needed indefinitely. Admitting that it might be optimistic to hope that networks for all major crops would be self-operating in 10 or 15 years, this question would be addressed in a policy paper which the Board was planning to present to the Quinquennial Panel.

22. In reply to a speaker who queried the need for half a million dollars a year for the computerized data retrieval program at the University of Colorado, Mr. Demuth reported on a recent view of this program which had resulted in a recommendation which was to be considered the following week at a meeting of the Board's Executive Committee. Though not yet approved by the Committee and the Board, he could report that it was proposed to allocate $300,000 a year for contractual services from the University of Colorado for technical assistance to the five important genetic resources centers and to use the remaining $200,000 budgeted for this item to employ a high-level information expert on the staff of the Secretariat and to make arrangements with other sources of assistance to help, upon request, in the documentation problems of other genetic resources centers. He noted that information systems, other than the EXIR system developed at Boulder, were being developed elsewhere and successfully used. Use of several different systems for genetic resources documentation was entirely feasible, so long as the same descriptors were used and the results were reasonably interchangeable.

Short Presentation by ICARDA

23. The presentation was introduced by Dr. Solandt, Acting Chairman. While drawing attention to substantial progress that had been made, he outlined the very considerable difficulties under which ICARDA had had to operate, due to unsettled conditions in the area and severe communication problems. He noted continual pressure on ICARDA to include some work on irrigation rather than sticking exclusively to rainfed agriculture. He was followed by Dr. Darling, the Director General. [Dr. Darling's presentation is given in Annex II.]

24. Dr. Cummings commented on the excellent progress that has been made at the Aleppo site and also in the negotiation of cooperative arrangements with a number of countries in the region, and with other international centers. Including work on irrigation would represent a fundamental change in ICARDA's mandate, and he urged that such a change not be made without ample consideration.
25. In answer to a question about ICARDA's responsibilities for farming systems work, Dr. Darling commented that ICARDA had participated in the recent stripe review and workshop on farming systems organized by TAC and had concluded that their work was generally in harmony with that which was being done elsewhere. He preferred an approach whereby one started with the farmer's traditional farming system and fitted a new technology to it, rather than the other approach which started with the technology and then designed the system around it. In this work he was pleased to report very warm support and enthusiasm from national programs.

26. In answer to a question about the sheep program, Dr. Darling emphasized that it was no part of ICARDA's plans to get involved in improvement of sheep.

27. A speaker drew attention to the importance of the redefinition of ICARDA's mandate resulting from lowering the precipitation limits for the regions with which it is concerned from 300-800 mm to 200-600 mm. He felt this necessarily implied some work on irrigation in some circumstances. Dr. Darling replied that if ICARDA did get into irrigation, it would be for reasons other than simply the precipitation limit. He felt there was a future for more effective rangeland management in areas with precipitation as low as 200 mm and work on this called for substantial resources.

28. Replying to a question, Dr. Darling emphasized the good state of cooperation between ICARDA and CIMMYT. Disagreeing with a speaker who felt that ICARDA should do more work on cereal quality, Dr. Darling felt that ICARDA should put as little into this kind of work as possible.

Full Presentation by IITA

29. The presentation was introduced by Dr. Camus, who had been Chairman of the Panel which had recently carried out a Quinquennial Review of IITA. [The text of his presentation, translated from the French, is given in Annex II.] He was followed by the Director of IITA, Dr. Gamble [whose presentation is also given, as is that of the Chairman of IITA, Dr. Bunting].

30. Asked for more information on IITA's work on postharvest losses, Dr. Gamble drew attention to a cooperative program between IITA and FAO which was working on on-farm storage of maize. This had been highly successful. A similar program was in progress for yams in which there was collaboration with British universities for some of the necessary basic research. IITA was screening lines of roots and tubers to try to identify natural resistance to insects, particularly the sweet potato weevil. Some storage problems were caused by damage during harvest and there was potential for developing lines of cassava and yams which were easier to harvest.

31. Asked to clarify IITA's criteria for entering into special project arrangements, Dr. Gamble stated that these were quite straightforward when dealing with national programs. First, the work must be directly relevant to IITA and there must be feedback between the cooperating organizations. Secondly, preference was given to areas, countries, or crops which represented a wide ecological area. Thirdly, IITA tried to ensure that the national program concerned was willing to disseminate the work further.
32. In reply to a speaker who was concerned about the very substantial resources that were being put into special projects at IITA, Dr. Gamble noted the difficulty of making a judgment as to when enough was enough. He thought that IITA might be approaching that point. They clearly had to be involved in cooperative programs, but could not hope to take on everything that was being suggested, either by national programs or by donors.

33. In response to the concern of one speaker, Dr. Gamble stated that IITA would be moving toward doing more economic analysis once they had a much better understanding of the behavior of farmers and farming systems. In reply to another question, Dr. Gamble said he detected some disillusionment in some African countries about the performance of bilateral programs due in part to the rapid rotation of staff. African countries were looking increasingly to IITA, which they were beginning to regard as part of the African continent and situation.

34. A speaker congratulated IITA on the success that it had had in tackling the problems of shifting cultivation.

Short Presentation by ILCA

35. Dr. Mensah, the Chairman of ILCA, opened the presentation [and his remarks are given in Annex II]. In the absence due to illness of ILCA's Director, Mr. Pratt, the presentation of ILCA's program and budget was made by Dr. Tribe. [This is also given in Annex II].

36. Dr. Cummings, speaking as Chairman of TAC, was pleased that ILCA's local difficulties seemed to be decreasing and that good progress was being made on the building program. TAC urged ILCA to take a more analytical approach to its program. It also felt the need for a further examination of monitoring work. Representatives of TAC would shortly be meeting with the Program Committee and staff of ILCA to review the projected program in depth.

37. Replying to a speaker who felt that perhaps ILCA's activities were becoming too dispersed, Dr. Tribe agreed with the need to focus the activities as sharply as possible. In attempting to work on as representative a range of animal production systems as possible, ILCA was concentrating on the highland area, particularly in milk production, small ruminants in the lowland wet areas, and cattle in the semi-humid and semi-arid areas. Such a program was manageable and ILCA did not intend to expand beyond it. Agreeing with a speaker who had suggested that ILCA might be under pressure to undertake too much disciplinary research, Dr. Tribe emphasized that this was part of ILCA's original mandate and the policy had not changed. ILCA encouraged national institutions to do as much disciplinary research as possible. In some cases, however, this had to be undertaken by ILCA.

38. In answer to a question, Dr. Tribe said that ILCA had already demonstrated its ability to put together a total package of systems which integrated social, economic and biological factors. Improved ILCA systems were already proving successful in the Ethiopian highlands.
A speaker emphasized the importance, particularly in Africa, of the relationships between animals and crops. He felt this led to a greater need for cooperation between the international centers.

**Short Presentation by WARDA**

WARDA's presentation was introduced by Mr. Coulibaly, the Executive Secretary. [His remarks are given in Annex II.] He was followed by the Research Coordinator, Dr. Will [whose presentation is also given].

Dr. Cummings, noting that a TAC Quinquennial Review of WARDA had only just been carried out, expected a fuller report at the CG's next meeting. He was pleased with the progress that WARDA had made in improving the quality of their field tests, particularly the irrigated ones. Good progress was also being made in training.

**Full Presentation by CIP**

[The text of the introduction by CIP's Chairman, Mr. Greenwood, and the presentation by its Director, Dr. Sawyer, are given in Annex II, as are the remarks of CIP's Deputy Director General, Dr. Rowe.]

Agreeing with a speaker that genetic uniformity was very hard to achieve in potatoes, Dr. Rowe thought this was a problem primarily when potatoes were to be processed rather than to be eaten by farmers' families.

In answer to questions, Dr. Rowe outlined some of the problems in the use of botanical seed. Dr. Sawyer mentioned the success of the Chinese in this area. Noting that many problems remained to be answered, Dr. Sawyer emphasized that CIP was directing its efforts towards poor tropical countries where the potential for the potato could be great, but where currently it was regarded as the rich man's food.

**Brief Mid-term Reports by CIAT, ILRAD and IRRI**

The three centers in the middle of a budget biennium each made a brief mid-term report, addressing particularly the justification for requesting supplementary funding for the second year of the biennium above what had been approved by the CGIAR when the biennial budget had been approved. [The texts of the presentations by Dr. Nickel of CIAT, Dr. Pino, the Chairman of ILRAD, and Dr. Allison, the Director of ILRAD, Dr. Gray, the Chairman of IRRI, and Dr. Brady, the Director of IRRI, are given in Annex II.]

Dr. Cummings noted that these three centers were the first to apply the new system of biennial budgeting. He noted that centers might have to change their requirements in the middle of a biennium due to anticipated changes in program, or currency realignments and government actions which were difficult to predict. He stressed the problem that ILRAD was now facing due to the unprecedented rise in the cost of housing around Nairobi. Noting that commercial sources would not provide enough experimental animals of the right quality, he suggested that ILRAD's needs to breed their own experimental...
animals should be examined carefully on a long-term basis, including investiga-
tion of the importation of trypano-tolerant material from elsewhere in Africa. In
order to give ILRAD more time to settle down in its new facilities and with its
new Director, the TAC Quinquennial Review would now be held in 1980 instead
of 1979.

47. He felt that CIAT showed restraint in putting forward proposals for
mid-term corrections in their budget. Improved transportation facilities had
been provided without requiring additional resources from outside. He commended
IRRI's long-term planning exercise, and suggested that other centers might wish
to do likewise.

48. Agreeing with a speaker's comment that there was scope for better
exploitation of the wild species of rice, Dr. Brady noted the need for more
efforts in collecting wild rices.

49. While ILRAD agreed that greater use could possibly be made of
existing sources of experimental animals, Dr. Allison stressed that it was
essential to know the complete history of an animal, particularly with regard
to its exposure to East Coast fever. He noted that the importation of ndama
cattle into Kenya was prohibited.

Informal Report on AVRDC

50. Although AVRDC is not funded by the CGIAR, its Director, Dr. Moomaw,
had been invited to make a brief informal report on its program. There was no
discussion.

Informal Report on IFDC

51. IFDC, which also was not funded by the CGIAR, was also invited to make
a presentation. In answer to a question, the Director, Dr. McCune, said that of
a total of between 55 and 60 staff of IFDC, about 28 were non-US citizens.

52. Agreeing with a speaker on the importance of sulfur, he mentioned that
IFDC would shortly launch a program on it. They would also be paying greater
attention to calcium.

53. In response to a question, Dr. McCune stressed that IFDC pursued a
policy of defensive patenting in order to prevent others patenting technology
produced at IFDC. IFDC would, without charge, license manufacturers in the
developing countries to use its patented processes.

54. In response to a speaker's concern that IFDC might be duplicating work
done at commercial laboratories, Dr. McCune stressed that very little commercial
work was being done of relevance to tropical agriculture. IFDC would help to
transfer technology no matter whence it had originated.

