FROM: The Secretariat                        February 1, 1978

Informal Summary of Proceedings

1. The fourteenth meeting of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research was held at the offices of the World Bank in Paris on November 16 and 17, 1977. The Chairman, Mr. Warren C. Baum, presided.

2. Enclosed with this memorandum is the Informal Summary of Proceedings, the List of Participants, and Annexes consisting of a list of Task Force Members, a statement from Dr. Agble on the Bellagio meeting of national agricultural research directors, a statement from the Scandinavian delegation on ICIPE, and a summary of donor contributions to the various CGIAR activities in 1978.

Attachments

Distribution:
CG Members
TAC Members and Secretariat
Center Directors
Main Points from Summary of Proceedings


The draft Terms of Reference were reviewed, and suggestions for some changes discussed. These would be taken into account in a revised version. The Task Force was urged to maintain an open mind as to alternative ways to solve problems of inadequate national research. All 14 of those invited to join the Task Force had agreed to serve, and there was strong representation from developing countries. Staff work was already in progress.

Agenda Item 4. Report and Discussion on the Quinquennial Review of the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT). Paras. 24 to 54.

CIAT was commended for vigorous redirection of programs, which were now aimed clearly at the roots of poverty and the utilization of a vast natural resource. The discussion also covered general questions on the objectives of quinquennial reviews.


A paper from the Secretariats was reviewed, and the discussion would guide TAC in its consideration of this question in February. There was considerable discussion of the appropriate scope of the Reviews.

Agenda Item 6. Discussion Paper on the Concept of "Associate Status." Paras. 73 to 82.

The Secretariat paper had discussed advantages and disadvantages of formal associate status. The consensus was generally cautious. TAC would take note of the discussion in its forthcoming consideration of this question. The conclusions and recommendations of the Secretariat paper were accepted as a course of action leading to further discussion of that question at the CG meeting in November 1978.

A comprehensive draft report had been received from Dr. Schuh and Dr. Tollini. After further review it would be circulated.

Agenda Item 8. Proposed Program of Work and Meeting Schedule for 1978. Para. 89

The Group planned to do all its business at one meeting in 1978, in November, which would combine Centers Week and definitive pledging. It was left open to have an interim meeting in Spring 1978 if necessary.


Financial needs for 1978 (US$85.7 million) would probably be adequately covered by pledges, though information was not complete. Requirements were expected to rise sharply for 1979, due to continued inflation and substantial capital expenditure by certain centers.

Agenda Item 10. Other Business.

(a) Bellagio meeting on national agricultural research, Paras. 117 to 124. Dr. Agble reported on the recent Bellagio meeting of directors of agricultural research from developing countries. He summarized a number of recommendations the meeting had made concerning the IARCs. The participants had agreed to form the nucleus of an international body, and had appointed a four-man executive. The meeting's report would be circulated when available.

(b) ICIPE, Paras. 125 to 134. The Scandinavian delegations made a statement strongly supporting ICIPE, which several participants endorsed. It noted that ICIPE's financial needs for 1978 were still far from covered. Some donors announced pledges to ICIPE. The Secretariat would continue to try to mobilize further support for ICIPE.

(c) Statement of IDRC, Paras. 135 to 138. Attention was drawn to the need for training of center scientists in research management. This would be referred in the first instance to center directors.

(d) Allocation of resources, Paras. 139 to 147. The Integrative Report had noted the need to prepare guidelines for allocating resources when demands exceeded them. This would next be considered by TAC, and a paper would be prepared for the CC for its November 1978 meeting.
(e) Basic research, Paras. 148 to 155. Gaps in fundamental knowledge could constrain the centers' work. More systematic examination of the need for basic research was needed. The question did not call for immediate answers, but would be kept under review.

(f) Dr. Hopper, Paras. 156 to 157. Mr. Mashler, warmly supported by the Chairman, paid tribute to Dr. Hopper's work on behalf of the Group.

(g) Press release, Para. 158. A draft Press Release was approved with one amendment.

Agenda Item 11. Time and Place of Next Meeting. Paras. 159 to 161.

The next meeting of the Consultative Group and Centers Week will be in the week of November 6, 1978, in Washington.
November 1977 CG Meeting  
Informal Summary of Proceedings

1. The Chairman, Mr. Warren C. Baum, opened the meeting by welcoming the participants and reviewing the items on the Agenda. He reminded the Group of the need to take a long-term view of the system's activities and pointed to the need to obtain more systematic information on the system's output and its impact on target groups.

2. Noting that the Scandinavian delegations wished to make a statement on ICIPE under Other Business, the Agenda was adopted.


3. The Chairman reported that all 14 people invited to serve on the Task Force under the chairmanship of Mr. Demuth had agreed to do so. A list of Task Force members is given in Annex I. Although the Task Force was somewhat big with 14 members, this was because not every member could attend every meeting and it was necessary to have wide representation of the various interests concerned. He drew the Group's attention to the proposed terms of reference which he and the Secretariat had prepared after careful study of the transcript of the September meeting. Mr. Demuth and the Staff Director, Mr. Koffsky, had been consulted on the proposed terms of reference.

4. A speaker felt that the new title of the terms of reference implied a slight change in emphasis from the previous discussion. As they stood, the terms of reference seemed to imply that a decision had already been taken as to the form of service which might be recommended.

5. Another speaker, in urging that if the service be set up, it be located in a developing country, noted with approval that the Task Force comprised adequate representation from developing countries.

6. Another speaker thought the terms of reference to be too broad. He felt any proposed service should be closely linked with the CGIAR's existing activities.

7. Another speaker, unconvinced that an international service would necessarily be the final solution, suggested an addition in the wording to paragraph 3(a) to provide for specific details to be collected through case studies of agricultural research in two or three selected developing countries with different research capacity in Africa, Asia and Latin America. He also proposed that paragraphs 4 and 5 be replaced with wording that provided for a forum discussion of alternative approaches.

8. Expressing reservations about the need for a new service, a speaker drew the Group's attention to the forthcoming Science and Technology Conference. It was asked whether there was adequate representation of FAO. The representative of FAO stated that the Task Force would have his organization's full cooperation and comprehensive documentation was being assembled for the use of the Task Force. He too felt that the terms of reference tended to suggest that a new service would be needed without adequate consideration
of alternatives. He proposed an addition to paragraph 3(c) after the word "entity" to read "either under the aegis of the CGIAR or attached to an existing international agency or organization."

9. Another speaker emphasized the great improvement that was needed in national research systems. He hoped that the Task Force would pay particular consideration to the existing forms of helping national systems and secondly the potential value of alternative ways of doing business.

10. Another speaker recommended that the Task Force confined itself strictly to food crops and systems already covered by the international centers. Also, that if a new organization was thought necessary, it should be closely integrated with the activities of the centers. He noted the unfortunate consequences of extension services that operated independently of research.

11. Stating that he felt the present terms of reference to be too broad, a speaker suggested an alternative description of the Task force's objectives, which was subsequently incorporated in the revised Terms of Reference. The Task Force should look carefully at possibilities for modifying existing mechanisms. Whilst it would be impossible to examine research properly without looking at training, the inclusion of "education" made the task unmanageable. Recognizing the very great importance of extension services, he felt the Task Force should limit its work to looking at extension only in so far as national research workers must work with extension services to make their adaptive research meaningful.

12. Another speaker drew attention to the distinction between "need" and "effective demand." The latter involved the concept of ability to pay.

