From: The Secretariat

February 1, 1983

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research held its regular yearly meeting, International Centers Week, from November 8-12, 1982, in Washington, D.C.

2. Crop Protection. The Group approved TAC's recommendation, based on a technical study, that no separate entity to handle crop protection research should be established within the CG system. TAC recommended that crop protection can best be handled as an integral part of the centers' crop management improvement programs and their existing farming systems research programs. TAC drew the attention of those financing crop protection research programs to the need to maintain and expand their support. The technical study would serve as a major input in the broader review of the priorities and pattern of resource allocation within the CG system that TAC is about to undertake.

3. Plant Breeders' Rights. TAC recommended that: (i) the centers should establish a complete description of the semi-finished varieties that they distribute and publicize this information widely when making it available to the national offices granting plant varieties' certificates. This information should be accompanied by small samples of seeds as a reference for these offices; (ii) the national offices involved should, in consultation with the centers, when possible, elaborate regulations and procedures to prevent misappropriation of the centers' products; and (iii) the centers should review their employment contracts with their...
personnel to prevent breeders seeking exclusive rights on the improved material which they develop as an integral part of the centers' programs. The Group agreed that legislation to protect plant breeders' rights would be difficult to enact in many developing countries because of the lack of relevant infrastructure.

4. Future External Reviews. TAC reviewed and approved existing guidelines for External Reviews (previously known as Quinquennial Reviews). The Board of Trustees and the center's management would, in future, be asked to submit statements to the Group on the review team's conclusions. TAC would supplement the External Review with its own analysis of the role of the center in the system as a whole.

5. IRRI Quinquennial Review. The main recommendation of the Review Panel and of TAC was that there should not be any reduction in the level of resources provided to IRRI and that ways and means should be found to increase financing of some of IRRI's activities. The QQR Panel's other findings were that: (i) IRRI's mandate, should be reinterpreted to achieve a better balance between basic and applied research; (ii) as countries were growing in capability, they were starting to require more "scientific servicing" than technology itself. The panel questioned what the future role of IRRI should be in terms of providing this scientific servicing; (iii) IRRI, which under its mandate now works mainly in Asia, should consider serving more directly the needs of Africa and Latin America; (iv) IRRI should concentrate on farmers in Asia who are now requesting assistance in developing farming systems, but other centers and institutions should be assisting farmers in developing such cropping and farming systems elsewhere, particularly in Africa; (v) IRRI should continue to improve relationships with developing countries through more intensive consultation and the relationship between IRRI and other centers should be better delineated than had been the case to date; (vi) the position of coordinator of upland rice studies should be established in IRRI; and (vii) IRRI should be attributed the leadership of work in rice research worldwide.

6. Funding Issues. The Group approved the programs and budgets of the centers that had been recommended by TAC -- subject to availability of funding. The core expenditures of the centers for 1983, within a financial bracket, were approved as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centers</th>
<th>Brackets (US$ Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Core Expenditures</td>
<td>178.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The Group also recorded its approval of the five-year indicative financial plan, shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Basic Operational Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations at 1983 level and working capital adjustment</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated increase to bring all centers to an approved level and standard of operations.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Capital Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated capital requirements including building requirements of ICARDA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Provision for Accelerated Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage real growth on previous year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Operations only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Special Projects. The CG Secretariat was asked to obtain better information on special projects from the centers. TAC will then be asked to review them on their merits to decide whether any of them could be included in the core budget.

9. Impact Study. The Group approved the initiative of the Swedish delegation that a study to determine the impact of the research work of the system on developing countries should be organized by the CG Secretariat. Several donors offered to contribute financially or in kind.

10. Funding Studies. Various suggestions were made by donors about funding issues that require study.

11. King Baudouin International Agricultural Research Award. The Award was established with the money from the King Baudouin International Development Prize, received by the Group in 1980. On the recommendation of TAC, IRRI became the first recipient of the award for its work on IR-36.
12. Appointments. The Chairman of the Group, Mr. Warren C. Baum, announced his intention of retiring at the end of International Centers Week in 1983. His successor would be selected from among the World Bank's Senior Management, after consultation with members of the CG. Mr. Curtis Farrar succeeded Mr. Michael L. Lejeune as Executive Secretary of the CG Secretariat at the end of the 1982 meeting. Mr. Philippe Mahler, Executive Secretary of TAC, took on other responsibilities on December 1, 1982.

13. Time and Place of Next Meeting. The mid-term meeting will be held in Paris from May 25-27, 1983 and International Centers Week from October 31-November 4, 1983 in Washington, D.C.
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Annex I: List of Participants
1. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research held its regular yearly meeting (International Centers Week - ICW) from November 8-12, 1982, in Washington, D.C. During the first two days of the week and part of the morning of November 10, the Plenary Session took place, during which the international agricultural research centers made presentations on their programs and activities. The remainder of the week was devoted to a business meeting of the Consultative Group. This paper sets out the main conclusions reached and decisions taken at the Group Meeting from November 10-12. A List of the Participants is attached as Annex I.

2. The Secretariat is issuing this paper as an expanded version of the traditional Main Conclusions paper, and, instead of issuing an Informal Summary of Proceedings, will make available on request a transcript of the proceedings on microfiche.