55. Agreeing that slow-release fertilizers were relatively expensive,
Dr. McCune felt that their use could be economically justified. He mentioned
that IFDC was considering a project to coat seeds not only with fertilizer,
but also with rhizobial inoculum.
In response to a question, he said IFDC's mandate was predominantly for chemical fertilizers, but it was possible they could get involved with regional centers, for example, in Southeast Asia, and this would definitely imply involvement in organic fertilizer. They might also get involved in the supplementing of compost from urban waste.

Informal Report on ICIPE

Dr. Haskell, Acting Chairman of ICIPE, and Dr. Odhiambo, its Director, made informal reports on the activities of ICIPE. There was no discussion.

Informal Reports on Agro-Forestry and Postharvest Technology

Mr. Hulse of IDRC gave informal reports on Agro-Forestry and Postharvest Technology. There was no discussion.
Main Points from Summary of Proceedings

Agenda Item 3, The 1978 Integrative Report, Paras. 2 to 19.

Members of the Group found the Report ["The Consultative Group and the International Research System -- an Integrative Report," September 1978] informative and useful. The main discussion was on the Report's findings on the impact of research conducted by the centers and the expansion of the centers' off-campus activities. It was agreed that the Group would set in motion a stripe review of off-campus activities. Many speakers commented on the trend toward increasing emphasis on research to benefit the resource-poor farmer, including research to reduce the risks he faced. As the programs of the centers expanded and new activities were added to the system supported by the Consultative Group, it was noted that the need to have clear priorities took on added importance. In this connection, several speakers suggested that the Group needed a committee or some other mechanism to guide the Group on the balance of the system and the allocation of the Group's resources.

Agenda Item 4, CGIAR Responsibility for International Agricultural Research not Directly Funded by It. Paras. 20 to 28.

The Group reviewed a Secretariat paper on this subject dated September 1978. A consensus emerged in favor of concentrating on research deserving full funding, while retaining flexibility to build various kinds of links with research institutions not funded by the Group. The Chairman summarized this to mean that an accreditation service (such as discussed in the paper) would not be established, and that the Group would not accord special status to research institutions. However, the Group could still have activities of interest come before it and could consider applications for full membership.


The Group considered a Report ["Report of the Task Force on International Assistance for Strengthening National Agricultural Research," August 1978] prepared by a Task Force under the chairmanship of Mr. Demuth, who introduced the discussion. The subject of strengthening national agricultural research had been before the Group and before TAC for many years and many members felt that positive action could be no longer delayed. Many speakers commended the Task Force's Report though some felt that a fuller range of alternative solutions should have been explored. A clear majority emerged in favor of establishing a new service to assist in strengthening national agricultural research as recommended by the Task Force. It was agreed that any new service should complement and not supplant assistance already available from existing organizations. The Chairman felt that the various reservations that some members had expressed could be accommodated.
as the establishment of the new service proceeded. He noted unanimous concern for harmonious relationships with FAO and the need to avoid any kind of duplication of the efforts of others. The new service was intended to enhance the effectiveness of the present CG system, and was a logical extension of the work of the international centers. A committee of interested donors was established and subsequently held a preparatory meeting on November 10.

Agenda Item 6, Application of International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) for CGIAR Sponsorship. Paras. 48 to 59.

The Group considered a request by IFPRI's current three sponsors (the International Development Research Centre and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations) that the CGIAR consider including IFPRI in the CGIAR system [see the letter dated September 13, 1978 from the three sponsors to the Chairman of the Group]. The Director of IFPRI, Dr. Mellor, gave a presentation summarizing IFPRI's background, achievements, and future development. Many speakers emphasized their high opinion of the quality of IFPRI's work. It was noted that although IFPRI's adoption by the Group would result in increased financial demands, these would initially not be very great. It was decided to refer IFPRI's application to TAC for its recommendation, which would be considered by the Group at its meeting in the spring of 1979.

Agenda Item 7, TAC Chairman's Report on the 18th, 19th and 20th Meetings of TAC. Paras. 60 to 66.

Many of the subjects coming before TAC at the three meetings under review had been considered under other agenda items. However, Dr. Cummings commented briefly on the status of quinquennial reviews, noting that those of ICRISAT and WARDA should be available for consideration at the Group's spring 1979 meeting. TAC also hoped to have a report of its Vegetable Subcommittee available at the same meeting. IDRC had commissioned studies of aquaculture and of water use and management and submitted them to TAC. These subjects would be considered by TAC in the context of overall priorities. TAC had noted a trend within the programs of the centers towards more basic research. TAC would have two meetings during 1979, from the 13th to the 20th of February in Rome1/, and from the 3rd to the 10th of July in Hyderabad.

Agenda Item 8, Priorities for International Agricultural Research - TAC Progress Report. Paras. 67 to 71.

Dr. Cummings outlined the status of TAC's work on priorities and stated that a paper on the subject would be before the Group in time for the meeting in spring 1979. The Group generally concurred with the approach and methodology proposed for TAC review of priorities.

Agenda Item 9, Conduct of Quinquennial Reviews. Paras. 72 to 84.

The Group's attention was drawn to the revised Terms of Reference and new guidelines for quinquennial reviews which were generally agreed to

1/ Venue subsequently changed to Washington.
be useful and comprehensive ["Terms of Reference" and "Guidelines for the Quinquennial Reviews," TAC Secretariat, 1978, DDD/TAC:IAR/78/11 Rev.1]. Many donors saw quinquennial reviews as a major, if not the most important, assurance that the system was working as it should. In general it seemed that the right questions were being addressed but the Group would have the opportunity for judging the effectiveness of the new guidelines when it came to review the two most recent quinquennial reviews. The Group therefore endorsed the proposed terms of reference and guidelines for future review. The Group needed, however, continually to assure itself of the effectiveness of such reviews.

Agenda Item 10, Approval of 1979 and 1979/80 Programs and Budgets of the International Centers and Programs. Paras. 85 to 106.

The Executive Secretary reviewed the financial requirements of all the international centers and WARDA and the IBPGR as modified after discussion between the center concerned and the Secretariat. There was some discussion of the Secretariat's recommendation that CIMMYT's policy seminar be financed outside the core budget. The Group explicitly approved the centers' programs and their recommended funding.


The total requirements for new funds in 1979 amounted to just over US$103 million. Twenty donor members of the Group were able to make pledges, in some cases still subject to approval by authorities. On the basis of these pledges and preliminary information conveyed to the Secretariat, it appeared likely that most of the needs for 1979 would be covered, with the likelihood of a small shortfall.

Agenda Item 12, Report and Discussion on Farming Systems Research, and Future Stripe Analyses. Paras. 133 to 138.

The Group had before it the report ["Farming Systems Research in the IARCs: Report of the TAC Review Team"] of a TAC panel reviewing farming systems work at CIAT, IITA, ICRISAT and IRRI and the proceedings ["Report of the Workshop on Farming Systems Research, September 1978"] of a subsequent workshop on the same subject held in Nairobi in May 1978. Members felt that the exercise had been very well worthwhile and had demonstrated the value of stripe reviews in general. It was felt that the stripe review of farming systems would be helpful to the centers in clarifying concepts and improving methodologies.

Agenda Item 13, Report on the "Costs and Benefits of Agricultural Research: State of the Art and Implications for the CGIAR." Paras. 139 to 147.

The Group considered a report on the above subject, dated October 1978, prepared by Dr. G. Edward Schuh and Dr. Helio Tollini. Dr. Schuh was present to introduce his report. A number of members, noting the difficulty of the topic, commended the report. The techniques reviewed in this "state-of-the-art" paper were likely to be of increasing usefulness and relevance and would assume greater importance for the work of the Group as a whole and of
the individual centers.

Agenda Item 14, Other Business.


Dr. Bommer reported that the CARIS directories had now been published. The service covered a total of over 2,000 research institutes, nearly 10,000 research workers and over 3,000 research programs. National and regional CARIS networks were being set up or under consideration and he urged that donors support them where necessary.

B. United States Sponsorship of the Candidacy of the International Fertilizer Development Center to become a Member of the Consultative Group System. Paras. 149 to 152.

The representative of the United States proposed that IFDC be considered for full membership in the CGIAR system. [See letter to CGIAR members dated November 3, 1978 from Mr. Babb of USAID.] After discussion in which a number of members paid tribute to the value of IFDC's work, it was agreed that IFDC's application should be referred to TAC for its meeting in spring 1979.


Mr. Hulse of TDRC drew attention to the need for better arrangements for the internal training of research managers in the CG system. After discussion it was agreed that the Secretariat would prepare a paper setting out a number of options for the consideration of the Group.

D. Report of Center Directors. Paras. 157 to 159.

Dr. Swindale, on behalf of Center Directors, reviewed the subjects which had been discussed at their recent meeting. These included improvements in the management of centers, clearer policies on salaries and benefits, procurement, medical benefits and other matters peculiar to the special needs of the centers. Recent changes in the US tax law had created some serious problems. Two inter-center conferences were planned for 1979, one on communications and another on baseline studies on soils. Useful discussions had been held with United States agencies and institutions which might be able to offer assistance under Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act. It was proposed to have similar discussions with other major bilateral donors, possibly during the forthcoming meeting of directors in Hyderabad.


A number of European donors had been concerned about the supply of staff willing and able to work in the tropics on national and international agricultural research. Dr. Lampe of the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) reported on the work of a small working group that some European members had established. A preliminary report had been filed with the Secretariat.
F. **Press Release. Para. 161.**

A press release was approved.

G. **Time and Place of Next Meeting. Paras. 162 to 163.**

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Consultative Group would be held at the offices of the World Bank in Paris on the 3rd and 4th of May, 1979.
CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING

NOVEMBER 8-10, 1978

WASHINGTON, D.C.

INFORMAL SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

1. The Chairman of the Consultative Group, Mr. Warren C. Baum, opened the meeting by outlining the program of work before the Group's members during the remainder of the week. This would include the planning of new directions, possible shifts in priorities and consideration of the implication of increasing demands on financial resources. He drew the Group's attention to the agenda, which was adopted after the inclusion of the application of IFDC under Other Business.

The 1978 Integrative Report (Agenda Item 3)

2. The Chairman outlined some of the main topics covered in the Integrative Report and introduced Dr. Grant Scobie who had contributed to it. Many speakers commended the report, which they felt was of good quality, timely, relevant and useful.

3. A speaker noted that financial commitments seemed to be growing, and reminded the Group of the general desire for a period of consolidation. While recognizing the importance of off-campus activities, he warned against the centers diluting their effort into areas outside their primary functions.

4. A speaker noted that donors tended to encourage centers to take on off-campus work while at the same expressing concern about the growth of extra-core activities. This was a question that called for more serious examination.

5. A speaker queried whether most off-campus activity was in fact support for national programs, and if so, whether this was at the wish of the centers or because of external pressures. It was felt that this and other questions that had been raised underscored the need for the kind of review of such activities as was proposed in the Integrative Report.