13. Another speaker who had recently attended a meeting of national research directors from developing countries pointed to the need to provide a service which would benefit developing countries whose research was relatively sophisticated as well as those who had very limited capabilities. He felt the participation of donors was essential from the outset.

14. A speaker noted that two types of questions were being addressed—whether there was a need from some kind of service and if so whether this would be appropriate for the CGIAR. He thought it beyond the scope of the Task Force to make judgments on the performance of other agencies involved in assistance to national agricultural development.

15. Another speaker hoped that the Task Force would give some views as to what should be expected as inputs from developing countries themselves. He would also like to see some indication of the extent to which recipient governments would have to make improvements in the decision-making processes for agricultural policy.
16. The Chairman, summarizing the discussion so far, assured the Group that it had not been the intention of the terms of reference to beg any questions but merely to follow lines of argument through to their logical conclusion. Raising questions did not imply that the answer to them would necessarily be positive. The Group would wish to consider whether the inquiry should be limited to an outgrowth of the IARC system or whether it should go beyond. The Group would wish to consider whether they wanted the Task Force to come up with specific recommendations or to present the Group with alternatives in a series of stages.

17. Two speakers took the view that the Task Force should not limit its studies to national research only vis-a-vis its association with work of the international centers. It had to look at the whole system.

18. The Chairman detected a consensus that the Task Force should study the issues of extension, education and training and other activities to the extent that they were necessary to make the national research effort more effective. Secondly, the technology in question should be appropriate to a national research program and not just that of the IARCs. Thirdly, the Task Force might come up with a specific proposal but it might present the Group with alternatives. A speaker noted reservations that some developing countries had about the activities of the CGIAR which was sometimes regarded as a "club." It was therefore most important that full participation of the developing countries be secured from the outset.

19. Dr. Cummings, Chairman of TAG, felt that it would be a mistake to confine the work of the Task Force solely to the transfer of technology from the international centers. Centers needed to interact with strong and balanced national systems which might well address matters outside the competence of the IARCs.

20. Another speaker felt that the recommendation of the Task Force could be a suitable subject for a forum discussion. However, the Chairman did not detect general support for this suggestion.

21. The Chairman of the Task Force, Mr. Demuth, noted that all 14 members who had been invited had agreed to serve. Arrangements had been made for staff work to be provided by Mr. Koffsky, Dr. Coulter, Dr. Hardon, Mr. Graves and Mr. MacNally. The Task Force would hold its first meeting in Washington on January 18 through 20. It had not yet been decided how many other meetings of the Task Force there should be, but it was planned if possible to have the report finished by the end of June or at the latest by the end of July. The staff had already begun assembling data on adequacy of national research systems. A preliminary report on the latest Bellagio meeting had been received and this would provide very valuable inputs. Contacts had been initiated with donor countries who would be providing a considerable amount of information on the existing constraints, the effectiveness of existing sources of assistance, particularly to institution building. There would be intensive meetings with FAO and with the international and regional financial institutions. Together with information from the IARCs and
with developing country members of the Task Force it would be possible to get a good view of the adequacy of the present system. It was obvious that external assistance could achieve little unless national research was given strong priority within its own country. Given the complexities of the problem the Task Force would be unlikely to come out with a complete or comprehensive solution but it was hoped to provide proposals which if approved by the Consultative Group and implemented would make a significant contribution.

22. A speaker noted that IFAD would have available funds of the order of $120 million from which national research systems could be supported. He hoped the Task Force would be in touch with them.

23. The Chairman noted that the Group had maintained close contacts with IFAD ever since the beginning and he himself had met Ambassador Sudeary two days before. Summing up, he felt the discussion had been lively and useful and had led to helpful suggestions as to how to proceed.

Agenda Item 4. Report and Discussion on the Quinquennial Review of the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT).

24. The Chairman of TAC, Dr. Cummings, introduced the report of the CIAT review. The review had been done in April 1977 and TAC had considered it at its June meeting. TAC generally endorsed the review's findings. CIAT's program was now headed in the right direction, and needed to be left in peace to get on with achieving a solid impact. CIAT had undergone major changes in its program, and in staffing, and with hindsight it might have been better to have postponed the quinquennial review somewhat. As a number of points had been discussed with CIAT's management in the course of the review, the panel was left with few major issues. CIAT was addressing the productive exploitation of the vast under-used lands of Central and South America, and its program may in future shift its emphasis as these resources become more intensively used.

25. Sir Charles Pereira, who had led the review panel, noted that, in assessing the quality and value of a center's program, quinquennial reviews should relieve it from frequent individual reviews. It was important not to interrupt scientists' work by continual reviews.

26. The panel had been most impressed by the change of direction introduced by CIAT's Board of Trustees, new director general, and staff. The livestock and pastures program now represented a very powerful attack on the multiple constraints facing the small farmer. The title "beef program" was too narrow, and somewhat misleading. It was a rehabilitation program for a vast agricultural resource.

27. Morale at CIAT had rapidly recovered after a period of major changes.

28. The quinquennial review panel had been impressed by the impact of CIAT's work in Guatemala, Brazil, and Colombia. One cooperative group of farmers in Colombia had adopted CIAT agronomy practices which gave yields
of 45 tons of cassava per hectare, as compared to the national average of 8 tons.

29. Although animal diseases were a major problem in the humid tropics of Latin America, the panel did not feel that CIAT should develop into a major veterinary center.

30. Sir Charles referred participants to the recommendations in the report on laboratory facilities, soil analysis, glasshouse techniques, and on sanitary work.

31. The panel had noted CIAT's initiation of an ecological and economic potential survey of constraints. Secondly, an economist was now included in each commodity team to study economic gains from research, and potential for future research. The panel strongly supported the integration of economists in crop work.

32. In conclusion, Sir Charles noted the dangers of too much emphasis on minimum input technology in areas where the soil was exceptionally poor.

33. Dr. Nickel, Director General of CIAT, expressed his own and his Chairman's appreciation of the review, and of the way in which it had been organized. CIAT had found the review helpful, and had benefitted from constructive criticism.

34. Mr. Mahler pointed out that a "stripe" review of farming systems work in a number of centers was under way, and some of its conclusions would be relevant to CIAT. This would be reported on at the next Consultative Group meeting.

35. A speaker, referring to the cassava yields achieved in Colombia, queried whether these could be maintained after CIAT's withdrawal. He wondered what steps the government was taking to ensure wider application of the CIAT practices.

36. Sir Charles Pereira replied that CIAT had introduced more productive plant material, but above all had convinced farmers of the value of clean, disease-free material; in other words, of modern scientific farming methods. CIAT had also taught farmers to plant cassava on ridges, which the national extension service had not.

37. Dr. Nickel pointed out that CIAT had been testing cassava materials over the wide diversity of climatic and ecological conditions that existed in Colombia. Now CIAT was moving increasingly to other countries, leaving activities in Colombia mainly to local agencies. CIAT was convinced of the need to work through such agencies. The cassava example referred to was rather a special case in that an organization was already in existence in the form of a coffee growers' association. This association had sent a trainee to CIAT, who became the main agent for technology transfer.
38. A speaker, noting criticism that some agricultural research was not well geared to the needs of the small farmer, wondered whether CIAT had enough sociological manpower to make an adequate contribution to the programs.

39. Sir Charles felt that sociological problems were concerned with distribution of wealth. These were far eclipsed by the importance of good planting material, without which there would not be the crops to provide that wealth.