Chairman's Opening Remarks

3. In his opening remarks the Chairman indicated that the CGIAR was facing a time of change, particularly in that financial constraints were increasingly apparent. However, a positive aspect of these constraints was that the various parts of the system were working closely together to address common problems and thereby the system was being led into a greater interdependence. A negative aspect of the constraints was reflected in the Group's decision at the May Meeting in Paris that an institute for irrigation water management should not be created within the Group at this time because of lack of additional sources of financing. Furthermore, the restraint on expenditures had provoked two painful budget cutting sessions in 1982 which had resulted in a substantial paring down of the centers' original budget proposals. Given uncertainties about the ultimate level of contributions from donors in 1983, TAC decided to recommend a bracket of funding for each center. The amount at the top of the bracket was defined as matching the center's requirements as perceived by TAC, and the amount at the bottom being the minimum the center required without grave damage being done to its program. The Chairman pointed out that the level of funding recommended for 1983 had been scaled down progressively in real terms with each revision of the five-year plan approved by the Group over the last four years. Beginning in 1979 the Group approved a budget of $252 million in 1983 dollars but in May 1982 the Group reduced this estimate by 33% to $184 million. The Chairman reported that, unfortunately, present funding indications suggested that only a program of $166 million, i.e. at the bottom of TAC's bracket, could be
financed in 1983. The reasons for this situation were discussed in the Integrative Report circulated at the meeting and were essentially the corroding effect of inflation and the continued strength of the US dollar relative to other currencies contributed by donors.

4. The Chairman announced that he had recently resigned from his position in the World Bank to continue as a Vice President in that organization, but without managerial responsibility. This raised the question of the length of time he would continue to serve as Chairman of the CG. Mr. Baum indicated his belief that rotation in office is essential both for the organization and for the individual concerned. There was no precedent within the CG system that could serve in this case. He indicated, however, that a ten-year period was normally a reasonable maximum for service in an office of this kind and his tenth year as Chairman would be completed in 1983. Mr. Baum mentioned that the new Chairman of TAC had been installed relatively recently and that the Executive Secretaries of the Group and of TAC were about to change. Therefore, he would step down as Chairman at the end of Centers Week in 1983 when the new team would be well established. On the question of his succession, Mr. Baum stated that in 1971 when the Group was established the members agreed that the World Bank would provide the Chairman and Executive Secretariat, with FAO providing the technical Secretariat and that the three cosponsors, i.e. the World Bank, UNDP and FAO, would share the cost of TAC and the TAC Secretariat. Mr. Baum announced on behalf of the Bank that his successor would be selected from among the Bank’s senior management and that there would be consultation with the interested parties of the CG before a selection was made.

Report By TAC Chairman on 28th Meeting of TAC

5. Professor Camus, appearing for the first time as TAC Chairman, gave a report on the 28th TAC Meeting held at CIMMYT in June 1982 and on the 29th Meeting held in Washington in the week prior to ICW. Professor Camus stated that TAC had coped with its multiple commitments and enlarged responsibilities by meeting three times in 1982. The Chairman paid tribute to the Center Directors for their cooperation with TAC. He also reported that the interaction between TAC and the Boards of Trustees of the centers was increasing; such meetings normally took place on the occasions of the Quinquennial Reviews (QQR’s) but in November TAC had its first joint meeting with the Chairmen of the Boards. This interaction was essential for TAC to be able adequately to advise the CG on the pattern of allocation of resources according to scientific priorities and the changing needs of the developing countries. TAC had performed its short term function of advising on the best method of accommodating centers’ budget requests within the amount of funding expected to be available, through the program reviews. However, the Committee was concerned with the longer term and was engaged in a process of reassessment of the overall priorities and strategies of the system. After ten years of operation, a global reassessment was a normal exercise. Priorities were last examined by the Group in 1979 in the context of an entirely different financial situation. Changes in financial trends since then had been rapid and the system had not had enough time to adjust smoothly and rationally to the new circumstances. The marginal adjustments to programs which have taken place at the time of
budget reviews by TAC have forced centers to sort out internal priorities but only in the short term. However, a major global assessment of the priorities of the system can only be done through Quinquennial Reviews, and through multiple consultations and general studies which cannot be carried out in a short-term perspective. Professor Camus announced that at the recent TAC Meeting a decision had been taken to pursue the following studies:

(i) A reassessment of the priorities among the ongoing activities of the system aimed at a sharper identification of the key areas, commodities, regions and functional tasks on which the CG system should now concentrate;

(ii) A survey of the centers' mandates and a study of the present interpretation given to them. The Board Chairmen were also to concentrate on this subject and Professor Camus looked forward to a fruitful exchange between TAC and the Chairmen;

(iii) A review of the changing relationships of the centers and the national programs in developing countries. The purpose will be to reexamine the comparative advantages of the centers in the short and long term, to identify their continuing functions, and to examine mechanisms of cooperation between the national programs and the centers.

TAC had commissioned a series of discussion papers on these three topics from its own membership and hoped that these studies would provide the basis for some general principles which TAC would then submit to the Group. Then TAC would undertake the formulation of proposals for a gradual restructuring and streamlining of the system, to make it more responsive both to the future needs of developing countries and to the general policy trends which the Group supports.