6. In supporting the proposal for an overview study of off-campus activities, a speaker drew attention to their relatively high cost and suggested that ways be sought to lower this cost by cooperation with national programs that have facilities already in place. Secondly, the review would need to look at the extent to which it was possible to generate additional funds for off-campus activities through the use of special project funding.
7. A speaker felt that the report would have profited from reference to the ILO publication, "Poverty and Landlessness in Rural Asia," the conclusions of which seemed to suggest that the Punjab case quoted in the Integrative Report was an exception. He noted what he thought was the report's preoccupation with production. He emphasized the need to stress research on increased production benefiting the resource-poor farmers and the rural poor. He felt that the problems of such people had not up to now been adequately addressed by scientists or development planners and felt that they should be the primary target of the Group's efforts. Reduction of risk for the poorest farmers may be more important than the increasing of yields. He felt that technologies developed by the centers should not be scale-neutral, but should be positively biased towards the poorest farmer since he felt that the well-off farmer is adequately looked after by research done by others.

8. Another speaker drew attention to the fact that research to serve the resource-poor farmers is likely to need more money and more time. He, as representing a major donor, accepted this and expected each center to factor these considerations into its program decisions. He, too, shared the concerns of others about the proliferation of off-campus activities and welcomed the proposal for an overview study. He felt that as the period of consolidation began to draw to a close, it would be timely to afford the CG to take a very serious look at where it was going in the years ahead. It was right that TAC should continue and even expand its examination of priorities.

9. A speaker felt that he could detect two different schools of thought within the Group. Some thought that an international center having responsibility for a particular crop or activity should become the "global conductor" of all the work going on throughout the world. On the other hand, others were uncertain about the appropriate role for the centers in view of the large number of other organizations doing similar work. As for off-campus activities, he agreed that it was necessary to distinguish between those activities which were central to the work of the center, but had to be done in a different location, and those which were more peripheral. He supported the suggestion for a stripe analysis of off-campus activities. He noted the need to introduce long-range planning for every center as an integral part of the CG system.

10. A speaker wondered whether the Group was giving enough attention to collaboration with national programs. He also drew attention to what he felt was the very modest provision made for training.

11. In answer to a speaker who had stressed the importance of aquaculture, Dr. Cummings noted that this had been under review by TAC for some time. A rather extensive review had been done by FAO. A study commissioned by IDRC and carried out under the chairmanship of Sir Charles Pereira had been tabled at the 19th Meeting of TAC last June and would be further considered after completion of the current exercise on priorities.

12. One speaker thought the Integrative Report demonstrated a trend towards equity and away from production. His own authorities welcomed this.
13. A speaker noted that technology alone could not resolve all economic and social problems. He felt that CGIAR would be most effective if it concentrated research efforts to develop new varieties that would prove most productive on farms with good environments. On the other hand, many other things were needed in order to meet the basic needs of poor farmers. This tended to underline the desirability of scale-neutral technology and of the continual monitoring of economic and social impacts of changes brought about by research.

14. Another speaker, joining those who emphasized equity considerations, pointed out that knowledge of the development process itself, particularly in rural areas, was still very limited. He was reassured by the evidence that the research efforts so far had been generally scale-neutral and that there had been real benefits to small farmers and to consumers. He cautioned against the attempt to find the one single correct answer. He concurred with another donor representative in pointing out that donors as a group were likely to find themselves, for the time being at least, in rather constrained financial circumstances.

15. Another speaker, in welcoming the evident shift towards more emphasis on equity, felt that it had not gone nearly far enough. He particularly welcomed the efforts in this direction by IRRI. He added that even if one could accept the report's contention that much greater resources be put into agricultural research, this did not necessarily mean that they should be channelled through the CG system. There was growing support for the view that additional resources should go increasingly to national research systems in developing countries. Noting that some centers had reached the state of maturity, he questioned whether it was desirable to recognize a formal limit to growth of their scientific staffs. There were proposals coming before the Group for consideration of new additions to the system. This led him to revive interest in his previous suggestion that the Chairman may wish to use his authority to call into being a special subcommittee of the Group to address the set of complex issues surrounding the future direction of the Group.

16. Another speaker reminded the Group that there were resource-poor consumers in addition to resource-poor farmers. Research done by his own organization had underlined the tremendous importance for the lower-income groups of the lowering of prices of staple foods.

17. Dr. Allison quoted the case of East Coast fever as technology which was explicitly designed to be of prime benefit to the small farmer who did not have facilities for control of ticks through dipping in the way that the large farmer did.

18. In summarizing the discussion, the Chairman noted support for the suggestion that there should be a so-called stripe analysis of off-campus activities. He drew the attention of the Center Directors and Chairmen to the suggestion that the reduction of risk should in itself be an important objective of research programs. The centers were placing increasing emphasis on the question of equity and it was the view of the Group as a whole that this trend should continue.
19. Another set of issues concerned the financial limits on the system and the means whereby priorities could be set. The Group needed to know how to deal with the approaching maturity of some centers and how to get better long-term planning for this situation. He would welcome the comments of others on the suggestion that a committee of the Group be established. Based on the experience of the Review Committee, he felt it unlikely that it would be possible to get such a committee into useful session before the spring meeting of the Consultative Group. He cautioned against allowing the particular financial problems of one or two donors to weigh too heavily in the consideration of the Group's future financial prospects.

CGIAR Responsibility for International Agricultural Research not Directly Funded by It (Agenda Item 4)

20. The Chairman drew the Group's attention to a Secretariat paper having the above title. He hoped the discussion would be confined to matters of principle and not to consideration of individual candidates for some kind of Group support.

21. Dr. Cummings noted that TAC had reviewed this question at several meetings. There was a strong consensus in TAC in favor of maintaining the present arrangements which were informal and provided enough flexibility. He noted the number of criteria that should apply if the CG were to give formal recognition without funding to the organizations. Such criteria included an international character, international staff, research oriented to agriculture, and with objectives and mandates consistent with those of the Consultative Group as a whole and of the centers they support. They should meet tests of scientific competence and should be financially supported by at least two CGIAR members. Two of the options proposed in the Secretariat paper came very close to TAC's criteria. He pointed out that extending the Group's recognition in such a way would necessarily increase the workload on the Secretariats.

22. A speaker pointed out that there would be an increasing number of activities that might seek full membership of the Group and some kind of special relationship might prove useful while the Group was making up its mind as to whether to adopt them as full members.

23. The Chairman stressed that although the so-called associated activities were able to present their programs to the Group, neither the Group nor TAC had a responsibility to review these programs which were, therefore, not necessarily confirmed as valid.

24. Another speaker, tending to the view that the presently existing associations should be more formal, noted the need to know what the extra costs to the Secretariats and to TAC would be if this were done.

25. Another speaker felt that the view that the Group might be besieged by a very large number of hopeful applicants for funding was probably exaggerated. New members could be considered on their merits as they came along. The Chairman felt on the other hand that there could well be a significant number of applicants, and other speakers too felt that new applicants had
definite expectations of improving their financial situation through association with the Group.

26. Another speaker thought that accepting additional activities which already existed into the Group need not imply an additional financial burden, since it could be expected they would bring their funds with them. If they expanded, then it was probable they would have done so far anyway either within or outside the system. However, their absorption in the system would undoubtedly increase the burdens on TAC and the Secretariats which had some financial implications.

27. Another speaker warned that too liberal an acceptance of new activities could lead to the undesirable result that the Consultative Group became an all-embracing system of international agricultural research. This would lead to more bureaucratization. He, too, fully supported the argument in favor of option #3. He thought the Group should pay more attention to the possibility that some particular research programs of non-member organizations be supported without necessarily supporting the institution as a whole.

28. Noting a consensus in favor of the option #3 as given in the Secretariat paper, the Chairman interpreted this to mean that the Group would not establish an accreditation service for organizations which might otherwise apply for it. It would not add any new activities to the present group of three accorded special recognition in the past. However, this had no implications as to the merits of particular institutions which the CGIAR may wish to consider adding to the system supported by the CGIAR nor as to the merits of supporting specific parts of the programs of such institutions. It left the Group open to be flexible in seeking occasions for activities of interest to appear before it without giving such activities any formal status.

Report of the Task Force on International Assistance for Strengthening National Agricultural Research (Agenda Item 5)

29. The Chairman introduced the item by sketching some of the background to the report that was now before the Group. It had long been recognized that strong national agricultural research programs were essential if the technology produced by the international centers were to achieve the maximum impact. In practice, many such national programs were very weak. There had been numerous international meetings on this subject, and development institutions were devoting increasing resources in support of national research. The question had been before TAC ten times and many documents on the subject had been written. There had been an informal meeting of CGIAR donors in Munich in April of 1977 which had resulted in the so-called Munich Consensus. At its meeting in September 1977, the Group had decided to establish a Task Force to study the question further, and he had selected Mr. Demuth as its Chairman, together with 14 other members representing a wide range of interests. This Task Force was supported by a study group under the direction of Mr. Koffsky. The Task Force's report was a unanimous one. He thought the discussion would proceed to the best advantage if two things were taken as given. First, that the real need to strengthen national agricultural research had been convincingly demonstrated, even if there was scope for argument about its actual size; and secondly, that in whatever the Group may decide to do, there was no
intention of supplanting the work done by others in this field, but only
to complement it if this should be necessary. Many of the bilateral donor
members of the Group were already doing much to support national programs,
as too were the Group's three co-sponsors -- the FAO, UNDP and the World Bank.

30. Mr. Demuth then made some introductory remarks and summarized the
main conclusions and recommendations of the Task Force's report. The Task
Force had a distinguished membership and each member had had direct concern
with the problem of improving national agricultural research in developing
countries. Six of the seven members from developing countries were or had
been directors of national research programs. Two members were directors of
international centers and five members were senior officials of development
assistance agencies. The Task Force's report had been considered by TAC
which, after expressing certain reservations and cautions, had endorsed it and
recommended it to the Group for favorable consideration. The record of the
TAC meeting showed an overwhelming majority of TAC members in favor of proceed-
ing with the proposal as recommended by the Task Force, namely that a new
international service be established under the aegis of the CGIAR with the
mandate to provide technical assistance to developing countries upon request
designed to help them increase their agricultural research capacity.