40. Dr. Nickel noted that each major program had an economist working with the biologists. One could question whether one sociologist in addition was enough, but physical scientists were also acutely aware of sociological issues.

41. A speaker was reassured by the experience at CIAT, which demonstrated that the system of Boards, center management, the CGIAR and TAC was indeed capable of carrying through major changes in a center's work. Noting the wide range of disciplines at CIAT, the quinquennial review emphasized the size of the problem being tackled. He wondered whether the proportion of CIAT's resources going to outreach was about right.

42. Sir Charles noted that CIAT's outreach was achieved mainly through training. Also local organizations had been strengthened by association with CIAT. Given the burden that CIAT's excellent training program already imposed on research staff, he doubted whether CIAT could take on much more.

43. Dr. Nickel thought that CIAT could increase training by about 50% above its present level of about 100 trainee-years per annum. There was a finite limit on training activities, as there was also on outposted staff. Ten staff were outposted now—the number could be doubled but not increased beyond that.

44. In answer to a question on CIAT-IITA cooperation in cassava, Sir Charles noted the grave danger of transmission of disease from Africa to South America. He expected the IITA panel to pay particular attention to this, and to opportunities for further cooperation with CIAT.

45. Mr. Mahler pointed out that cooperation between centers was primarily a matter for their respective Boards and management.

46. In answer to a question as to how CIAT could better monitor its contribution to tropical agriculture, Dr. Nickel noted that the economists in each program wrote a report on CIAT's commodities twice a year. The statistical base for such reports was improving, and it was now possible to analyze changes in yields, and the reasons for them, in considerable detail.

47. The Chairman noted the Group's concern with getting a better basis for measuring the impact of centers' work, which would be followed up in the coming year.
48. A speaker asked what lessons might be learned from the discontinuing of CIAT's small farmer program.

49. Sir Charles Pereira noted that TAC was engaged in a "stripe" review of small farmer problems. As a focus for scientific research, "the small farmer" was too broad. The panel had been convinced that the small farmer was benefitting from every part of CIAT's activities, but others would benefit too.

50. A speaker, commending the report, noted the need for CIAT to be able to do at least minimum justice to the great potential of the livestock sector.

51. Another speaker stressed that donors should accept that CIAT's beef production work needed long-term support. Speaking from his own veterinary experience which led him to believe that the most significant animal disease problem was malnutrition, and the worst husbandry problem was parasitic disease, he was glad that the report did not recommend de-emphasizing veterinary work.

53. Sir Charles noted that national organizations were strengthening their veterinary work.

54. Dr. Nickel mentioned a consortium looking at anthropod-borne blood diseases in Latin America, which sought funds under Title XII. Other aspects of animal diseases would remain unaddressed. CIAT hoped to assemble people and funds to look at all aspects of the problem, but it would be a complex operation. CIAT would be prepared to host a coordinated effort on animal health in Latin America, which had very different problems from those of Africa. Whereas in Africa there were two deadly diseases, problems in Latin America were mainly those of nutrition. CIAT's criteria for priorities were, first whether the problem could be solved by technology; secondly, whether the technology was internationally transferrable; and thirdly, whether an international center had a comparative advantage vis-a-vis other institutions. On these grounds, he felt CIAT's present emphasis on nutrition and related health aspects was correct.

**Agenda Item 5. Preliminary Note on the Quinquennial Review Process.**

55. The Chairman noted that a previous question on resource allocations led logically to discussion of the Quinquennial Review process itself. He drew the Group's attention to the Secretariat's paper dated October 26, to which was attached a note from the TAC Secretariat. Enough reviews had now been done to make it appropriate to ask whether their mandates were about right, or needed a different focus. And secondly, how the objectives of a review could be most effectively met. The present meeting was an opportunity for the Group to give views to TAC, who had the subject on their next agenda.

56. Dr. Cummings noted that although TAC's emphasis was on scientific competence, other questions were being increasingly raised. Some felt that these were being adequately addressed by other review mechanisms. Group members had the opportunity to include special concerns in a review terms of Reference, though this had not worked perfectly in practice.
57. Noting that the papers from the Secretariats had been prepared in a rather unusual way due to unforeseen circumstances, Dr. Cummings thought that, though there was some overlap there was no conflict between them.

58. Pointing to the experience at CIAT, and in answer to an earlier question, Sir Charles Pereira stressed the attention the panel had given to the allocation of resources to beef. He was glad to note that the effort was now directed at the basic root of poverty in large areas of Latin America. A scientific group addressing specific questions in a limited time could not look at broad questions of philosophy nor economic impact. Panels needed to have extensive discussions with Boards of Trustees. His panel’s discussion with CIAT’s program committee had been very useful.

59. The Chairman noted that the CIAT report had recommended that there be meetings between the panel leader and center directors and staff, prior to the fieldwork.

60. A speaker noted that the terms of reference for the CIAT review had not mentioned small farmers explicitly. The Chairman thought that this raised the question of whether reviews should assess the scientific quality of existing programs, or the strategy and balance between programs.

61. A speaker thought that the centers were all staffed with accomplished professional scientists. Nevertheless, it was possible for excellent scientific methodology to be directed at relatively unimportant questions. Internal reviews were the best means of ensuring excellence. He suggested that TAC structured future reviews so that external reviewers could address more fundamental issues.

62. Another speaker, stressing the importance of reviews to centers and donors, felt that the questions of emphasis, and of forward planning, should get more attention in future. Reports should be in two parts, one for researchers and one for policymakers. Of prime importance was the composition of the panel. Quinquennial reviews should be an input to the setting of overall priorities.

63. Another speaker expressed concern that, in introducing new elements to the review process, the main purpose of the reviews might be set aside. The Group needed assurance of scientific quality at least once every five years. It may be asked whether quinquennial reviews were in fact able to look at questions of strategy and balance. The assessment of scientific quality was paramount.

64. Another speaker felt that the review process was increasing in importance, particularly for smaller donor countries. He hoped it would be possible to reach a compromise, in which scientific quality would be assessed, but forward planning and the proper balance of activities would not be neglected.
65. In agreeing that there was a continuing need for examination of scientific quality and the content of research at the centers, a speaker suggested that Boards of Trustees be invited to prepare papers on resource allocation, for discussion by the Group.

66. Another speaker noted that there had to be a system of priorities, since funds were limited. Any such system needed to examine different commodities, as well as different target groups. TAC's quinquennial reviews should concentrate on scientific questions, whereas policy was a matter for the Group. Perhaps review panels should include someone qualified to judge whether a center's activities were in line with Group guidelines. Care must be taken not to overload the centers with reviews.

67. Dr. Nickel detected a consensus in the views expressed. He thought it possible to deal with scientific excellence at the same time as relevance. Boards of Trustees were most important: most of their members come from developing countries. CIAT was concerned with the impact on yields, not the volume of research publications.

68. Dr. Cummings mentioned that the TAC priorities paper was being re-examined in case it needed updating. TAC was devoting more attention to criteria for decision-making. The review process would be improved by staffing panels with a higher proportion of people who had done a review before.

69. The representative of a donor outlined his agency's criteria for evaluating programs. First, do the objectives fit with those of the donor's development assistance program as a whole? Secondly, how effectively are these objectives addressed? And thirdly, how efficiently is the work carried out? There were also some internal considerations. He would very much welcome one document which provided answers to all questions of concern to his agency (except purely internal ones).

70. Another speaker thought that, although scientific work should be assessed, there were three other important areas. First were scientific achievements, expenditures and balance between programs. Secondly, there was the effect on research capacity in developing countries. Thirdly, there was the impact of the centers' research on production in developing countries.