6. Crop Protection. Professor Camus referred to a TAC document distributed in advance of the Group Meeting under the covering note ICW/82/27. A technical report prepared by Professor J. Hirst was followed by consultations with the centers. Two main conclusions emerged from the study. The first is that there should be no separate initiative on crop protection within the CG system; TAC's recommendation is that the subject, which is well covered by the existing centers, can best be handled as an integral part of their crop management improvement programs and their existing farming systems research programs. The corollary to this conclusion is that TAC recognized the wide diversity of specialized research activities and services in crop protection which should complement the work of the centers, but could not identify a single institution which could meet by itself the multiple demands of the centers for basic research on these activities and services. TAC wanted to draw the attention of those financing crop protection research programs to the need to maintain and expand their support. This study would serve as a major input in the broader review of the priorities and pattern of resource allocation within the CG system that TAC is about to undertake.
Several speakers supported the TAC recommendation that a separate entity should not be created for crop protection. The UK representative offered the services of UK specialized institutions to the centers at no extra cost to them; his government would be open to suggestions for a project to be funded in addition to its core budget pledge. The delegate from the IDRC also stated that the Government of Canada at the time of the UNCTAD Meeting established a special fund to support research in Canada directly related to the opportunities and problems of developing countries and had begun programs with CIMMYT and ICARDA. Mr. Hulse stated that he had written to all the Directors General of the centers inviting them to advise on specific actions that might be undertaken. Dr. Bommer added his support to the TAC recommendations and stated that as a result of FAO initiatives various collaborations between the national and international centers were underway, particularly those supported by the Government of the Netherlands. A global program supported by UNEP on integrative pest management was an activity that was closely coordinated with the work of the centers. In addition UNDP supports the strengthening of national plant protection services in which the major target region is Africa. Dr. Bommer also reported that the FAO had looked into the question of plant quarantine regulations applied by the centers and the national systems. In general, conditions had been discovered to be satisfactory but at the same time the Center Directors had requested further assistance -- particularly with two national systems -- to update procedures and to make sure that the spread of disease is contained. Furthermore, the Committee of Agriculture of FAO will discuss an overall strategy in plant protection at its March 1983 meeting.

8. **Plant Breeders' Rights.** The TAC statement on this subject was issued under covering note ICW/82/26 and also consists of supporting technical documents, including the conclusions and recommendations of the TAC workshop on the subject and the report of the consultants. Professor Camus expressed his appreciation to the individual experts and the FAO, which hosted the TAC workshop under the Chairmanship of Dr. Bommer. Professor Camus stressed that the Committee had confined itself to a study of the implication of plant breeders' rights legislation on the work of the centers' and on the CGIAR system as a whole. The major concern of the CGIAR had been the possible risk of misappropriation by private interests of material developed by the centers with public funds. The study concludes that under existing legislation this risk is confined to the semi-finished varieties that the centers distribute through their cooperative networks. TAC had three recommendations to avoid this risk:

(i) The centers should establish a complete description of the semi-finished varieties that they distribute and publicize this information widely when making it available to the national offices granting plant varieties' certificates. This information should be accompanied by small samples of seeds as a reference for these offices;

(ii) It is desirable that the national offices involved should, in consultation with the centers, elaborate regulations and procedures to prevent misappropriation of the centers' products;
(iii) The centers should review their employment contracts with their personnel to prevent breeders seeking exclusive rights on the improved material which they develop as an integral part of the centers' programs.

9. TAC did not have any evidence that existing legislation had limited the freedom of movement of genetic material and had accelerated genetic erosion. Such risks were serious ones and deserve continuous monitoring, particularly as regards the free movement of genetic material which is vital to the success of international breeding programs. The IBPGR had commissioned a study which indicated that the risk of genetic erosion is inherent in breeding programs and in the extension of high-yielding varieties in developed and developing countries with or without plant breeders' rights legislation. Finally, in its statement on plant breeders' rights related to the centers activities, TAC indicated the additional costs involved in taking the preventive measures recommended above and requested the Group to assess whether the risk of misappropriation of semi-finished varieties by private interests warranted these additional expenditures.

10. A rather lengthy discussion followed the TAC Chairman's presentation in which there was considerable agreement that legislation to protect plant breeders' rights would be difficult to enact in many developing countries now, because the necessary infrastructure was not yet in place. Dr. Havener reported that CIMMYT and at least two other centers have now incorporated into their employment contracts a condition that all plant genetic material which results from employment activities at the center is the property of the center and may not be patented by or the patent rights claimed by the employee. In response to a question about the practice in international organizations, Dr. Bommer noted that the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) deals primarily with patent rights' questions. Secondly, Dr. Bommer reported that the intergovernmental Body on Science and Technology discussed commercialization of publicly funded research results. The current discussion in the UN should lead to more clarity on this matter. Mr. Mashler reported that the issue had arisen for UNDP on several occasions particularly when veterinary vaccines and chemotherapies had been developed. The UN adopted the position that UNDP as a cofinancier is assisting governments in their activities, therefore any patentable materials are the property of the governments who receive the assistance. The UNDP urged recipient governments to make these patents available to the broadest spectrum of other countries who might benefit from them under mutually agreed arrangements. A decision will be taken by the World Health Assembly on patent rights at the recommendation of the Director General of WHO in the near future. Mr. Mashler pointed out that when the ILRAD charter was being drawn up a provision was included that the Board should decide in the first place who owned the vaccines and should make a recommendation to the Group on the policy issue. So far this had not been done and Mr. Mashler suggested that the ILRAD mandate might ultimately assist the Group in taking decisions with regard to the crops research centers. Mr. Mashler said that he would report back to the Group on the outcome of discussions in WHO.
11. Future External Reviews. Professor Camus explained that the term External Review will replace the standard terminology of Quinquennial Review, in accordance with the recommendations of the Second Review Committee. TAC had reviewed the guidelines for these reviews and considered them broad enough to cover the scientific aspects as well as other aspects such as mandates, priorities, long-term plans, etc. TAC had, however, suggested that the document submitted to the CGIAR giving the Review Team's conclusions, should also include a statement of the Board of Trustees and the center's management on the recommendations. In future TAC would be prepared to submit to the Group a statement giving its view of the relationship of a center with other centers and the establishment of priorities among centers, entailing possible changes in mandates, with a list of the main policy issues for the Group's consideration. Such work, however, can only be carried out by TAC after studies such as commodity reviews are completed. Therefore, a revised paper on External Reviews incorporating this particular recommendation will be submitted to the May Meeting of the CG for comment and approval. The second question on External Reviews concerns training. Material is presently being assembled for TAC's review at its next meeting, after which Professor Camus hoped that a proposal would be ready which would describe the methodology to be used to examine the whole question of training by the centers.