31. The Task Force had first considered the need for such assistance
and agreed that it was large and not presently being adequately met. There
was a particular but not exclusive need for assistance at the level of overall
management, planning and organization, and in the preparation of long-term
programs expressed in terms of specific projects that could be conveniently
financed. The Task Force considered that such financing was likely to be
forthcoming from donor agencies if the planning was adequate and the programs
were given high enough priority. A long-term commitment on the part of the
donor and recipient alike was needed. The Task Force had concluded that
existing agencies could not meet in full the pervasive needs of national
agricultural research and that additional technical assistance was required.
This could best be provided by the organization of a new service under the
sponsorship of the CGIAR. This would be a logical extension of the Group's
present activities. Such a service should have the following characteristics
if it were to operate with maximum effectiveness. It should be autonomous and
nonpolitical. It should have a career staff of high caliber. It should be
able to respond quickly to requests from developing countries. It should
have the stature to help developing countries secure external finance in
support of national research. After considering a number of alternatives,
the Task Force had concluded that such criteria would best be met by a new
service concentrating largely on research policy planning, organization
and management. Though the service would be free to respond to requests for
assistance on any important aspect of a national agricultural research system,
the Task Force had set out a number of specific activities that the new
service might be expected to undertake. However, provision of long-term
assistance in the implementation of research programs and projects should be
subject to conditions. First, that such assistance must be fully financed in
ways other than through the Consultative Group and on terms that precluded the
possibility of any future claim by the service on the Consultative Group; and
secondly, that the service, in determining its own priorities, must encourage
full use of technical expertise available from other qualified sources accept-
able to the government in question. Far from competing with other sources
of technical assistance, the Task Force considered that the new service would in fact create additional demands for assistance on the other sources such as FAO, the bilateral agencies and the private organizations, since it could be expected to encourage governments to accord agricultural research a higher priority and give them a greater sense of urgency in strengthening their national programs. The service should start small and grow only as justified by the demands for its help. The Task Force proposed an initial staff of about 20 professionals, plus 5 or 6 consultants. However, the Task Force believed that there would be a large demand for the assistance of the service and the staff could therefore be expected to expand substantially in the future. Financial claims on the Consultative Group would be limited to the amount necessary to finance the cost of the initial staff and other necessary operating expenses, for the start-up year and for a five-year initial period thereafter. It was estimated that this would need $1.5 million for the start-up year and $3 million per year from the second year on, in 1978 dollars. The new service should be a full member of the Consultative Group subject to normal Group and TAC review processes.

32. After considering a number of criteria for the location of the service's headquarters, the Task Force had concluded that the headquarters should initially be either in Rome or in Washington, with consideration to be given to moving to a developing country after the initial five-year period.

33. Dr. Cummings confirmed the very high importance that TAC had attached to strengthening national agricultural research. After thorough discussion of the matter at its meeting in September 1978, TAC had endorsed the proposal and commended it to the Consultative Group for favorable consideration. However, TAC noted a number of points as worthy of the Group's attention. The efforts of the new service should be regularly monitored. The service should be alert to the sensitivity of various organizations that might be concerned. TAC laid stress on the importance of training, and suggested that the use of expatriate staff in implementation should not be overemphasized. It was important to distinguish between the core staff and the additional staff who would be hired on contract to implement the programs. It would be necessary to adopt personnel policies that ensured a high quality of staff.

34. A speaker said that his own government, as a member of the CGIAR and also of FAO, could not but regret that a misunderstanding appeared to have arisen between the two organizations on the proposed service. His government supported the establishment of an international service for national agricultural research. He and many other speakers stressed that its activities should be complementary to those of other organizations. He felt that FAO should be encouraged to increase its activities in this field. He expected this service to discharge the following functions: to assist developing countries in making best use of the CGIAR system and in fulfilling activities in research planning and setting of priorities. It could coordinate the outreach activities of the international centers in relation to specific national programs. The service might have a role as an honest broker between the CGIAR, developing countries and donor countries. Insofar as funding were available, it could be involved in the implementation and execution of research projects. His government, and others represented at the meeting, firmly opposed the unnecessary proliferation of international organizations. The
new service should, therefore, be established within the system of the Consultative Group. This led to the conclusion that the core budget, as in the case of the international centers, should be financed by the Group, and arrangements for administration and review should be the same as for the international centers. The core staff should not exceed 20 senior and middle-level professionals. The service should not set up regional centers away from its headquarters. In conclusion, he emphasized that mutual confidence and a spirit of cooperation between the new service and FAO was an essential prerequisite for success. The principles upon which such cooperation should be based must be determined.

35. Several speakers stressed that the views of the developing countries should be fully taken into account. It was noted that there had been a special Bellagio meeting of research directors from developing countries which had endorsed the need for assistance of the kind proposed and that the Task Force had had developing country members on it.

36. A speaker from a developing country strongly supported the proposal to establish the service. He stressed that it should provide assistance to national programs and not to the international centers. The emphasis should be on helping the nationals of developing countries do things themselves. He hoped that the service would facilitate the development of bilateral assistance to national research. He, too, stressed the importance of training. He felt the service should be very cautious in getting involved in policy matters. He noted that FAO had been active in this field and had the capacity to do more, and hoped that the relationship between the service and FAO would be very carefully worked out together with its relationships with the International Agricultural Development Service and the International Food Policy Research Institute. He felt it desirable that the headquarters of the service should be located in a developing country and he felt that five years in a developed country for the start-up period was too long. Another speaker hoped that the service could be established from the beginning in a developing country.

37. Points made by another speaker were that the report had come out in favor of a new service without sufficient appraisal of alternatives, that it had not sufficiently discussed the issue of broadening the CGIAR's mandate to encompass technical assistance as well as research, that it should have evaluated the effectiveness of technical assistance already in being (such as the FAO initiatives) and that it should have discussed more fully how the new service would fit with bilateral programs to support national research.

38. Speaking on behalf of FAO, Dr. Bommer pointed out that his organization was already strongly supporting national agricultural research. He had participated as an observer in the discussions of the Task Force, and was familiar with the deliberations and conclusions reached. He tended to agree with a previous speaker who had felt that only one alternative had been fully explored. He also agreed that the proposed service was a different kind of activity from those supported so far. The Task Force had been informed of the concern expressed by FAO about the proposed establishment of the service. Such concern was reiterated by the FAO Program Committee, which is composed of representatives of governments from all the regions of the world, mostly
from developing countries. The matter would come before the FAO Council which would meet at the end of November 1978. The FAO Program Committee had noted that there had so far been no approach to a developing country at the governmental level. He felt the need for a clearer definition of the two types of tasks which the service might undertake. There was the relatively restricted task concerned with the transfer of technology developed by the international centers through the national programs, and the other much broader task embracing support for national research systems as a whole. While these aspects remained unclear, it was difficult to see how possible collaboration could be developed. FAO was experienced in collaborating with very many international organizations and he foresaw no difficulty in establishing other collaborative arrangements. He felt the major gap was not the lack of a new service, but the commitment of resources. If more resources could be committed, then existing services could expand to meet the need.

39. Speaking on behalf of UNDP, Mr. Mashler said that his organization supported in principle the recommendations for establishing the new service under the aegis of the CGIAR. UNDP was the largest multilateral technical assistance program, and agriculture was the largest single part of its activities. It was naturally interested in ensuring that its own programs were closely coordinated with those of other agencies in order to achieve the greatest possible impact. UNDP resident representatives in over a hundred field offices around the world had a central role in coordinating technical cooperation programs within the UN system. This coordination extended also to bilateral programs. UNDP should, therefore, be in a uniquely strong position to help CGIAR in some of the tasks that may be entrusted to the new service. Of the over 1,500 projects which UNDP had supported in agriculture since 1959, practically all of them had been implemented by FAO. UNDP had contributed much to research aimed at increased food production through its support of the international centers. It would, therefore, welcome any new initiative to maximize the impact of this research. He felt that the discussions that had taken place in the Consultative Group at a number of Bellagio meetings and elsewhere confirmed the belief that existing organizations had not yet focussed successfully on the crucial problems of national research. In supporting the establishment of the proposed service, UNDP was particularly mindful of FAO's central role as the most important international agency devoted to the promotion of agriculture, and looked to FAO to play an important part in the cooperative effort being discussed. He suggested that FAO be given a permanent seat on the Board of Trustees of the new service, and that it should play a constructive part in its activities.

40. Mr. Yudelman said the World Bank supported the recommendations of the report. The case for the service being supported by the CGIAR was strengthened by three considerations. First, the activity would not be an alien one for the CGIAR, but would be an essential adjunct to the work of the centers, and could be viewed as a logical extension of their activities. Secondly, without such a service there was an increasing danger that centers would have to yield to pressures to undertake activities which fell outside their mandates. Thirdly, the Bank was firmly of the view that ISNAR should not be a substitute for the work of other agencies. There were a number of these, notably FAO, who were doing effective work in helping national research efforts. It was, however, the Bank's experience that there remained a gap to
be filled. The Bank was in contact with many governments in developing countries and there was great interest in developing national research systems and increasing investments in national agricultural research as a whole. Often the main impediment to this increased investment was the lack of the services which were now being recommended by the report.

41. Another speaker drew attention to two aspects of the problems which the new service would address. One was the provision of technical assistance to developing countries. The other separate issue was the dissemination of the results of the international centers. In the second case, the boundaries would be set by the limits of the centers' own scientific mandates.

42. Dr. Swindale, on behalf of the Center Directors, noted that the proposed service had been discussed at the Center Directors' meeting last summer and the Directors had supported it. The Directors felt that it was most important that they continue their cooperative work with national programs inasmuch as it was a proper part of their own mandates, and believed that this point of view had been adequately taken into account by the Task Force. The new service and the Center Directors should have adequate and proper consultation, and develop their programs together. They hoped that there would be some representation of the international centers available to the Board of the new service.

43. A speaker, noting that he had been one of the unanimous members of the Task Force, referred to the view expressed by other speakers that the new service should be confined to supporting research activities of the international centers. He felt that the new service should give first priority to the crops and interests currently included in the CG system, and only respond to other needs at the request of the country concerned. Such a limitation would be consistent with the spirit of the Task Force, but would be responsive to the needs of the developing countries. The new service would not be directly concerned with extension services, nor the range of other activities needed to build greater agricultural production, and its limits would be set by what were the legitimate concerns of a national agricultural research institution.

44. Another speaker felt the need for a clearer definition of the mandate and for a better defined set of options. He felt the opinions of the developing countries would be important in this regard. Secondly, he did not think that the Task Force report had gone far enough in defining why a new institution was needed rather than the strengthening of existing ones, and the improvement of coordination between them. As to the location of the new service, he felt the same criteria should be applied as had been applied to the international centers. Noting the desire to move rapidly ahead, he nevertheless felt that the issue of the new service was a very serious one and represented a major departure from the traditional work of the centers, and he urged that the Group did not move too hastily. He suggested deferring the decisions on the new service until there had been a serious study of the future directions of the Group which would provide a framework for decisions on other additions to the system which were being considered.
45. The Chairman then summarized the main points emerging from the discussion. While a number of speakers had raised questions about the adequacy of some of the coverage of the Task Force report, most agreed on its usefulness and that it had given findings which provided the basis for further consideration. Judging from the positions taken by each of the speakers, it was clear to him that there was a majority in favor of proceeding in principle with the establishment of the new service. However, there was not unanimity, and a number of reservations had been expressed. On the other hand, he detected as large a degree of consensus as had been enjoyed on a number of other issues where the Group had decided on the basis of that expression of opinion to move ahead. He felt that a number of the reservations which had been expressed could readily be accommodated during the further steps that could be taken towards the establishment of the service. The point on which there was the greatest degree of unanimity was the deep concern about the importance of preserving a harmonious relationship with FAO. There was a clear sense of regret that the current proposal had given rise to differences, and a desire that these should be dispelled at the earliest opportunity. Virtually all speakers had emphasized that the new service should complement the activities of existing agencies, specifically FAO, and if and when this were set up, the Group should, at the earliest opportunity, find ways of ensuring that cooperation does in fact take place. FAO may wish to consider the suggestion that they have a seat on the Board of Trustees. The Chairman himself was encouraged by Dr. Bommer’s statement that FAO would find ways of working with the service if the Group decided to proceed with establishing it. He hoped that Dr. Bommer would convey to FAO the very strong sense of the meeting that the differences of opinion with FAO were very much regretted and that the Group had collectively decided that the service should have a complementary role, collaborating and cooperating as effectively as possible with FAO.