71. The representative of another donor pointed out that contributions had to be justified to non-scientists. Much of the necessary information came from material put out by the centers. It was important to avoid duplication of reviews, and upsetting the work of the centers. Specialists from developed countries should be able to participate in reviews, without having to mount their own. While noting the TAC Chairman's point about using people for several reviews, it would not be desirable to create a semi-permanent group of reviewers. Organization of future reviews must remain flexible.

72. The Chairman concluded by reminding the Group that the purpose of the discussion was not to reach agreement, but to provide guidance for TAC. Reviews had to satisfy a variety of interests. On the donor side, there was
a distinction between scientists and administrators. The importance of full involvement by Boards of Trustees had been stressed, but this should not interfere with the Boards' responsibilities. As to the conduct of reviews, the Group should consider whether to have a small advance party, as suggested by the CIAT panel. Also, whether panel members should increasingly be drawn from a common pool. Whilst there was no question that reviews should continue to focus on scientific quality, many speakers sought study of objectives or balance, and of forward planning. TAC would now prepare specific recommendations and the matter would be on the agenda of the next Consultative Group meeting.

**Agenda Item 6. Discussion Paper on the Concept of "Associate Status."**

73. The Chairman noted that the Group had in the past considered its relationship with institutions it did not fund on an individual basis. It had been felt necessary to consider a general policy, and the Secretariat had accordingly prepared a paper, which identified three basic options. One option was no change, another was a more restrictive policy, and the third would introduce some way of officially accrediting certain types of activity. TAC had an important role in any proposal that an activity be adopted or accredited by the Group. The discussion would guide TAC in its consideration of this question at its next meeting. Because much of the Secretariat's paper was concerned with formalizing some form of associate relationship, the Group should not assume that this was what was being recommended.

74. A speaker noted that an important issue was the relevance of potential "associates" to the work of the centers. If such work was relevant, then a more restrictive policy would not be appropriate. He felt the present arrangements provided a desirable degree of flexibility.

75. Another speaker, advising a pragmatic approach, thought the efficiency and reputation of the system might suffer from a large increase in activities supported. Recognizing there might be situations where associate status could be appropriate, he felt that the specific conditions should be assessed on a case by case basis.

76. It was noted that developing countries tended to look to the CG for coordinated action in a particular problem area. The need for consolidation applied not only internally within the Group, but to reflection on the overall agricultural research needs of developing countries. Therefore, one criterion for support of a new activity should be willingness of developing countries to participate; other criteria were location in a developing country, need for donor coordination, and agreement on relevance and value. TAC and the CG should be able to express opinions about research activities without implying any special relationship.

77. The representative of a major donor noted his authorities' general agreement with the Secretariat paper. He felt it worthwhile to suggest raising the matter at the next Centers Week, without prejudice to future relationships.
Dr. Cummings listed a large number of activities which had come before TAC, which was constantly being asked to recommend recognition. Noting that associate status had not been officially defined, he felt that the concept implied a continuing obligation. Recognizing that TAC was now almost forced to formulate some kind of policy, he invited guidance from the Group.

A speaker, expressing a personal preference for a clear policy of "in-or-out", felt no decision could be made at the current meeting. He noted the negative consequences of failure to get recognition. Ongoing responsibility for an activity implied effective monitoring.

Commending the proposal to wait and see, a speaker warned against seeing the CG as the only means of carrying out regional or international agricultural research.

A speaker, noting both advantages and disadvantages to associate status, thought that the Group needed some way to recognize work done at institutions which it does not support. His authorities would favor an arrangement whereby the Group could recognize international research activities, while allowing the Group itself to decide whether such recognition should include the use of Group funds. Donors should clearly recognize limits to the Group's expansion. Quality of research and flexibility of management could be jeopardized if the Group became too large.

The Chairman thought the Group was in general agreement with the Secretariat's analysis and definition of the problems. The next step would be consideration by TAC, who should note that most views tended to favor caution and conservatism. The success of the Group had created pressures for endorsement.

Agenda Item 7. Progress Report on the Paper "Costs and Benefits of Agricultural Research, State of the Art and Implications for the CGIAR."

The Chairman reminded the Group of its decision to commission a study of the state of the art of assessing the costs and benefits of research, and their agreement to the engagement of Drs. Schuh and Tollini of Purdue University.

Mr. Lejeune drew attention to the Secretariat paper of October 20, to which was attached a brief summary of the Schuh/Tollini paper. The paper was itself a very comprehensive survey, including four methods for ex-post, and nine for ex-ante evaluations. It was planned to solicit comments on the latest draft of the paper, after which a final version of the paper would be circulated to TAC, the Group and the Centers.

A speaker stressed that techniques for evaluating research were only as good as the physical data on which they were based. Physical scientists were often hesitant to make predictions as to the outcome of research. The burden was not one for economists alone.
86. In answer to a question, Mr. Lejeune pointed out that the Schuh/Tollini paper was not a study of what the benefits of CGIAR research had been, but an academic and theoretical review of the techniques available for comparing costs with benefits.

87. A speaker pointed to the importance of political decisions, and questioned whether research results could be evaluated in isolation. He wondered whether the state of the art was advanced enough to be able to attach weights to the various factors involved.

88. The Chairman concluded that substantive discussion of this difficult subject was premature. The recommendations of the Secretariat's paper were accepted.

**Agenda Item 8. Proposed Program of Work and Meeting Schedule for 1978.**

89. The Chairman invited comments on the Secretariat's memorandum of October 20, which outlined the work program and key dates for 1978. One innovation was the suggestion that Centers Week and the definitive pledging session be combined in a single annual meeting, to be held in November. It was proposed to keep the possibility of another meeting in the late Spring of 1978, if necessary. He noted general concurrence with the suggestion to have one meeting, and despite one donor's preference for a June or July date, felt that on balance early November was the most suitable. September was too early for firm pledges, and December too late for center and Secretariat financial arrangements. As the meeting would include Centers Week presentations, it was proposed to hold it in Washington.

**Agenda Item 9. Donor Indications of Financial Support for 1978 and Thereafter.**

90. The Chairman invited donor members to make statements of their total contributions to core programs in 1978. Details of special project funds, and allocations between centers, were to be given to the Secretariat in writing.

91. Mr. Mashler stated that, subject to the usual approvals, the UNDP would make available $4,096,600 for core programs in 1978, payable in US dollars, plus $2,257,700 for Special Projects at ICRISAT and IRRI. The figures for 1979 would be $3,198,000 and $2,042,900 respectively, but could be higher, depending on the outcome of negotiations with the centers. He later added that between US$100,000-150,000 in non-convertible currencies might be available for the Genes Board and IRRI, probably outside core programs.

92. Mr. Lejeune, in answer to a question, said it would be difficult to provide a definitive statement of all pledges at the end of the meeting, since some important donors were absent or unable to indicate firm figures.

93. Mr. Lloyd Jonnes said that the US would continue to provide up to 25% of the total center budgets, which would mean just under $22 million for 1978. Most contributions were planned for January.
For Germany, Dr. Treitz indicated his government's pledge of DM 14 million (US$6,240,000). His government was also asking for Parliamentary approval of an additional DM 1 million (US$446,000). Allocations between centers had been given to the Secretariat, but his government was able to consider proposals for change. Payment would be made in line with Review Committee recommendations.