12. TAC's Future Program. Professor Camus reported that in 1983 TAC would pursue questions related to the review of priorities within the system and proposals for a closer integration and coordination of the activities of the system. Four External Reviews would be carried out in 1983 compared with two in 1982, since these reviews are essential elements in the reassessment of priorities. The review of CIP will be carried out in February, that of ICARDA in April, WARDA and IITA will follow during the summer and fall of 1983. The study of training activities will be on TAC's agenda in March. Professor Camus warned however, that if TAC were forced to make further downward adjustments of the 1983 programs and budgets of the centers, then it would be extremely difficult at the March meeting to give due time and attention to strategic and priority issues. One speaker questioned whether a centralized institute dealing mainly in research in its broadest sense was the most appropriate concept for some of the areas of activity of the CGIAR. Support was expressed for the proposal to evaluate the mandates and the internal priorities of the centers. Another speaker raised the question of the coordination of activities not only among the family of the CGIAR but with other agencies. A speaker noted the extremely heavy workload for TAC in 1983 and suggested that the priorities should be strategic considerations and a continuing attention to the External Reviews.

IRRI Quinquennial Review

13. The Chairman pointed out that IRRI is one of the older centers and that the QQR undertaken in September and October 1981 by a panel appointed by TAC was IRRI's second QQR. The draft report was discussed by the Board of IRRI at a meeting in March 1982 and the report was considered by TAC at its 28th Meeting in June 1982. The Chairman reminded the participants that concern had been expressed in the past by the Center
Directors, by TAC and by the Group itself, that insufficient time and attention had been given to QQR's. There had also been complaints that there is over frequent review of centers. The Chairman indicated that if enough time and attention were given to a QQR -- as was being done at this meeting -- the donors should be able to become thoroughly briefed on a particular center and should raise whatever questions they might have about the programs, budgets, mandate, management, quality and type of scientific research and so forth. As a result everybody present at the meeting should be able to make informed recommendations to their authorities about the level of funding of that center not only in the coming year but also for a series of future years. The presentation was divided into several parts: the review panel report was presented by its Chairman, Dr. Almiro Blumenschein; Professor Camus gave TAC's views on the panel report; Dr. Clarence Gray, Chairman of IRRI's Board, gave the Boards comments; and Dr. Swaminathan, the Director General of IRRI commented on the QQR and also discussed IRRI's program for 1983 and beyond. These presentations were followed by a general discussion by the Group.

14. Dr. Blumenschein pointed out that the QQR panel had not been qualified to look at the role of IRRI in the CGIAR system as a whole, but the panel recognized that this would have been an important part of their terms of reference. The panel was very much impressed by IRRI's achievements in developing new knowledge and in the fields of genetics, of soil fertility and physiology. The panel noted that one or two of the countries it visited were now already exporting rice and other countries were just reaching the point of self sufficiency in rice production. Farmers and the authorities in the countries visited recognized that IRRI had made a good contribution to these successes. Some of the socioeconomic impact of IRRI's work was also visible in the improved living conditions and increased numbers of jobs on farms and in the villages. The panel had also been impressed by IRRI's achievement in strengthening national research programs through effective training programs all over Asia. These former trainees are now developing their own training programs. The panel particularly noted the participation of countries of the area in the planning and development of the research program of IRRI, and noted that the relationship was moving from cooperation to collaboration and that countries were now taking initiatives and not just receiving suggestions. The conclusion was that the money invested in IRRI had received an impressive return. The panel did wish to draw attention to the fact that countries that were benefiting most from IRRI were the ones who recognized the importance of research and were themselves supporting their own national programs. Dr. Blumenschein listed the panel's main findings:

(i) The panel felt that IRRI's mandate should be reinterpreted to achieve a better balance between basic and applied research;

(ii) The panel noted that as countries were growing in capability, they were starting to require more "scientific servicing" than technology itself. The panel questioned what the future role of IRRI should be in terms of providing this scientific servicing;
(iii) While IRRI's mandate states that it should work mainly for Asia, the panel recommended that IRRI consider serving more directly the needs of Africa and Latin America;

(iv) IRRI should concentrate on farmers in Asia who are now requesting assistance in developing farming systems, but other centers and other institutions should be assisting farmers in developing such cropping and farming systems elsewhere, particularly in Africa;

(v) The panel recommended that IRRI continue to improve relationships with developing countries through more intensive consultation; two members of the panel recommended that IRRI should more clearly state its position on cooperation with national programs in developing countries outside Asia. In the same vein the panel recommended that the relationship between IRRI and CIAT, WARDA, IITA and other institutions outside the system should be better delineated than had been the case to date;

(vi) The panel had carried out a special analysis of upland rice at the request of TAC and it recommended that the position of coordinator of upland rice studies be established in IRRI;

(vii) IRRI should be attributed the leadership of work in rice research worldwide.

The panel recognized that some of their recommendations would increase IRRI's expenditures and require more financial support. However, it was hoped that financial constraints were temporary and that some economic studies, as also projects for water management and irrigation, could be supported by special projects -- simply a matter of convenience.