46. Noting the concern of speakers that the proposal did not respond to the needs of developing countries, he felt on the contrary that they strongly wanted this service. As a speaker had suggested, it was important that the service should not be purely expatriate but should help the developing countries' institutions to help themselves. Developing countries should have an effective voice in the conduct of the service's affairs, and one way of ensuring this was to give them adequate representation on the Board of Trustees. As to whether the mandate of the new service should be confined to activities currently undertaken by the existing centers, he agreed with the speaker who had suggested that such activities should be given first emphasis but not in an exclusive way so as to deny national research programs effective assistance in areas where they needed it. It emerged clearly from the discussion that the basis for the new service was the intention to enhance the effectiveness of the existing CG system. The idea behind the new service had a very long history and had not been originated by the Center Directors. Nevertheless, he noted that they supported it. A number of speakers had pointed to the fact that such a service would provide relief for the centers and enable them to resist pressures which could strain their mandates. There had been a variety of views on the location of the headquarters of the new service, but this was not an issue that needed quick decision.
47. If it were correct that there was a majority consensus to establish a new service, the next step would be to form a committee charged with the specific responsibility for translating this proposal into action. This committee would be made up of all interested donors and there was no limit to the membership. The Chairman of the committee could be appointed either by the committee itself or the Chairman of the CGIAR. One early responsibility of the committee would be to identify an executing agency with responsibility for implementation of the next steps. The Group had now reached the point at which a committee should be established to which all interested donors were invited, to have that committee meet as soon as possible and to appoint its Chairman, appoint an executing agency, and above all begin a dialogue with FAO to ensure that the proposal enjoyed the degree of cooperation with FAO which all members of the Group wished. The members of the Group were given the opportunity to express dissent from the Chairman's formulation of the situation and he took their silence in the tradition of the Group to indicate consent. In this he was supported by representatives of two major donors who had earlier expressed some reservations. Following the Chairman's summing up, it was agreed that there would be a meeting of the committee of interested donors before the members all left Washington at the end of the week.

Application of International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) for CGIAR Sponsorship (Agenda Item 6)

48. The Chairman drew the Group's attention to a formal letter of application from the presidents of the International Development Research Center, the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation addressed to him, dated September 13, 1978. Members would recall that the idea of creating a food policy research institute under CGIAR auspices had been discussed at CG meeting in July and September 1974. The three sponsors he had just mentioned had established IFPRI outside the CGIAR system, expecting that the Group reconsider supporting IFPRI in due course. The three sponsors were now asking the Group to accept IFPRI for full membership. It was necessary to decide how to proceed with consideration of the application. It had been suggested that TAC should consider the role of IFPRI and its potential contribution to the system and report to the Group at the next meeting tentatively scheduled for next spring. He then called on Dr. Mellor, the Director of IFPRI, to address the Group. [The text of Dr. Mellor's address is given in Annex III.]

49. A speaker, representing one of the sponsors of IFPRI, said that the case for IFPRI's adoption was based on two points. First, IFPRI was needed as part of the Consultative Group system as he saw it. While the centers themselves did much socio-economic work, their mandates were limited and were concerned with specific crops and problems. The system needed a socio-economic capability to study the scale and nature of the world food problems and the progress being made towards solving it and to analyze the programs and policies, both international and national, that are needed to overcome world hunger. The second point was that the CG system needed the capability to analyze the impact of research that it was conducting and the alternatives in selecting research objectives. These were issues which had been given prominence in this year's Integrative Report. IFPRI's method of
work was evolving in the same way as the other centers insofar as it was highly selective in the research it undertook. It was a small organization in relation to the problems that it addressed. It relied to the extent possible on work being done elsewhere though it did do some research itself. IFPRI was also establishing collaborative research relationships with national groups in developing countries which would test IFPRI's results in local settings and also build up local socio-economic research capacity.

50. Regarding the budget, the three original sponsors were providing $1.5 million a year and agreed to do so throughout the first five-year period. The estimate of IFPRI's operating costs in the fifth year was about $2.5 million and for the second five years current forecasts suggested that the cost could be between $3-$4 million a year. Therefore, clearly, IFPRI needed more resources and it should be understood that if IFPRI were accepted, it would mean additional financial demands upon the system. However, these demands are relatively small. As far as priorities were concerned, the establishment of IFPRI had been originally urged by TAC in recognition of the importance of a socio-economic component for the system. Though one should recognize that there were a number of other applicants for membership in the system, neither their numbers nor their financial requirements were particularly intimidating and certainly not on the scale of the addition of a new international center of the traditional type. However, the decision to admit new members to the CG should be taken lightly, and he urged the most careful review of scientific quality and priority by TAC, and the development of a coherent and interrelated plan for dealing concurrently with the appropriate limits on growth of the present CG members and with the addition of possible new members. Against the background of financial realities, he felt that these issues could be dealt with by a Consultative Group committee in advance of the spring 1979 meeting.

51. The Chairman brought to the Group's attention a cable he had received from the Asian Development Bank regretting their inability to attend the meeting but strongly endorsing the application of IFPRI for participation in the Group.

52. Another speaker, commending the quality of IFPRI's work, recommended that TAC should take this item on its agenda for its next meeting. However, he urged that the Secretariat should give due consideration to the overall budget implications of the proposal to adopt IFPRI.

53. The Chairman noted that at a number of points in the discussion, the suggestion had been raised that an ad hoc committee be set up to help decide on allocation of resources between competing claims. He reminded the Group that the Review Committee had recommended that the Chairman should have authority to set up such an ad hoc committee. However, he was getting the sense that the Group might be faced with a process rather than a particular problem which could be dealt with at a particular time. This raised the question of whether the Group wanted some modification of the administrative structure to provide a more permanent way of dealing with such questions, to supplement the competence of TAC on the technical side. He suggested that the Secretariat should prepare a paper on the pros and cons of establishing such a committee. As for procedure, he suggested that IFPRI's proposal
should be referred to TAC who would report to the Group in the spring of 1979. At the same meeting, the Group would have a paper from the Secretariat examining the merits of a committee or some other mechanism for reviewing priorities and future directions. The Group could then decide for or against IFPRI and other applicants for adoption, or decide to create a committee or other mechanism to handle these issues.

54. A speaker highly commended the quality of IFPRI's work. However, he wondered whether it was right to adopt IFPRI within the Group as a fully fledged member on the same basis as the biologically based centers. He saw it more as an internal support service which perhaps could be better attached to the Secretariat.

55. A speaker from a developing country, also commending the quality of IFPRI's work, said his government gave great weight to IFPRI's guidance and would strongly endorse their application for CGIAR membership.

56. Dr. Bommer, on behalf of FAO, confirmed that his organization enjoyed a very good working relationship with IFPRI and considered it an important institution. He hoped that this collaboration would increase and that IFPRI would be able to take on further tasks more directly related to the Consultative Group.

57. Another speaker also complimented IFPRI on the quality of its work and felt that it had an important role within the CG system. However, he urged that its acceptance be only made within the context of a broader look at long-term development of the system.

58. On behalf of TAC, Dr. Cummings urged members to submit as promptly as possible any questions about IFPRI or other applicants that they wished TAC to take into account.

59. Summing up, the Chairman noted that there was agreement that the IFPRI proposal should be referred to TAC for prompt consideration and would be considered by the Group at its meeting in the spring of 1979. Noting interest in the establishment of a committee of the Group to advise on such questions, he detected support for the view that the decision whether to establish such a committee should be taken by the Group next spring on the basis of a position paper prepared by the Secretariat.

TAC Chairman's Report on the 18th, 19th and 20th Meetings of TAC (Agenda Item 7)

60. Dr. Cummings began by pointing out that many of the subjects which had been under review by TAC had already been covered during earlier parts of the agenda or would be covered under items still to come.

Quinquennial Reviews

61. The field work for the ICRISAT review was done during the period September 23 through October 14 under the chairmanship of Dr. Lloyd Evans of Australia. The panel's draft had been discussed with senior members of the
ICRISAT staff and its Director, and would be shortly put into final form. TAC hoped to accelerate the timetable for getting the panel's report to the members and expected to have only one review of it at the meeting in February. Members should have the report in time for the spring 1979 meeting. The same would be true for the quinquennial review of WARDA which had taken place just before the ICRISAT one. The team had been assembled for the quinquennial review of the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources, the terms of reference had been drawn up and the review would take place under the chairmanship of Dr. Swaminathan in the spring of 1979.

**Vegetables**

62. TAC hoped to have a definitive report of the vegetable subcommittee before the members of the Group in time for the spring 1979 meeting.

**Aquaculture and Water Use and Management**

63. Dr. Cummings reported that IDRC had commissioned teams, under the chairmanship of Sir Charles Pereira, to examine these two topics. IDRC had given the preliminary report on aquaculture to TAC for information early in 1978. This subject, together with water use and management, would be considered in the context of overall priorities. TAC welcomed the initiative of IDRC in volunteering to examine these subjects.

**Basic Research**

64. TAC was examining the question of basic research in the context of overall priorities and what it saw as a shift in the role of the international centers as their programs matured, and as cooperation with national programs developed. There was some shift in the direction of more basic research.

**TAC Procedures**

65. Some changes had been made in the working procedures of TAC in order to improve efficiency and its ability to address a wide range of issues. It was hoped that TAC could conclude its business with only two meetings in 1979, but the workload on TAC continued to grow. The next meeting would be from the 13th to the 20th of February 1979, in Rome, 1/ and the next one from the 3rd to the 10th of July, 1979, in Hyderabad. Although some deliberations of TAC had to be held in closed session, the intention was to open as many sessions as possible, and CG members were invited to send observers.

66. In answer to a question, Mr. Mahler stated that agendas for TAC meetings would be sent out well in advance and it was hoped to send out the agenda of the February meeting during December.

---

1/ Subsequently changed to Washington.
Priorities for International Agricultural Research -
TAC Progress Report (Agenda Item 8)

67. Introducing this item, the Chairman stressed the difficulty of the problems facing TAC and reminded the Group that TAC would welcome their views on appropriate criteria.