Mr. Dithmer stated that, subject to approval by the Board for International Development and by Parliament, Denmark would contribute Dkr. 4.4 million (US$723,800) in 1978. Contributions in 1979 were expected to be Dkr. 5.4 million (US$888,300) and for 1980 Dkr. 6.5 million (US$1,069,250).

Professor Strand said that, subject to approval by Parliament, Norway would contribute Nkr. 10 million (US$1,832,000) in 1978, and again in 1979.

Dr. Menzi stated that the Swiss Development Corporation had approved a contribution of SFr. 2.8 million (US$1,108,000), payable in US dollars during January 1978. An additional US$320,000 will be provided for Special Projects, of which $160,000 would go to CIMMYT—this being shown in CIMMYT’s budget as part of the core.

Dr. Cunningham said that, subject to Parliamentary approval, the United Kingdom would provide £ 2.5 million (US$4,612,500). This was an increase of 25% over 1977, and he hoped that the trend of steady increase would be maintained. Although slight adjustments in allocations might be made, the UK had systems for allocations of funds, and the scope for changes was very limited.

Dr. Hardin reaffirmed the Ford Foundation’s intention to provide $US 1 million in 1978, the allocation between five centers to be worked out with the Secretariat.

Mr. Lindores states that, subject to approval, Canada would contribute Can$ 8,370,000 (US$7,565,000), which included Can$ 820,000 restricted core contribution to CIMMYT. Payment would be made in the first half of the fiscal year starting April 1, 1978. Contributions for 1979 would not be less than those for 1978.

Mr. Bengtsson mentioned that Sweden had recently done a study of Swedish support to international research, including a case study of a developing country. He noted the recommendation that Sweden should continue to support the CG for the next five years. After 1978, contributions would be based on advice from agricultural scientists in developing countries. The

\[1/\] All conversions in this summary are, for reasons of consistency, given at the exchange rates of October 31, 1977. Dollar amounts may therefore differ slightly from donor statements. A revised summary of donor pledges is given in Annex IV.
Swedish contribution would be SKr. 12.5 million (US$2,612,500) for 1978, including a small amount advanced in 1977. SKr. 1 million of this amount was a restricted contribution to the Genes Board. He hoped it would be possible to make unrestricted contributions to the Genes Board in future.

102. Mme. Vervalcke announced that, subject to the normal approvals, the Belgian contribution for 1978 would be BFr. 80.5 million (US$2,285,400). This was provisionally divided into BFr. 56 million unrestricted and BFr. 24.5 million restricted. In addition, Belgium planned to contribute BFr. 2 million (US$60,000) to ICIPE, and contributions to activities recognized by the Group, but not included in CGIAR core budgets, would amount to BFr. 19.5 million (US$582,000). There might be a slight increase for 1979.

103. Dr. Pino confirmed that, subject to approval of the Board, the Rockefeller Foundation would make US$1.25 million available as unrestricted core contributions for 1978.

104. Professor Olembo reconfirmed UNEP's pledge for 1978 as US$600,000. Funds should be available in January.

105. Dr. Hardon confirmed that the Dutch government would approve contributions to unrestricted core budgets totalling US$1,650,000 in 1978. For ongoing Special Projects, US$730,000 was expected to be disbursed in 1978, and a further US$555,000 would be available for commitment to new Special Projects.

106. Mr. Katsuno was not yet in a position to give the amount of the Japanese pledge for 1978.

107. Mr. Daniels stated that IDRC would contribute Can$ 1,525,000 (US$1,378,300) to restricted core budgets in 1978. Contributions to certain centers would be reviewed early in 1978 and might be increased.

108. Mr. Lafourcade confirmed that the Inter-American Development Bank would pledge the equivalent of US$6.2 million for 1978. Disbursement would be in local currencies.

109. Subject to approval by the necessary authorities, Mr. Gruner was able to confirm that the EEC would commit a total of EUA 2 million (US$2.2 million) for 1978. This would be divided equally between ICRISAT and IRRI. Contributions for 1979 were expected to be at least of the same order of magnitude.

110. Mr. Vernede stated that France's contribution would be at about the same level in 1978 as in 1977.

111. Dr. Whittem confirmed that Australia would make Aus $2.7 million (US$3,058,000) available for unrestricted core budgets in 1978. Australia would be supporting every CGIAR activity except one. Australia had modified
its allocations somewhat since September, after consultation with the Secretariat.

112. Mr. Yudelman confirmed that, subject to approval by its Board of Directors, the World Bank would make up shortfalls in funding, up to a total of US$8.7 million.

113. Summarizing the financial position insofar as this could be done with somewhat incomplete information, Mr. Lejeune stated that total net requirements for 1978 were estimated at $85.7 million, and pledges announced during the meeting totalled $79 million. In addition, Italy had indicated a pledge of US$330,000; Iran of US$2 million; the Kellogg Foundation of US$320,000; and Nigeria provisionally of US$770,000. Allowing for as yet unconfirmed pledges from Japan, the Asian Development Bank, the Arab Fund and New Zealand, it seemed likely that requirements would be met in full. 1978 happened to be a year when there would be relatively little capital expenditure, but donors should be aware that there could be a significant increase in 1979.

114. In answer to a question, Mr. Lejeune reported on relations with Saudi Arabia, which remained very interested in CGIAR activities. He and the Deputy Executive Secretary would visit Riyadh shortly, when discussions would include possible technical assistance. Saudi Arabia's participation would be valued, but became important financially only from 1979 when ICARDA would begin to incur heavy expenditures. He added that host countries in the Middle East had given considerable nonfinancial assistance and made significant contributions in kind, such as land from Syria and Iran.

115. The Chairman noted that some donor countries in the Middle East preferred to channel research and development funds through other institutions, such as IFAD. IFAD was prepared to consider supporting the CGIAR when it was in a position to do so.

116. The Chairman concluded by reiterating that although the situation was satisfactory for 1978, financial needs would rise sharply in real terms in 1979, and inflation would also have to be taken into account.

Agenda Item 10. Other Business

117. (a) Bellagio meeting on national agricultural research. The Chairman invited Dr. Pino to introduce the report on the meeting, which had been held under Rockefeller Foundation auspices, and Dr. Agble, who had attended, to give a first-hand account.

118. Dr. Agble said that the meeting had been mainly organized by Dr. Madamba of the Philippines. It had been attended by heads of national research programs in 17 developing countries, representatives of the International Agricultural Development Service (IADS), Dr. Diouf, and Mr. Mahler.

119. The meeting had aimed primarily to foster cooperation between national agricultural research systems. Secondly, to develop reciprocal arrangements between national systems and IADS. Thirdly, to focus on
strategies for generating support for national research. Fourthly, to study a mechanism for regular meetings of research directors. Fifthly, to identify strategies for the application of research. Sixthly, to exchange experience on personnel policies. Lastly, to develop recommendations for UN agencies, international donors, and national governments.

120. A number of country case studies were presented. The participants had split up into three task forces to prepare the recommendations to the three sets of entities mentioned above. The recommendations relating to the international centers were as follows:

- long and short-term objectives of IARC programs should be clearly defined;
- LDC scientists should participate in management and formulation of policies at the IARCs;
- there should be a formal mechanism for collaboration between the IARCs and national programs;
- IARCs should introduce personnel policies allowing for secondment of LDC scientists for from three to five years;
- more joint training programs should be introduced;
- the CGIAR and the international donors should consider new initiatives;
- donor agencies should address the financial needs of national research systems.