15. Professor Camus stated that during the preparation of IRRI's second QQR, several members of the Group asked TAC about the possibility of IRRI reducing its research program to a maintenance level, given the considerable impact IRRI had already had on irrigated rice production. The Review Panel found that in order to sustain the gains in production from increased yield and resistance to pest and disease, the research problems of the second and third generation of the plant were often more complex and more difficult to solve than those which were faced in making the first major advances in developing high-yielding varieties. TAC fully shared the view that while some aspects of the essential basic research should be addressed by specialized institutions, many others should be investigated by the institute itself. The main implication is that no reduction in the level of resources provided to IRRI is recommended. On the contrary, TAC recommended that ways and means be found to strengthen IRRI's activities in some areas. TAC has requested the Board and Directorate of IRRI to consider a revision of the basic functional tasks of its mandate and their geographic scope, in relation to the work of other centers and national programs. The committee, however, realized that this review will have to
be conducted in the broader framework of an External Review of the respective roles of CIAT, IITA, WAKUA and other institutions in rice research, particularly as regards upland rice. The long-term plan was delayed because of changes in management and will be affected by several of the recommendations of the panel. TAC will, therefore, examine a later version of IRRI's long-term plan during the course of 1983.

16. Dr. Gray, Chairman of the IRRI Board, announced that in October 1982 the Trustees approved changes in the Articles of Incorporation and the Bylaws which have been filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission of the Republic of the Philippines. One of the changes provides for election of three trustees from the CGIAR. Dr. Gray reported that IRRI had in process a management study to advise the Board and the staff on organizational matters and on the administrative and financial management of the institution.

17. Dr. Swaminathan outlined plans for the three major rice growing environments, which had received detailed consideration from the QQR, and which the Program and Executive Committees of the Board, together with IRRI management, had prepared for IRRI's third decade. The review team recommended that IRRI should carry forward its program to increase the yield potential of rice under irrigated conditions. Because rice is probably the only cereal which is 99% used as human food and is grown under diverse conditions of soil, climate and altitude, the Review Panel recommended that IRRI concentrate on the problem of improving productivity under more adverse growing conditions, i.e. under purely rainfed unbunded conditions of cultivation in upland areas and in the other extreme of moisture excess in lowland areas. The third program target concerns problem soils. Dr. Swaminathan also underlined the need for conservation of genetic resources. He announced that jointly with IBPGR there would be a meeting in April to decide how best to accelerate the pace of collection to meet the target of about 100,000 varieties by 1985. After discussing progress being made in increasing the yield of different varieties of irrigated rice, Dr. Swaminathan turned to upland rice and stated that the meeting at Bouake in the Ivory Coast had been successful. It was his expectation that TAC would take up the recommendations of the Bouake Meeting at a subsequent date for in-depth examination. Dr. Swaminathan announced that recently the President of the Republic of the Philippines had presented IRRI on the occasion of World Food Day with 100 hectares of land in an area where the growing conditions were more typical of the conditions for upland rice cultivation. He promised that IRRI would try to implement the recommendations of the QQR team to the extent possible.

18. The discussion on the QQR was a lengthy one with many speakers intervening. A main concern of the Group was IRRI's mandate, particularly concerning its concentration on Asia and on irrigated rice. The discussion centered on the most effective mechanisms for interrelating and coordinating rice research at IRRI with that at CIAT, IITA and WARDA. The Group agreed that precise definitions and changes in IRRI's mandate and work program would have to await the External Reviews planned for IITA and WARDA at the end of 1983. Only at that time would TAC have the information with which to make judgements on these very important questions. The second
area of concern was the relationship between IRRI and national research systems. Several speakers indicated that they considered that the international centers in general should better define the areas in which they have a comparative advantage over the national systems and should transfer all other activities to those national systems. Dr. Swaminathan emphasized that the philosophy of IRRI was that work with the national research systems was on a partnership basis. Some donors raised questions concerning the predominance of IR-36 in rice plantings in Asia. They worried about a possible over-concentration on IR-36 and its vulnerability to disease and pests. Dr. Swaminathan told the Group that the responsibility for varietal release and multiplication, and extension services, was entirely with the national research systems, but that IRRI continually requested the national research systems to ensure that there is a diversity in varietal pattern. For example, the Philippines was now divided into eight trial regions and IRRI had requested the national system to identify -- in addition to varieties with general adaptation -- those with local adaptation, to achieve a mixture of the two. Several speakers were concerned that the rice genebank should be a high priority in IRRI's program and were assured by the Director General that it was. Other speakers were disappointed that the QQR had not specifically covered management questions but the Director General announced that the Board had already arranged for a separate management review of IRRI. Some discussion took place, which Dr. Swaminathan said he would report to his Board, on the question of patenting of IRRI designs for seeds, machines, azolla, etc. Dr. Swaminathan tended to believe that an open door policy provided benefits to the recipients which would not be offset by the small revenues that would be obtained from the sales of these patents. Certain donors were concerned about the implication of the QQR team that IRRI's budget should be allowed to expand even to the detriment of other centers. More than one donor expressed the view that there should be an internal reallocation of priorities and of work programs rather than an increase in funding. All the speakers congratulated IRRI on its performance and the QQR team and Dr. Blumenschein as Chairman for the quality of the report. Dr. Swaminathan's presentation was singled out for special praise.