68. Dr. Cummings noted that there had been a priority paper in 1973 and a revision of it in 1976. However, it was clear that the Group needed another exercise on priorities at this time and that this should include consideration of new initiatives. This question had been discussed at three meetings and after the September one, a progress report had been distributed. TAC intended to have a draft revised priority paper in the hands of the Group in time for the meeting in spring 1979. He had already noted the shift towards more basic research work. He drew attention to a number of functions which had been identified by the meeting of national agricultural research institutes at Bellagio as being proper functions for the international centers, namely: (i) collection, conservation, cataloging and distribution of germ plasm; (ii) organization of path-breaking research designed to raise the ceiling of yield and to impart greater stability to yield; (iii) the development of improved research techniques; (iv) the organization relevant to training programs; (v) the organization of information and bibliographic service; (vi) organization of symposia, seminars and monitoring tours. In addition to increasing the amount, quality and stability of food supplies in the developing countries and meeting the nutritional requirements of the less advantaged group, TAC felt that more account should be taken of the need to improve income and the standard of living of the most disadvantaged sector of societies in the LDCs, and also to the problems of equity and distribution of benefits from research. TAC needed to know how to handle questions of policy determination and also those concerned with the factors of production. Although with IFPRI's help TAC had assembled a certain amount of information on the quantitative parameters that could be relevant, it had to be admitted that TAC did not at present have a means for applying quantitative measures as the basis for resource allocation. TAC was examining the question of how the degree of maturity of the international centers affected the allocation of resources. The Review Committee had addressed this question and suggested that there might be an optimum size. Some of the international centers were already seriously addressing this question.

69. A speaker, noting the tendency to move the work of the international centers increasingly into basic research as national programs became stronger, emphasized the need to maintain arrangements whereby such research could be contracted out at much lower cost. Noting that there were a number of important crops that justified major research programs, he felt that many of them were best studied only within the context of farming systems.

70. A speaker commended the suggestion made in the TAC paper that there be a study and comparison made of various centers with the view to establishing personnel and budget ceilings. He felt the pattern of future growth needed to be controlled in line with suggestions of TAC.
71. A speaker expressed some skepticism as to what priority papers could achieve unless they were wholeheartedly supported by Boards of Trustees of the centers. He felt that consideration should be given to a specific mechanism to be introduced whereby the Group could ensure that the findings of TAC and of others were indeed implemented.

Conduct of Quinquennial Reviews (Agenda Item 9)

72. Dr. Cummings pointed out that the original purpose of quinquennial reviews had been to concentrate on the scientific quality of the programs of the centers and initial guidelines had laid heavy emphasis on this. However, it had emerged that some of the members of the Consultative Group preferred to see some other issues addressed. As a result, TAC had examined the question and at its meeting last February revised the terms of reference and the guidelines under which quinquennial reviews would be conducted. He drew the Group's attention to the various headings for review terms of reference.

73. Mr. Mahler pointed out that the guidelines were mostly of a procedural nature for the guidance of the Secretariat and the panel Chairman. The guidelines emphasized the fact that quinquennial reviews were a cooperative venture between the institute and the panel, involving joint evaluation and planning of future activities, and stress was given to the need for continuing consultation between the Center Director, the Board of Trustees and the panel. The composition of panels was very important, the principle being to ensure that the review was truly external and objective and could draw on a wide range of talents which could look both at specialized aspects of the programs as well as broader problems. The selection of the panel involved consultation with the center. It was most important that panels received lists of questions that CG members wished the panel to address.

74. A speaker noted that members of the Consultative Group, including himself, had in the past pressed for consideration of issues beyond the scientific quality of the center, but he noted that the guidelines, as they currently stood, covered an enormous range of issues. He wondered what the experience had been in applying them so far.

75. Dr. Camus, who had been Chairman of the panel to review IITA, said that his guidelines were not, in fact, as complex as the ones currently before the Group. But, nevertheless, his panel had tried to answer most of the questions contained therein.

76. A speaker, noting the extreme difficulty of meeting all the terms of reference, asked where people could be found with the extraordinary qualifications to carry them out. In addition to being good scientists, they must have some familiarity with the CGIAR system. On previous reviews, it had, in fact, taken rather a long time for some members of the panel to become familiar with the system. He noted that the final report of the quinquennial panel was the only permanent record of answers given to questions raised by the Group, and he wondered whether there was a danger of such reports being too bland.
77. Dr. Cummings admitted the difficulty of finding suitable people for quinquennial reviews but hoped that it would be possible to build up a roster over time. As for the frankness of the reports, this presented something of a dilemma. They had to be honest and constructive at the same time. In practice, there was a good deal of consultation during the course of the review resulting in improvements, so some of the most effective aspects of the review were not reflected in the report.

78. The representative of one donor noted that his agency had relatively little contact with the centers and, therefore, depended rather heavily on quinquennial reviews. His own review process was broken down into three basic questions. First, the congruence between the objectives of the center and the objectives of his agency. Secondly, the effectiveness of the center in meeting its objectives, and thirdly, the question of efficiency. It was in this latter area that he had most difficulty.

79. Another speaker felt that given the size of the investment being made in the system, a very substantial effort was warranted for the review process. He hoped it could involve many of the centers' staff.

80. Another speaker, in agreeing that much depended on these reviews, suggested that TAC might wish to continue experiments in ways of conducting them as, for example, in meeting with people from developing countries separate from the meetings with the center staff. Some of the questions about impact on effectiveness and relevance to the world's food problems could perhaps be addressed by IFPRI. Perhaps, the review could take place in two parts with an interval of time between.

81. In answer to a question, Dr. Cummings stated that the Center Directors who had so far been subjected to a quinquennial review had been very heavily involved in preparation for them, for months ahead in some cases.

82. Another speaker, joining those who had congratulated TAC on the document, stressed the need for a greater involvement of national institutions so as to get the best possible judgment on the center's work in the national context. This would provide for better contact between the national system and the CG system and might also reduce the workload of the review panel.

83. A speaker pointed out that it was not the function of the review panel to tell the center's management how the center should be run. It was to advise the donors as to the quality of the institute's work.

84. Summarizing the discussion, the Chairman underlined that quinquennial reviews are seen by donors as a major, if not the most important, assurance which they have to convince their governments that the system is working well. Therefore, the Group had a continuing interest in seeing that they were properly done. It was important to be constructive in the comments of the review and also to have very close contact and full participation of the center in carrying them out. They should not be so bland as to raise doubts as to the credibility of the process, or so as to fail to give donors the
information that they needed. Some concern had been raised about the ambi-
tuousness of the objectives of the reviews, but it was felt that, in general, 
the right questions were being addressed. The Group would have an opportunity 
of judging for itself the merits of the reviews carried out on the new guide-
lines, and this question should be a matter of continuing concern.

Approval of 1979 and 1979/80 Programs and Budgets of the 
International Centers and Programs (Agenda Item 10)

85. The Chairman noted that this was the first time that the Group was 
asked to give explicit approval to the programs and budgets of the centers. 
This was not intended as any substantive change in the way the CG conducted 
its affairs nor any loss of informality, but merely provided for the explicit 
recording of the decisions that were being taken.

86. The Executive Secretary, Mr. Lejeune, reminded the Group of the 
processes for review of center program and budgets. He outlined the require-
ments of each center and the changes or other points which he felt should 
be brought to the Group's attention. He quoted the 1979 financial require-
ments of CIAT at $13,075,000. Within this total, there was an increase of 
some $757,000 above what was presented last year when the biennial budget 
was put forward. This was almost entirely due to the expected impact of 
inflation in Colombia and of changes in exchange rates. The Secretariat 
recommended that this additional amount be covered, also suggesting that 
the necessity for the full amount be reviewed early in 1979 and that CIAT 
would be authorized to expend it only after such a review had taken place.

87. For CIMMYT, the recommendation was $13,597,000 in 1979 and $16,249,000 
in 1980. This reflected the recommendation of TAC that the program of seminars 
for policymakers should be removed from the core program and treated as a 
special project.

88. The amount recommended for CIP was $6,912,000 for 1979 and $8,346,000 
for 1980. The 1979 figure was $500,000 less than originally requested due to 
revised estimates of the effect of the devaluation of the Peruvian sol. There 
was no difference of opinion between the Secretariat and CIP on this question.

89. The amount recommended for ICARDA for 1979 was $11,476,000. This 
was $500,000 less than that put forward in the program and budget document, 
being the result of savings due to slower progress at one of ICARDA's stations.

90. ICRISAT had made some modifications to its budget on the basis of 
recommendations made during the quinquennial review and the net financial 
requirements were now estimated at $8,914,000 for 1979 and at $10,836,000 
for 1980. The Secretariat and ICRISAT were in agreement on these figures.

91. The amount recommended for IITA was $14,480,000 in 1979 and 
$14,466,000 in 1980. The 1979 figure was identical with IITA's request, 
but that for 1980 was $300,000 less than they asked for by IITA, reflecting 
an estimate on the Secretariat's part that earned income will, in fact, be 
greater than forecast in IITA's budget document. Although this had been
provisionally agreed with IITA, it was proposed that this estimate would be reassessed next year in the light of actual experience.

92. For ILCA, an amount $7,552,000 was recommended for 1979. This was some $228,000 less than suggested by ILCA, and reflected the Secretariat’s recommendation that some of the program on trypano-tolerance should be handled by special project funding.

93. The net requirement for ILRAD was $8,792,000 for 1979. This was $150,000 more than was presented in their program and budget paper and was due to a number of factors, such as the extra requirements for housing, which were discussed in the Secretariat’s paper containing its observations.

94. For IRRI, the net amount recommended was $13,503,000 for 1979, as requested by IRRI.

95. For WARDA, the amount requested and recommended was $2,334,000 for 1979.

96. For the TBPG, the amount requested was $2,720,000 for 1979 and $3,219,000 for 1980. While it was hoped to preserve the integrity of biennial budgets into the second year, it should be noted that there would be a quinquennial review of the IBPGR during 1979 and this could be cause for some adjustment in the budget.

97. The total across the whole system, therefore, amounted to $103,355,000 in 1979. Although one could not be precise about it, the estimate for 1980 was of the order of $125 million.

98. A speaker admitted to being puzzled at the recommendation that CIMMYT should not proceed with the seminar for policymakers using core funds.

99. Another speaker confirmed that CIMMYT still considered that this was an appropriate activity for core funding.

100. On behalf of TAC, Dr. Cummings said that there was no wish to discourage CIMMYT from this activity which was proposed as an experiment for a three-year period and not necessarily an ongoing activity beyond that.

101. Another speaker noted the difficulties that arose when activities were begun as special projects and later incorporated into core programs. This could amount to a way of getting something started which would not have been included had it been proposed for the core from the beginning.