121. The meeting also recommended that national governments pay more attention to organizing and funding national research systems.

122. The participants agreed to form the basis of an international federation for agricultural research for development. They had appointed Drs. Drilon, Swaminathan, Madamba and Agble, as its executive, whose first meeting would be in January 1978.

123. Mr. Mahler added that he hoped that future meetings of this kind could also include representatives of countries where research was least developed.

124. The Chairman assured participants that the report on the Bellagio meeting would be distributed to them as soon as it was available.

1/ The complete text of this section as presented by Dr. Agble is given as Annex II.
125. (b) ICIPE. Professor Strand read a statement on behalf of the Scandinavian delegations, including the following points:

-- ICIPE's research was of high quality, and much of it was relevant to the work of the centers;

-- ICIPE had an important role in developing research capacity in Africa;

-- pledges to ICIPE for 1978 were far below requirements. This might affect its ability to do collaborative work with the centers. Present donors, who did not constitute a consortium, could not provide all the funds needed for operating and capital;

-- the Secretariat should actively consult with ICIPE and its donors during 1978, and should report next centers week;

-- the Scandinavian countries urged a pragmatic review of future relations with ICIPE;

-- donors and developing countries were urged to contribute further to ICIPE in 1978.

126. The Chairman agreed that it was appropriate for the Secretariat to do what it could to help ICIPE, and it would continue to do so. The consideration of associate status, to be continued by TAG and then again at Centers Week next year, might clarify relationships between the Group and organizations such as ICIPE.

127. Mr. Lejeune reminded donors that the Secretariat had asked for information on proposed contributions to ICIPE for 1978. Those who had not already given this information were urged to do so in the course of the current meeting.

128. Mr. Jonnes mentioned that USAID was reviewing a project on tick physiology and ecology, amounting to some $400,000 a year, of which about two-thirds would be provided by USAID and one-third by UNDP.

129. Dr. Treitz said that the German government shared the Scandinavian view of the value of ICIPE and the need to support it. He hoped to find a formula whereby funds could be made available in 1977, and the government would announce its decision during November. They were prepared to support ICIPE in 1978 out of the unallocated part of the pledge to the CGIAR, provided such activities were included in the core budgets of the respective centers.

1/ Full text attached as Annex III.
130. Mme. Vervalcke, also supporting the Scandinavian position, noted that Belgium had budgetted BFr. 2.1 million (US$63,000) for cooperation with ICIPE in 1977, and BFr. 2.0 million (US$60,000) were budgetted for 1978. This was for activities in connection with the centers. If funds were to be channeled directly to ICIPE, as might be more practicable, there was the problem of accounting for them within the overall framework of the CGIAR.

131. Mr. Soels noted that the Netherlands had no difficulty in supporting some special projects of ICIPE. But an international effort was needed to sustain ICIPE's core budget. He endorsed the Scandinavian view.

132. The Chairman referred to the discussion at the Group's September meeting, from which it emerged that although ICIPE was highly regarded, most members did not want the Group to have a formal relationship with it. ICIPE would be funded indirectly through the centers. The Secretariat would continue to encourage support for ICIPE from bilateral and multilateral donors.

133. Dr. Cunningham endorsed the Scandinavian assessment of the quality of ICIPE's work, and noted that the UK would provide some $600,000 over the next three years. It would not help the UK to have ICIPE financed through the CGIAR in any way. Present regulations made it difficult to contribute to the core budget, as funds had to be used for specific projects or for capital.

134. Dr. Whittem mentioned that Australia had provided Aus$ 100,000 (US$113,000) to ICIPE in 1977 for work with IRRI on the brown plant hopper. Of this some Aus$ 50,000 (US$56,600) would not be spent in 1977, and would be available for 1978. Australia proposed to make available a further Aus$ 100,000 (US$113,000) for this purpose in 1978, thereby providing about half of the program's estimated requirements of US$302,000 in 1978.

135. (c) Personnel policies and training. Statement of IDRC. Mr. Daniels read a statement on behalf of Mr. Hulse in which, while recognizing the high quality of the management of the centers, it was pointed out that, since the CGIAR was set up, only one center director had been appointed by promotion from within the system. IDRC believed that there were many scientists in the centers with the potential to become directors if given the right encouragement and training. Management training for middle and senior level staff was commonplace in many organizations of comparable size. The CGIAR should consider, together with the centers, establishing regular short intensive courses in research management for selected center scientists. IDRC would be prepared later to offer suggestions on curriculum. It was suggested that this be considered at the next meeting of center directors, and possibly at a meeting of the Group.

136. A speaker, noting that the CGIAR system was quite small, saw merit in bringing in outsiders for senior posts. He wondered who would conduct the proposed course. Complacency and in-breeding were dangers, which might also apply to quasipermanent quinquennial review panels. There were benefits to be gained from management courses.
137. Another speaker mentioned in-service training through assigning scientists to management positions as assistant to a director. This had been discontinued partly on grounds of cost. Any suggestions the Group might have should be referred to Boards of Trustees.

138. The Chairman stressed the Group's interest in securing dynamic personnel policies which could produce leaders from within, including those from developing countries. He hoped that IDRC would table a paper for consideration by center directors, and depending on the outcome, the matter might be put on the Group's agenda.

139. (b) Allocation of resources. Mr. Lejeune referred to the 1977 Integrative Report's discussion of the need for a method of allocating resources in a situation where requests for funds substantially exceeded pledges, or where uncoordinated growth led to a distortion of the Group's overall objectives, or where new activities were under consideration.

140. The Integrative Report suggested that a paper be prepared which would review the present allocation of the Group's resources and develop criteria for periodic judging of the broad allocation, consider what changes, if any, should be sought over the next five years, and propose policy guidelines for future planning.

141. TAC now proposed to look again at its paper on priorities in the light of the Group's objectives so as to determine the relative importance of research under way or proposed and the degree of urgency of the various programs. It proposed to develop criteria for making these judgments.

142. Mr. Mahler pointed out that TAC did not intend to deal with the allocation of financial resources, nor with allocation between centers. It expressed opinions on priorities, on the relative importance of certain international research activities, and it identified gaps. Allocation of funds was done by donors.

143. Neither TAC nor its Secretariat had a magic formula or a methodology to establish priorities. TAC would rely on quantitative data and on value judgments in the light of experience and advice of members of TAC.

144. The TAC document on priorities in international agricultural research, prepared in 1973 and revised and expanded in 1976, would be to some extent revised and updated. The world food situation and that of individual commodities had evolved. New data were available on demand, production, and consumption, the latter based on food consumption studies by FAO. Statistics which were submitted on the budgets of the different centers and allocated to different commodities should permit a finer analysis than had been possible in the past.

145. Previous priorities were based on three categories. TAC had subsequently defined a certain number of criteria which were put to the last meeting of the Consultative Group, and TAC would use these criteria to look at new activities and existing activities from a new angle. These would be
analysed in the forthcoming months with the cooperation of IFPRI, the International Food Policy Research Institute.

146. TAC had scheduled two stages, the first until the next TAC meeting in February, when it would identify problems and sectors where the allocation of resources to one or another commodity did not seem to correspond in relative terms to the priorities as they seemed to exist now.