Report by Chairman of Center Board Chairmen

19. Dr. Sen, Chairman of the Board of IFPRI and Chairman of the Center Board Chairmen, reported on the meeting of the Center Board Chairmen that had taken place prior to International Centers Week. Dr. Sen summarized five resolutions which had been passed. The first recommendation related to Recommendation 9B of the Second Review Committee. The Committee of Board Chairmen believe that management reviews should be conducted on a regular basis and should be a matter for individual Boards; the CG Secretariat should be involved only if specifically requested to provide the review facilities for a particular Board. The second resolution referred to Recommendation 12 of the Second Review Committee. This recommendation called on the CGIAR Secretariat to help with the planning, conduct and assessment of management reviews or audits which the Boards initiate; the Committee of Board Chairmen believed that a full time management specialist was not needed within the Secretariat. Rather, priority should be given to developing a capacity to help direct and
articulate the economic and social impact of the work of the centers, since the Committee believed that funding problems arose from lack of attention by the Secretariat and individual centers to the question of impact. The third resolution related to Recommendations 15 and 16 of the Second Review Committee in which it had been agreed that the CG Secretariat would consult with a small advisory group on mutually acceptable methods of consultation between the Boards and the Group on important matters of policy. The Center Board Chairmen stated their wish to consider and comment on the draft discussion paper before it was given wider circulation. The fourth resolution relates to Recommendation 17 and states that it is the responsibility of the Boards to ensure that their members are informed of their responsibilities on accepting appointment and that suitable documentation should be available on the CGIAR system as a whole. The Board Chairmen want to have an opportunity to review the draft of the proposed handbook to be prepared by the CG Secretariat. The fifth resolution states "the Committee of Board Chairmen discussed longer-term funding prospects for the CGIAR system and the need to identify and generate new sources of income. Since current rules penalize centers which generate such funds by taking a dollar away for each new dollar generated independently, the Committee recommends that such penalties should be dropped."

20. One speaker stated that Dr. Sen's concepts were unacceptable in that the donors had the responsibility to be accountable to their parliaments for the resources provided to the system. The major part of the discussion on Dr. Sen's comments took place during the discussion on Recommendation 9 under the presentation of the report "Progress on Implementation of Recommendations of the Second Review Committee" (see paragraph 24). The Group endorsed the Second Review Committee's recommendation that a management review be systematically included in the QQR. One speaker noted that the results of the management review would carry more weight with donors if the review was part of the QQR and had been discussed by the Group, than if such a review had been carried out by the Board.

Report by Chairman of Center Directors

21. Dr. Havener, representing the Center Directors, reported on the meetings of the Center Directors held the previous week. He pointed out that as their Chairman he could speak as a Center Director but not necessarily for the Center Directors as a whole, because each of the institutes is an autonomous institution with its own governing body and its own management. Dr. Havener provided the Group with an analysis which he had carried out of the Boards of Trustees. The Boards represented 64 nationalities; of those nationalities, 14 were from developed country market economies and 50 from countries of the developing world. As far as numbers were concerned some 40% of Trustees are from developed market economies and approximately 60% from the developing world. This latter group broke down as follows: 27% from the Middle East and North Africa; 19% from Latin America, 18% from Asia; 36% from Africa South of the Sahara.

22. Dr. Havener stated that the Center Directors as a group had been through a difficult time in paring down operating budgets and in releasing staff, but nevertheless the donors had provided the centers with
good financial and moral support and the centers were still able to do important and useful work. For the first time the Center Directors had met three times that year, in January, June and November. Most of the items on the Center Directors' agenda were described as routine housekeeping chores but some new items had been added on which the Chairman of the Center Directors asked for advice and assistance. In the first place, these related to the possible sale of publications, goods, services and seeds in order to increase the center's income and conserve resources. The second item concerned approaches to cross-center and cross system information and publicity services in order to enhance the system's visibility. Another item had been the appropriate role of nutrition in the research agendas of the international centers. Dr. Havener reported that the Consortium for Development of Africa (CDA) had discussed with many donors, who were represented at the CG meetings, ways of strengthening agricultural research institutions and the appropriate role of CG centers in that process. Another item concerned issues related to plant quarantine and the safe and efficient movement of genetic materials across national boundaries and regional boundaries. The implementation of the recommendations of the Second Review Committee Report were reviewed and, with the assistance of IDRC, further consideration was given to the data and information transfer network between centers, between their regional operations and with national programs.

23. The Center Directors were asked by TAC to reflect on issues of strategic importance for the center system. A subsequent discussion was held with TAC. Following points were made:

(i) Dr. Havener reported that the Center Directors were pleased that the Second Review Committee had said for the first time -- categorically -- that the centers have a permanent role to play in the network of international agricultural science and technology and development. Dr. Havener stated that the centers needed time to review their long term functions, particularly their comparative advantage in an international network where national programs are constantly changing, new technology is becoming available, new systems of germplasm are becoming available, etc.;

(ii) The Center Directors concurred with the notion that it was time to look again at their mandates. While the Board of Trustees could update their interpretation of their mandates, they could not determine what the mandate of another center ought to be. Therefore, it must be the role of TAC to advise, and the system finally to decide, on appropriate mandates for the centers;

(iii) The Center Directors believed that there was a need to explore and clarify several management issues relating to the appropriate roles of the Secretariats, and the role of the donor of last resort in allocating resources;
(iv) Priorities within the system and within existing centers would have to be addressed, for example, food self-sufficiency versus income generation of peasant cultivators;

(v) Questions of the rights, privileges and obligations of centers in their host countries and in the countries in which they operate needed to be analyzed;

(vi) Patterns or mechanisms that enhance the transfer of technology between the center and countries, and between countries that are a part of the system, need further analysis;

(vii) The issue that has consumed the time of various parts of the system recently has been that of funding. However, there are other issues which require more effective solutions than have currently been found. These concern: (a) the problems of cash flow -- here centers are often borrowing in the local or on international money markets at very high rates of interest to cover short-term cash flow problems; (b) the problem of donor default after a budget has been prepared -- Dr. Havener suggested that there must be a means to assist a center through the transitional period when the default became known; (c) the handling of the budget when unanticipated rates of inflation and changes in exchange rates occur; (d) the question of carry over of funds (there is no incentive in the system today to encourage centers to earn the maximum amount of income possible or to make the maximum amount of savings possible, because all savings and all earned income revert to the system at the end of the year and constitute a deduction from contributions to that center in the following year); (e) the lack of provision for loans for capital development; and (f) financing by the center of payroll and other costs for special projects, since several donors paid for special projects carried out on their behalf only some months after they were completed.