102. In answer to a question, Mr. Lejeune said that it was the intention of the Secretariat and the TAC Secretariat to examine special projects in as much detail as core activities, but there was sometimes practical difficulties in doing so.

103. A speaker objected strongly to the principle that centers should not use core resources for new ideas. He did not think that was what had been intended.
104. On the basis of a show of hands, one per donor delegation, it was clear that there was a majority in favor of the recommendation of the TAC and the Secretariat that CIMMYT's policy seminar be classified as a special project.

105. In answer to a question, Mr. Lejeune confirmed that it was not possible to bind donors for the second year of a biennial. What was sought was approval in principle of the budget for the second year as well as the first so that centers could plan on a two-year basis.

106. The Chairman noted the approval of the Group of the 1979 or 1979/80 budgets of the centers with the changes recommended by the Secretariat. He noted that it had proved difficult to stick to biennial budgets in the cases where it had been tried so far, and there was a feeling that there should be stricter rules with respect to changes at mid-term. The changes could be justified where expenditures were necessary which could not have been foreseen, or which were beyond the control of the center.

Donor Indications of Financial Support in 1979 and Thereafter (Agenda Item 11)

107. The Chairman noted that the Secretariat had estimated the total requirements of the international centers for 1979 at slightly in excess of $103 million.

108. Mr. Mashler stated that UNDP would provide in 1979 for the core programs of CIMMYT, IRRI, ICRISAT, ILRAD and ICARDA in varying amounts, a total of $4,084,000. In addition, UNDP would provide for special projects, a total of $2,438,000, making a total of $6,521,000 for UNDP in 1979. For 1980 and 1981, he expected amounts equal and possibly slightly higher being made available.

109. On behalf of the Inter-American Development Bank, Mr. Epstein stated that the Board of Executive Directors had approved a contribution in the equivalent of $6.2 million to the core and capital requirements of the three international centers located in Latin America for 1979, to be disbursed in the national currency of the host country in which the centers were located. The contribution would come from the resources of the Social Progress Trust Fund.

110. Mr. Pearson stated that the British government would make available a total of up to £3 million sterling towards budgets of various international centers. This would be subject to the assurance that each contribution would, to the extent practical, be expended by centers during the year of the pledge, and should the overall unexpended balance of the individual center exceed an acceptable level of 25% of annual expenditure, his authorities would wish to know, following their initial payment of the year, whether it was the intention that such balances should be reduced within a reasonable period, before a further contribution was made. He emphasized that he did not wish this requirement to be interpreted dogmatically, but large unexpended balances
did create audit problems. His government was not convinced of the value of continued unlimited increase in the financial resources of the system. He felt the time was now ripe for a closer examination of priorities which could not realistically be undertaken against the background of indefinitely increasing financial support in real terms for each institution. The United Kingdom intended in the immediate future to try to maintain its overall contribution in real terms at the same level as indicated for 1979, but further increases were not precluded.

111. Dr. Treitz stated that the government of the Federal Republic of Germany would make available in 1979 an amount of DM 17 million for activities supported by the Group. This was an increase of 14% over 1978. Of the DM 17 million, DM 2 million was still subject to parliamentary approval. DM 14 million had been allocated so far to the nine centers plus WARDA and the TRPCGR, which were all contributions to the unrestricted core. The remaining DM 3 million will be allocated in consultation with the Secretariat. His government would maintain their strong interest beyond 1979.

112. Speaking for Denmark, Mr. Dithmer said that subject to parliamentary approval, the Danish contribution in 1979 to four centers would total DKr 5.4 million, and in 1980 would amount to DKr 6.5 million.

113. Speaking for the Ford Foundation, Dr. Bell said that $1 million would be made available in 1979, and the same amount in 1980. This did not include contributions to IFPRI.

114. Dr. de Zeeuw announced an increase in the contribution of the government of the Netherlands to US$2 million. The unallocated part of this contribution was in principle reserved for ISNAR. In addition, a further US$550,000 would be made available for special projects, and there would be a contribution in kind under the associate expert program. He did not anticipate substantial real growth in the Dutch contribution for 1980.

115. Mr. Johnson stated that, subject to the approval of the Board, the Rockefeller Foundation would make available a total contribution of US$1.2 million for 1979.

116. Dr. Wilhelm stated that Switzerland would contribute in 1979 a total of US$1.9 million plus a further US$1.75 million for special projects. He anticipated a similar contribution or perhaps a slightly greater one in 1980.

117. Mme. Vervalcke stated that Belgium would contribute a total of BF88 million in 1979. To this should be added a supplementary contribution of BF 2 million to ICIPE, and special project contributions to some centers either in cash or in kind.

118. Mr. Lindores stated that in view of delays in preparation of the budget of the Canadian government, it was not possible for him to make any definitive statement. This delay should not be interpreted as diminishing interest on the part of his authorities. Current indications were that the level of contributions that would eventually be approved for Canada for 1979 would represent a substantial increase in Canadian dollar terms over
the contribution for 1978, which was given as US$7.62 million. However, an increase in the level of Canadian contributions should not be expected for 1980 and perhaps not for 1981. He hoped that donors enjoying buoyant economic circumstances would find themselves able to assume a greater share of the burden. At the same time he stressed the need for the managers and boards of the international centers to ensure that requests for funding were realistic and reflected due concern for efficiency.

119. Mr. Ingram stated that the Australian contribution for 1979 to the core budgets would be $A 2.344 million. In addition, Australia would continue for 1979 its support for the TAC at $A 115,000, and would also contribute some $A 241,000 to various programs of the centers. The total Australian contribution to the work of the CGIAR system would, therefore, total some US$3.1 million.

120. Mr. Christian Will on behalf of IFAD accepted his organization's membership in the CGIAR. He gave members of the Group a review of the history, policies and procedures of IFAD. He hoped that proposals for IFAD's support for the CGIAR be expressed in terms of projects. If they were in line with IFAD's criteria and policies, it was hoped that they could be submitted for the approval of the Executive Board in March 1979.

121. On behalf of the World Bank, Mr. Yudelman stated that as in past years, the Bank would be ready to contribute up to 10% of the requirements of the approved programs for the system. Subject to the approval of the Board of Directors of the Bank, it was proposed to contribute up to a maximum of US$10.2 million for 1979.

122. Mr. Knutsson stated that Sweden would contribute SKr 13 million to core budgets for 1979. He did not foresee any major increases for 1980 and beyond.

123. Mr. Vernede stated that the contribution of France to the international centers would, at the rate of exchange of F 4.5 to the dollar, amount to US$700,000. This excluded funding for cooperative agreements between the French government and IRRI and ICRISAT and also support to ICIPE. The total represented more than doubling of the amount compared to 1978. They would be essentially core restricted contributions. The programs to be supported would have to be selected from among those approved by the Consultative Group, taking into account the possibilities of cooperation with French institutions engaged in similar activities. If this cooperation established on an experimental basis for 1979 proved successful, it was expected that beginning in 1980, the French government would establish contracts covering several years.

124. For the United States, Mr. Babb confirmed his government's traditional practice of contributing up to 25% of the funds available from all donors for core budgets. This was in addition to grants made for special projects and the US$4 million grant to IFDC. In 1979, the US contribution would be made in two tranches. His government was supporting national research efforts in a number of ways and, as he had previously indicated, would be supporting the development of ISNAR. He too added his voice to the concern expressed by others as to the rate of growth in the budgets of the international centers, particularly the older ones, and urged that this be scrutinized.
125. Dr. Strand stated that, subject to the approval of parliament, the Norwegian contribution for 1979 would be NKr 10 million. He expected to contribute the same amount for 1980.

126. Dr. Hulse expected the contribution of IDRC to be significantly less than it had been in the past and would be affected by decisions taken on IFPRI and IFDC. The expected minimum contribution to core was about US$600,000 and to special projects about US$1.2 million for 1979, but several matters were still under negotiation.

127. For New Zealand, Dr. Kerr stated that his government could not yet state its commitments for 1979 except to say that support should continue at its present level of US$25,000. His government would shortly be examining its commitment to the CGIAR program, and any changes would be communicated to the Secretariat.

128. Mr. Gruner stated that the Commission of the European Communities expected, subject to a final decision to be taken shortly, to contribute 2.8 million European units of account to the core research activities of four international centers. This was an increase of 40% compared to 1978. They would continue to support IRRI and ICRISAT, but for the first time were extending their support to two other institutes, CIAT and CIP.

129. UNEP were unable to make any commitment at this time, but would shortly be in communication with the Secretariat.

130. For Japan, Mr. Yoshihara noted that due to a different fiscal cycle, his delegation was not yet in a position to give a definite indication of the level of their contribution for 1979. It should be noted, however, that Japan's contribution had been increasing dramatically over the past few years and efforts would be made to enable it to continue to do so.

131. For Nigeria, Dr. Iyamabo stated that due to conditions of financial stringency his government would not increase their contribution for 1979, but would leave it the same level as of 1978, i.e., N 500,000.

132. On the basis of the pledges given so far, and other information which had been given to the Secretariat, Mr. Lejeune estimated that total new funds for 1979 would amount to between $102 and $103 million, compared to requirements of $103.4 million.

Report and Discussion on Farming Systems Research and Future Stripe Analyses (Agenda Item 12)

133. The Chairman reminded the Group that the report of the Review Committee in 1977 had recommended that studies of individual activities carried out by several of the centers be subjected to so-called stripe reviews. The first of such reviews had examined farming systems research at CIAT, IITA, ICRISAT and IRRI. The report was followed by a workshop on the same subject in Nairobi in May 1978.
134. Dr. Cummings noted that centers having the most advanced farming systems program had been selected for review. Some account was also taken of national programs and all of the institutes had been invited to send representatives to the workshop. After a desk review the panel had done their field work, producing a report which was examined by TAC prior to the workshop. The workshop, chaired by Dr. Mosher, had 35 participants representing all the international centers except for ILRAD, and representatives from nine developing countries. The review had been successful in providing an overall conceptual framework for farming systems research at the international centers, had provided them with the common perspective for their work, and made cooperation between them easier for the future. It had also been possible to clarify the respective roles of the centers and the national programs. TAC had endorsed the findings of the panel, further clarifying concepts and terminology and developing methodologies. Also, there could be more active cooperation between centers and national programs. Specific actions had been recommended whereby methodology and terminology could be improved. Each center should appoint a liaison officer to deal with information exchange, and FAO should be asked to increase its activities in this field. An international data bank might be considered. There was general support for more cooperation between centers in farming systems work.

135. A speaker emphasized the importance of straws and stovers in the small farm system as they were the basic for much of the animal production in the developing world.

136. A number of speakers commended the quality of the report, and felt that it had demonstrated the value of carrying out stripe reviews. One speaker, noting the growing importance of farming systems work, pointed to the major challenge that it represented, as compared to seed-based technology. The transfer of farming systems technology would be difficult, and would depend heavily on national systems.