147. In the second stage, and after having received the opinions and directives of the TAC Committee, the TAC Secretariat would prepare a revised text of the priority paper, considering quantitative and qualitative aspects. It was not enough to consider commodities and crops individually. In order to have a realistic and valid evaluation of priorities it is important to define priorities in terms of problems rather than in terms of crops or commodities. Problems would be identified by major ecological areas, examining the contribution which international research could make to solving them. TAC hoped to go beyond the consideration of individual crops and commodities to deal with the relative importance of the various scientific disciplines. TAC would try to evolve a multidimensional matrix, made up of commodities, the disciplines, regional geographic aspects, and a series of other factors, in particular production factors. The TAC Secretariat would submit detailed proposals to the February meeting. There would be a revised draft for submission to the TAC at the June meeting. The document would be made available to the CG. The whole process would be done in close cooperation with the Secretariat of the CG and certain aspects might serve as inputs for next year's Integrative Report.

147. Mr. Yudelman commented that he hoped that the paper on the problems of cost and benefits would also make a contribution to the TAC paper.

148. (e) Basic research. Mr. Lejeune reminded the Group that the Integrative Report noted the need for members to be satisfied that the scientists engaged in applied research had available to them in the years ahead a store of fundamental knowledge fitted to their needs. They used basic scientific knowledge developed by others, usually in the industrialized countries.

149. IRRI and CIMMYT had got quick results in wheat, rice and maize, at least partly because they were able to draw on findings of research, including basic research, which had been carried out for many years before the IRRI and CIMMYT programs got under way. Less work had been done on crops which are the main concern of the newer centers, such as millet, sorghum or cassava, which were staple foods in the less developed tropical countries.

150. Adequate basic research was essential to the success of the applied research programs in the centers, the question being whether a sufficient store of knowledge existed or was under way for their present purposes or to provide them with the knowledge they will need in future.
151. The Group could consider whether the basic research now being done in the universities and national institutions of the developed countries, and to some extent in the institutions of the developing countries, was adequately oriented to the Group's concerns or whether there was a need to stimulate research relevant to the production problems of the developing countries, and if so, how this could best be done.

152. Depending on the answer to these questions, it could be asked whether the centers should do more basic research to ensure that they would have in good time the knowledge that they need.

153. Basic research was costly, and it may be inefficient to conduct it away from the major universities and research institutions in the developed countries. If the centers felt the need for more basic research, there might be a case for them to act in concert to contract with specialized research institutions. This fundamental question should be examined systematically. The Integrative Report had suggested a process for doing so.

154. Each center would first assess its needs, looking five or ten years ahead. These could be considered collectively, and a report prepared which would be given to TAC, which would make recommendations to the Group on what, if anything, the Group should do to facilitate the timely satisfaction of these needs felt by the centers.

155. The Chairman suggested that, in the absence of comments from the floor, the question be kept under review, with the Secretariat reporting from time to time.

156. (f) Dr. Hopper. Mr. Mashler expressed UNDP's appreciation of the strong support the Group had been given over the years by Dr. Hopper, who would shortly be leaving IDRC and TAC.

157. The Chairman felt the Group as a whole strongly endorsed UNDP's view, and asked the IDRC representative to convey to Dr. Hopper the Group's appreciation and good wishes.

158. (g) Press release. With one amendment, the draft Press Release was approved.

Agenda Item 11. Time and Place of Next Meeting.

159. The Chairman noted that, in the discussion of a previous item of business, it had been agreed to hold the next meeting of the Group in Washington in the week of November 6th, which would combine International Centers Week, the Consultative Group meeting, and the definitive pledging session.
160. Dr. Cunningham reminded European members that the 1978 regional European meeting would be hosted by the UK, in the first week of April at Reading University.

161. The Chairman thanked the participants and closed the meeting at 12:30 p.m.
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Text of Dr. Agble's Statement

Summarizing Bellagio Recommendations on IARCs

The paper addresses the weaknesses and the strengths of the IARCs, and it makes the point for having strong national research systems.

Recommendation 3 is as follows:

"On the basis of the analysis of strengths and weaknesses of IARCs and the experience of the last 16 years in the functioning of IARCs, the following recommendations are made to further enhance the value and strengths of IARCs and to eliminate or minimise their weaknesses."

(a) Clear definition of the short and long term research objectives and programmes of IARCs. The research programmes of IARCs should have a short and longer term perspective, all designed to strengthen the national research systems and accelerate agricultural advance. Among the long term goals of crop improvement-based institutes, the following should be emphasised:

(i) collection, conservation, cataloguing and distribution of germ plasm;

(ii) organisation of path-breaking research designed to raise the ceiling of yield and to impart greater stability to yield (i.e., research which can lead to the development of high yield cum high stability varieties with desired quality);

(iii) development of improved research techniques;

(iv) organisation of information and bibliographic services;

(v) organisation of relevant training programmes; and

(vi) organisation of symposia, seminars and monitoring tours.
Research on farming systems at a single location has limited value and should be replaced by operational research projects undertaken jointly with national research systems in farmers' fields on a watershed area basis.

The short term goals may include selection of advanced breeding lines and other forms of research of immediate applied value. The two animal science institutes in Africa should by the very nature of the rationale for their establishment concentrate on removing the constraints which now impair animal productivity in many parts of Africa.

(b) Participation of scientists from developing countries in the management and formulation of research priorities in IARCs. There is a need for a greater representation of agricultural scientists from developing countries in the Boards of Trustees of IARCs. Similarly, more working scientists from developing countries should be associated in programme formulation and in determining priorities.

(c) Mechanism for collaboration with national research systems. Each IARC and the interested national research system should enter into a Memorandum of Understanding spelling out in broad terms the major areas of mutual interest. Such a memorandum should provide for the development of a Work Plan covering two years at a time jointly by scientists from the IARC and national research system. Such a joint Work Plan would provide the needed flexibility for tailoring the quantity and quality of IARC's support to the national system according to changing needs. The immediate aim of the collaborative programme should be the strengthening of the national research system.
(d) **Personnel policies.** IARCs should consider establishing personnel policies which provide for a core staff recruited on a long-term basis and a large number of scientists taken on deputation from national research systems of developing countries on tenurial appointments for periods ranging from three to five years. This will help the scientists from the national research systems to enrich their experience, at the same time ensuring that national research systems do not lose good scientists on a permanent basis. There is also need for a large number of post-doctoral fellowships and sabbatical leave assignments for scientists from developing countries to work for a year or two in IARCs. A Task Force may be set up by CGIAR for developing guidelines for such a regular to and fro movement of scientists between IARCs and national research systems.

(e) **Training.** In addition to in situ training at IARCs, more joint training programmes should be organised in the country concerned by the national research system with such inputs from an IARC as may be appropriate with reference to the goals of each training programme.

(f) **New initiatives for the consideration of CGIAR and the International Donor Community.**

There is talk in the paper about some of the things like the International Council for Research on Agro-Forestry, and then regional collaborative networks among research systems of developing countries, and I suggest that more of the WARDA-type regional organisations could be followed.

"International Service for strengthening national agricultural research in developing countries.

There is scope for such a service if it performs the following functions in a manner which will be complementary to the on-going programme of FAO, UNDP and regional agencies and Banks."
(a) Help to generate additional resources for supporting national research systems.

(b) Help to fill the major gaps in national research systems on the basis of an analysis of the felt needs of the country concerned for achieving national food security and agrarian and rural prosperity.

(c) Assist countries in deriving full benefit from the results of the research work of IARCs by organising consortia of IARCs to cater to the total needs of major farming systems.

(d) Assist the national research systems by organising training programmes in the area of management of agricultural research.

(e) Arrange for periodic meetings of leaders of national research systems of developing countries; and

(f) Respond speedily to specific requests from time to time. The headquarters of such a Service should preferably be in a developing country.