The Center Directors felt that there was a need for some mechanism or special committee to review these problems and to attempt to find solutions. Dr. Havener analyzed the problems implicit in the core unrestricted versus core restricted versus special projects or extra-core type funding. Greater flexibility was obviously required. Dr. Havener believed that the Group itself at a very high level should consider the whole subject of sources of and mechanisms for funding. An increase in the availability of funds was important but equally so was the stability of funding.

24. In the ensuing discussion Dr. Havener was asked whether training was a particularly endangered activity in periods of financing difficulties. Dr. Havener pointed out that if there were a shortfall in the operating budget, training was one of the few items where a Center Director could make an adjustment within a six-month period. Therefore, training was subject to cuts in periods of shortfalls. However, other centers probably were using the same tactics as CIMMYT, in trying to find
special project sources of funding for training to compensate for these cuts in core funding. In response to a question, Dr. Havener stated that a considerable amount of reprogramming took place regularly in individual centers. In CIMMYT there was a reprogramming exercise at the end of each cropping cycle and at least twice a year there was an internal review both across programs and within programs. The Board of Trustees' Program Committee met at least twice every other year and once a year on the odd year for an in-depth look at programs. There was a tendency to talk about programs such as the wheat program at CIMMYT as if it were static; in fact there had recently been a major overhaul in this program, which was a regular feature of the program evaluations that took place.

25. In reference to Dr. Havener's comments on funding issues, Mr. Baum stated that the World Bank tried to keep enough money in reserve to iron-out unevenness among centers and to deal with emergencies. However, there was obviously a trade-off between keeping funds in reserve and making funds available to centers that they could count on during the course of the year. This presented a difficult problem of management. The Center Directors had raised the question as to whether they could access earlier in the year on a loan basis -- funds which were in the World Bank's second tranche. Mr. Baum suggested that the paper on financial issues, which was recommended by the Second Review Committee, should provide some solutions to these broader problems of financing.

Progress on Implementation of Recommendations of the Second Review Committee of the CGIAR

26. The report of the Second Review Committee listed 24 recommendations. These were fully discussed at the Group's meeting in November 1981, when all but one were accepted. At its subsequent meeting in May 1982 the Group discussed progress made in implementing these recommendations. The paper distributed for the November Meeting [ICW/82/20] listed the recommendations in the order they were presented in the Review Committee Report and each recommendation contained notes on what had transpired to date. A summary of the discussion on the main items follows.

27. Recommendation 2: Professor Camus reported that TAC was assembling and collating the documents on training provided by the centers. These would then be discussed with the Center Directors prior to TAC making recommendations on the subject. Recommendation 4: The Chairman asked the relevant parties to note that it was the desire of the Group that there be a central record in the CG Secretariat in writing of agreements that take place between the different centers acting in specific geographic regions. Recommendation 5 and 6: The preparation of lists of research topics of high priority to the centers' programs, which should be circulated widely among donors and research institutions, had made slow progress given the pressure of other business. However, the issue was aired at the meeting in Mexico in June and Professor Camus reported that it was probably not difficult to draw up a list for each center. But to establish priorities across centers was a complex task for which time had not yet been found by TAC. Recommendation 7: The preparation of five-year plans by the centers need to be linked into a five-year plan for the system.
as a whole. Several speakers indicated that the present situation was somewhat fluid since the system of quinquennial reviews, commodity reviews, and across center reviews had not been completed and so far did not enable TAC to make rational recommendations to the Group. Professor Camus recommended that for the time being a pragmatic approach be taken. Given the shortfalls in the funding of the Group's five-year plan, it was extremely difficult to ask centers to adjust their long term plans annually. Only when TAC had completed its consideration of strategic issues for the future would it be possible to establish a master plan which would provide a framework for the composite plans of the centers.

Recommendation 8: The CGIAR Secretariat assisted by consultants as necessary should undertake a comprehensive review of the process of assembling estimates, evaluating competitive demands and deciding on the final allocation of resources. The Chairman of the Group stated that the CG Secretariat intended to do some pretesting of the terms of reference through an informal consultation with interested parties to ensure that the full range of issues would be covered by the study. One delegate requested the Secretariat -- and the Chairman agreed -- to include in the terms of reference the desirability of revising the funding procedures to allow the centers to carry forward at least some small portion of their funding from one year to the next. The delegate from Australia indicated that his government would be willing to participate in kind or otherwise in supporting the resources of the study group. Recommendation 9: The discussion concentrated on item B concerning management reviews of the institution. The Chairman of the Group noted that when the Review Committee made the recommendation it had two separate points in mind. First, that the management adviser, who would be added to the staff of the Secretariat, would be a resource available to the centers at their request to assist them with management problems and, second, that a management review be systematically included in the QQR of a center. Several members of the Group supported this recommendation and its interpretation by the Chairman and indicated that by including a management review regularly the centers would be protected from a series of such reviews by individual donors. Another speaker, while encouraging individual centers to conduct in-house management reviews, noted that the results of a management review would carry more weight with donors if the results had been discussed with the Group, than would such a review carried out by the Board. Professor Camus reminded the Group that in the terms of reference of the QQR item E stated that the team should look at management of the scientific and financial resources of the center and the coordination of its activities. Dr. Cunningham, speaking as a member of the Second Review Committee, recalled that the Committee felt strongly that management reviews were necessary to complement the technical reviews. It was felt that special expertise should be established in the Secretariat, which could be used at the time of the QQR's without overloading the existing members of QQR panels with this task. It was suggested that the terms of reference for such a management review should be sent to all members of the Group so that donors with specific concerns about their own funding process would be enabled to include items in that review of interest to them.