137. Another speaker emphasized the special importance and problems of women in the development of small farm systems.

138. In conclusion, the Chairman noted support for stripe reviews in general, and reminded the Group of the decision already taken to have the next one done on the subject of off-campus activities.

Report on the "Costs and Benefits of Agricultural Research: State of the Art and Implications for the CGIAR" (Agenda Item 13)

139. The Chairman reminded the Group that it had been decided to commission a study of this question, and in February 1977, the Secretariat had engaged Dr. G. Edward Schuh and Dr. Helio Tollini, both then at Purdue University, to undertake it. Their report had been circulated to the Group.

140. Mr. Lejeune sketched the underlying rationale for cost-benefit analysis, and indicated why the Group had shown particular interest in it, despite the special difficulties of applying it to agricultural research. It had been deliberately decided to keep the study on a modest scale, to guide the Group in further examination of the possible usefulness of the various techniques.
141. Dr. Schuh, introducing his paper, noted that it addressed the question of costs and benefits, rather than the narrower one of cost-effectiveness. Cost-benefit analysis was generally thought necessary for agricultural research, since there was no adequate market price system. He stressed that his report recommended no single technique or procedure that could be uniformly applied. A great deal of emphasis was given to the specification of goals. The techniques described could be very useful in clarifying priorities.

142. A speaker, noting the complexity of some of the models, queried the extent to which they were actually being used in the United States. Dr. Schuh replied that he himself had been surprised by the extent of their application, in industrial, military and agricultural research in the US. The speaker went on to wonder whether these techniques might not be an appropriate field for IFPRI.

143. A number of speakers commended the quality of the report, and its usefulness. They included some who admitted to previous skepticism about the value of the exercise. One was particularly pleased to note the consideration of nutritional aspects. He thought TAC should pay more attention to nutrition.

144. Another speaker underlined the importance of separating judgments on potential benefits from judgments on the probabilities of achieving them, with which Dr. Schuh concurred.

145. A speaker felt that the report provided a basis on which the centers could significantly advance their analytical work, though he cautioned against undue cost and complexity. He commended IRRI's work in this direction. He, too, thought IFPRI might have some role to play.

146. Speaking on behalf of the centers, Dr. Nickel was pleased to note that the report took account of concerns that they had expressed when reviewing earlier drafts. Center staff had been consulted during the report's preparation, and the economists felt that it supported the work they were themselves doing in the commodity programs. This work was greatly affecting the setting of research priorities, but the need for subjective judgment would remain, as the report acknowledged.

147. A speaker noted agreement that the Group should develop a constructive and positive attitude to the techniques described. The report would be useful if it improved the ways in which centers set priorities. The Chairman felt that centers would consider using the paper as an aid in their evaluation of programs.

Other Business (Agenda Item 14)

A. Status Report on CARIS

148. Dr. Bommer reported on the Computerized Agricultural Research Information Service which had been funded through the Group. This was now virtually complete and covered a total of over 2,000 research institutes, nearly 10,000 research workers, over 3,000 research programs and listing in total
some 20,000 research project titles. Data had been available from the computer memories since April 1978 and the directories had now been published and were ready for dispatch. Two national CARIS systems were already operational and three regions had shown interest in setting up cooperative CARIS networks. Simple methodologies had been developed suitable to the needs of the less developed nations. In addition to technical advice, a number of national and regional centers would need financial support and donors were urged to consider such requests favorably. The CARIS network could prove to be a valuable instrument in strengthening national agricultural research as well as technical cooperation between developing countries.

B. United States Sponsorship of the Candidacy of the International Fertilizer Development Center to become a Member of the Consultative Group System

149. Mr. Babb drew the attention of members to a letter from USAID outlining the history of the development of the International Fertilizer Development Center, and proposing that it be considered by TAC for adoption by the CGIAR. This was accompanied by the resolution of the Board of Directors of IFDC requesting membership in the CG system. The importance of fertilizer had long been recognized and IFDC had a long history of consideration by the Consultative Group. TAC had welcomed the initiative of the United States in establishing IFDC in 1974 and had endorsed the program in 1975. The United States had gone ahead on its own resources in the light of the crisis situation which prevailed at that time. While the crisis had not proved as serious as had at one time been thought, it was recognized that in the poorest countries and for the poorest farmers, the possibilities for increasing food production and incomes rested largely on the ability of the research community to develop more efficient ways of using fertilizer. The United States believed that IFDC fitted well within the CGIAR system. It was international in nature, and had an international Board of Directors and staff. It served the developing countries and had proved itself effective in doing so. There was an increasing demand for its services, and there was growing cooperation with the international centers, particularly IRRI, IITA and CIAT. While the United States was proud of its contribution to IFDC, amounting at present to about 70% of the total, nevertheless, it felt that the best interests of IFDC would be served by its coming within the CG system and under the scrutiny of the CG's procedures. Its location in a developed country might be seen as a drawback, but there were good reasons for locating it close to the facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The United States would not be able to continue indefinitely to provide the levels of funding for this one center that it was currently doing. The efforts of IFDC's Board and Director had been successful in attracting financing from other sources. There were indications that adoption by the CG system would materially help IFDC in attracting additional financing. If, on TAC's recommendation, the Group decided to adopt IFDC, the United States would not immediately reduce its support to its traditional 25%. It would allow a reasonable time for the center to obtain financing from other donors, and the US contribution would be phased down gradually at a reasonable rate.
150. Another speaker had been impressed by the case presented by IFDC and with the success they had had in demonstrating the potential of rock phosphates which could be processed rather simply by methods suitable to the developing countries. He felt IFDC could make a valuable contribution to the CGIAR system, and his viewpoint was further supported by a representative from a developing country. He noted that despite IFDC headquarters location in Muscle Shoals, it was active in the developing countries and its advice was greatly valued in his own country.

151. The Chairman noted the general agreement that the application of IFDC to join the CGIAR should be considered by TAC and a report reviewed by the Group at its spring 1979 meeting.

152. Dr. Cummings added that he hoped the donors would refer to TAC immediately any particular questions on the subject which they wish TAC to address.

C. Report on the Training of Research Managers

153. Mr. Hulse of IDRC drew attention to the fact that although the Group had been extremely fortunate in the high quality of the senior management of the international centers, nevertheless, there were few opportunities for promotion from within. He felt not enough was being done to train middle-level staff members in the system in research management and administration. There was within and connected to the system a very large body of expertise which could be usefully transmitted to people in mid-career. As a specific suggestion, he proposed that the CGIAR might consider presenting every year a training course of two to three weeks duration for project leaders and new or potential Directors General, where some of these subjects might be addressed. There were many resources on which to draw. If the Group agreed he would suggest that the Secretariat might consider appointing a consultant, possibly from among those who had held senior positions within the system, to work out the details of such a training course.

154. A speaker said that if the Secretariat was to prepare a paper, it would be worthwhile to consider some alternatives. One such alternative could be to use existing management training centers, of which there were several excellent examples, some in the advanced countries and some in developing countries. It might be better to make arrangements with them rather than setting up a course in isolation. He agreed with Mr. Hulse as to the importance of the subject and agreed with another speaker's suggestion that there should be an exploratory paper which would provide a focus for discussion at a meeting of the Group.

155. Another speaker mentioned the work being done in this area by the Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture and stated that this organization would stand ready to provide facilities and give the Group the benefit of its experience.

156. The Chairman concluded that the next step would be to ask the Secretariat to prepare a paper presenting a number of options to the Group.
D. Report of Center Directors

157. Dr. Swindale, on behalf of the Center Directors, pointed out that they had an informal association with no secretariat and a rotating chairmanship. At their meeting this year, the Directors had discussed improvements in management of the centers, including a clearer policy towards salary and benefits for the principal staff, and were working together to come up with baseline criteria for determining such things. They had also discussed such questions as procurement, medical benefits and other problems peculiar to the special needs of the centers. An important item had been getting information on changes in the laws in the United States relating to taxation on the income of US nationals living abroad. Insofar as these changes had adversely affected benefits going to US nationals, it would affect the ability of the centers to attract American scientists in the future. This was a problem shared with other non-profitmaking charitable organizations and it was to be hoped that the US Congress could be better informed on these issues and reconsider the position in the course of future legislation. Another problem arose by virtue of changes in international exchange rates.

158. The Directors had discussed coordination in technical matters as for example, in connection with the recent stripe review on farming systems. It should be possible to collaborate in doing baseline studies necessary for farming systems research and centers in Africa should be able to help those located on other continents but whose mandate takes them into Africa. Centers should be able to work together in the collection of germ plasm.

159. The Directors were planning two inter-center conferences during 1979, one on communications within centers and another on baseline studies on soil. The possibility of exchanging technicians between centers had also been discussed, and some important initiatives had been taken in training programs. The centers were well aware of the problems raised by continued growth, and actions were being taken by the managements and boards to limit it. Evidence for this, particularly for the more mature centers, could be seen in the tables in the Integrative Report. Nevertheless, if, as the centers believed, their work had a high return, the natural inclination would be to do more of it. The Directors had had useful discussions with the agencies concerned with operations under Title XII of the US Foreign Assistance Act. These had been valuable, and it was suggested that Directors might wish to have similar discussions with other major bilateral donors and perhaps the Directors' next meeting at Hyderabad would provide the opportunity for this.

E. Working Group on Training Needs

160. Dr. Lampe reported that at the meeting of European donors in the UK in the spring the need was felt to increase the existing supply of personnel willing and able to strengthen national and international research. A small working group had been formed to look into the problem, to define postgraduate training needs, the facilities already available, and the additional training program that might be necessary. A report outlining the basic concept had been prepared, and the working group was asked to finalize the proposal for an international postgraduate training course in agricultural
research planning and management by the spring. Copies of the preliminary report had been given to the CG Secretariat. Most European donors felt that the number of scientists available for research work should be increased, and it would be an advantage to train young scientists from developing countries and industrialized countries in joint postgraduate training courses. Efforts to strengthen national agricultural research would depend strongly on availability of the right scientific personnel. The availability of an international course open to every young qualified scientist was one attempt to meet this need. If this was a subject which interested the Group, a report could be made available for the next CG meeting.

F. Press Release

161. A draft press release was reviewed and, after minor modifications, approved. The Chairman added that he felt the Group needed to do much more to exploit or enhance the public image of its activities and each member needed to consider with respect to his own country or organization what means could be taken to provide more publicity for our activities. The Group's story was a remarkable one and should be more widely known. Public relations was probably the weakest of the Group's activities, and suggestions as to how they might be improved would be most welcome.

G. Time and Place of Next Meeting

162. Some members, particularly those from far distant countries, queried the need for two CG meetings in 1979. In the view of one speaker, this question was connected with the suggestion he had made for the establishment of a smaller committee of the Group to handle some of its business. The Chairman also noted that it was the clear desire of delegates to work towards holding one meeting a year. After some further discussion it was agreed that the next meeting of the Consultative Group would be held at the offices of the World Bank in Paris on the 3rd and 4th of May 1979.

163. The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.
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