Gaps in ecological coverage of IARCs is not so important.

(g) Funding national research systems. The financial needs of the joint work plans of national systems and IARCs as well as of the regional networks could be met by members of CGIAR, bilateral or multilateral donors, as well as UN agencies. The International Fund for Agricultural Development should also consider providing funds to national research systems for implementing the Joint Work Plans and operational research projects."
Statement of Scandinavian Delegations on ICIPE

We would like to make suggestions as to whether there are any actions by the CGIAR Secretariat which might facilitate approval of additional funds to ICIPE. That is on point 3(v) in the document of October 20, 1977 about ICIPE circulated by the Secretariat of the International Consultative Group.

The Scandinavian countries share the views expressed in the document from the Secretariat that ICIPE performs research of high quality with relevance to urgent development needs, including aspects of the problems that the centers within the CG system deal with. ICIPE also has a particularly important role and potential for the formation and strengthening of capacity for problem-oriented basic research in Africa. These achievements and functions of ICIPE are decisive motives for a substantial support from Denmark, Norway and Sweden to its activities.

The foreseen total pledges to ICIPE for 1978 and beyond seem, as has been pointed out by the Secretariat, to fall far below the requirements presented in the revised budget.

The programs that ICIPE has agreed to undertake in collaboration with some of the CG centers will be funded by special contributions through the respective centers. We welcome this emerging cooperation between ICIPE and the CG centers. We are, however, worried that the foreseen serious shortfall in the funding of ICIPE's core operating expenditure will make it difficult for ICIPE to meet the expectations of the centers and at the same time continue to carry out its other important tasks.

It's becoming obvious that it's no longer possible for the present ICIPE donors to meet the requirements for core operating funding and necessary
capital development. The Inter-Agency Group referred to in the consensus of the September meeting of the CG is a very informal group and it is not a consortium that can be expected at least in the short run to raise and coordinate the necessary fund for ICIPE.

In order to identify and facilitate a viable solution to ICIPE's financial and organizational problems the Scandinavian countries propose that the group should ask the Secretariat to continue during 1978 to take an active part in consultations on ICIPE.

Other parties in these consultations will be those in the so-called Inter-Agency Group that is UNDP, other present and potential ICIPE donors, African countries, possibly some other developing countries and ICIPE itself. Furthermore, the Scandinavian countries propose that the CG Secretariat shall report on the progress of these consultations to the group during centers week in 1978.

The essence of this statement is that the Scandinavian countries ask the other CG members to recognize that ICIPE is an international institute engaged in problem-oriented basic research of high potential relevance to economic and social development. The international community including African countries therefore should share the responsibility for the funding of ICIPE and also participate in the guidance of its activities.

As to the future formal relations between ICIPE and the CG, the Scandinavian countries are prepared to take a pragmatic view and we want to encourage other donors to do the same. Some kind of a closer association between ICIPE and the CG might be necessary in order to provide ICIPE with a firmer base for its work and development and to facilitate for some donors to contribute to the center.

Finally, the Scandinavian countries urge the donors present at this meeting and also developing countries to make all possible efforts to contribute to ICIPE already for its activities during 1978.
### ANNEX IV

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

**TENTATIVE ESTIMATED 1978 FINANCIAL ALLOCATIONS**

| DONOR                | TOTAL | CIAT | CIMMYT | CIF | ICRISAT | ITTA | IRRI | ILCA | ILRAD | GENES | NARDA | ICARDA | Unallocated |
|----------------------|-------|------|--------|-----|---------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-------------|
| Arab Fund            | .310  |      |        |     |         |      |      |      |       |       |       |       | .310      |
| Asian Dev. Bank      | .500  |      |        |     |         |      |      |      |       |       |       |       | .500      |
| Australia            | 2.750 | .130 | .145   | .200| .440    | .115 | .710 | .140 | .200  | .080  | .340  | .030    |            |
| Belgium              | 2.415 | .130 | .240   | .060| .930    | .150 | .510 | .105 | .060  | .120  | .060  | .030    |            |
| Canada               | 7.620 | 1.000| 1.835  | .545| .820    | 1.090| 1.090| .500 | .140  | .275  | .275  | .030    |            |
| Denmark              | .750  |      | .180   | .315|         |      |      | .085 | .170  |       |       |         |            |
| EEC                  | 2.240 |      |        |     |         |      | 1.120| 1.120|       |       |       |         |            |
| Ford Found.          | 1.000 | .200 | .100   |     | .450    | .100 |      |       |       | .150  |       |         |            |
| France               | .400  |      |        |     |         |      |      | .200 | .100  |       |       | .100    |            |
| IIB                  | 6.200 | 2.650| 2.850  | .700|         |      |      |      |       |       |       |         |            |
| IDBG                 | 1.395 |      | .050   | .160| .640    |      |      |      |       |       |       | .565    |            |
| Iran                 | 2.000 |      | .100   |     | .300    | .250 | .350 |      |       |       |       | 1.000   |            |
| Italy                | .130  |      |        |     |         |      |      |       |       |       |       |         | .130      |
| Japan                | 3.500 | .200 | .300   |     | .400    | .150 | 2.300|       |       | .150  |       |         | .150      |
| Netherlands          | .120  | .320 | .320   |     |         |      |      |       |       |       |       |         |            |
| Norway               | 1.650 | .200 | .275   | .150| .300    | .150 | .150 | .100 | .100  | .175  | .075  | .120    | .120      |
| Switzerland          | .025  |      |        |     | .025    |      |      |       |       |       |       |         |            |
| Switzerland          | .615  |      |        |     | .385    | .155 |      |      |       |       |       |         |            |
| Sweden               | 2.000 | .220 | .320   | .420| .400    | .400 | .120 | .120 |       |       |       |         |            |
| United Kingdom       | 1.250 | .300 | .400   |     | .250    | .300 |      |      |       |       |       |         |            |
| Rockefeller          | .270  | .220 | .615   | .755| .150    | .300 | .310 | .220 | .320  |       |       |         |            |
| Sweden               | 1.270 | .100 | .200   | .200| .200    | .220 | .300 | .150 | .150  | .100  |       |         |            |
| United Kingdom       | 4.795 | .355 | .385   | .430| .720    | .840 | 1.055| .355 | .190  |       |       |         | .115      |
| U.S.                 | 4.135 | 1.860| 1.115  | .440| .720    |      |      |      |       |       |       |         |            |
| United States        | 2.600 | 2.000| .150   | .775| .075    |      |      |       |       |       |       |         |            |
| World Bank           | 4.681 | .350 | .100   | .225| .300    | .150 | .300 | .100 | .100  |       |       |         |            |

**Notes:**

1. In a number of cases a donor's contribution, or its allocation, is subject to legislative or similar approval.
2. Actual payment of contributions takes place at various times during the year. For presentation in this table, however, all contributions have been converted to U.S. dollars at exchange rates prevailing on December 31, 1977.
3. The "Total Estimated Availability" shown in this table is estimated to be adequate to cover the budgets of the centers as approved in November 1977. Exchange fluctuations during the course of the year and other unforeseeable events can, however, alter this estimate significantly.
4. The World Bank's contribution is made in two tranches, one in February and the second in September. The figures in the table are tentative estimates of the sum of both tranches. The February tranche will be about $5.7 million. The amount of the second tranche will be determined in September after the Bank, as donor of last resort, has reviewed the residual needs of the centers at that time.