Recommendation 10: After comments that the marathon of a Centers Week with its multiple presentations in a two-day period was unsatisfactory, the Chairman of the Group recommended that the CG Secretariat canvass the members of the Group for suggestions as to how the administrative
arrangements for Centers Week could be improved. The Group agreed that Recommendation 11, dealing with the establishment of a budget review committee, which was turned down by the Group, should be reviewed at Centers Week in 1984. Recommendation 13: The Chairman of the Group reported that a search committee had been established to find a successor to Mr. Lejeune as Executive Secretary of the CG Secretariat. After receiving the advice of that committee, he had selected Mr. Curtis Farrar who would be replacing Mr. Lejeune at the end of the meeting. Professor Camus announced that a search committee had been established to recommend to the Director General of FAO candidates to replace Mr. Philippe Mahler who would be leaving the TAC Secretariat at the end of November. This search committee had been established by FAO and was to be co-chaired by Dr. Bommer and Professor Camus. Recommendation 15: The Chairman of the Group indicated that the draft of the discussion paper on relations between the Boards and the Group would be circulated to the Board Chairmen as well as other members of the Group before it was finalized. Recommendation 18: The study of pension benefits for staff serving in the system had been initiated. The UK representative volunteered his Government's services to discuss any technical problems with the Secretariat -- without any implications as to the subsequent financial follow-up. In the discussion on Recommendation 19, information was requested from members of the Group on women who were suitably qualified for Board membership and for employment in the Centers. The names of appropriate candidates from both developed and developing countries should be forwarded to the CG Secretariat. A representative of a Foundation requested that information be collected by the Secretariat on participation of women in the system, (i.e. with regard to Board membership, staff and training programs), and also shared with members of the Group. Recommendation 20: Mr. Baum announced that UNDP was prepared to contribute seed money of between US$15-20,000 as a one-time initiative, to be used for the travel of representatives from developing countries who attend CGIAR meetings. The total amount that would be required would be in the order of US$40-50,000 and members of the Group were encouraged to contribute to such a fund. One of these representatives pointed out that for the representatives from a region to be effective, they had to be mobile within the region and be able to bring a consensus from the countries about the issues facing the CGIAR. The FAO had implemented the recommendation that the centers involve the regional representatives in the respective regions in their important meetings. No action by the centers is on record. The representative from Australia stated that his Government would be pleased to look at a specific proposal to contribute in a small way towards the cost of these activities. Recommendation 21: Dr. Havener stated that the Center Directors had provided comments to TAC on the training of postdoctoral fellows, their origin, their type of training and the positions to which they return. Dr. Havener commented that the purpose of postdoctoral training had changed over time and increasingly fewer postdoctorals were joining the staff of the centers at which they took postdoctoral training or even joining the staff of other centers. Most of the postdoctoral fellows in the system now were from developing countries. To avoid unduly lengthy absence from their home countries, the postdoctorals in future might be taken in mid-career rather than immediately following a Ph.D. program. Recommendation 22: Dr. Havener stated that the relations of
centers with national programs when they are proposing research activities that would affect these programs and the role of centers in assisting developing countries in their relationships with potential donors were subjects of continuing interest to the centers and a continuing item on the Center Directors' agenda. While they had not organized themselves to prepare a statistical report, the centers were implementing this recommendation under the auspices of ISNAR. For example, ISNAR was currently mobilizing a group of Center Directors to address particular development programs in Africa in specific countries.

28. 1982 Report on the Consultative Group and the International Agricultural Research It Supports - An Integrative Report [ICW/82/06]. The Chairman introduced the report stating that as usual it was in two parts and focused on the critical issues that the system faced this year. The first part of the report dealt with the question of germplasm and reiterated the theme of effective international collaboration in the collection, preservation and distribution of germplasm. The International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR) and the centers had established a network of contacts that encompassed not only the centers within the Group, but institutions throughout the world that are cooperating in the collection of germplasm. This work is fundamental to the development of improved plant varieties and is essential to the effectiveness of much of the research supported by the Group. Through this activity information is collated in one place about the germplasm work going on throughout the world. Obviously the IBPGR, which is the creation of the FAO and the CGIAR, plays a critical role in this important activity. The second part of the report discussed the use of financial resources in 1982, prospective funding in 1983, and proposed an updated five-year indicative plan for the period 1984-1988. The Group was asked to give specific consideration to the proposed five-year plan since approval in principle was an essential requirement for the guidelines that must be given to the centers, for the preparation of programs and budgets, and for the centers' longer-term planning.

29. Dr. Plucknett, who presented the first part of the report, stated in response to a question that the growth of national programs for germplasm conservation had been particularly significant in developing countries over the last few years. Certain delegates questioned the role of FAO in the formulation of an international agreement on germplasm exchange and on the possible setting up of an international genebank. Dr. Bommer explained that a request to FAO had arisen in the FAO Conference, when some Latin American nations expressed their concern about the ownership of genetic resources and, in this context, about the IBPGR placing these resources in genebanks where an assurance of free exchange was provided. The request to the Director General consisted of two studies. One was to provide the elements of an agreement between governments rather than between scientific institutions for the free exchange and conservation of germplasm. The second asked if an international genebank would be set up to ensure that all nations have free access to the genetic material which will be assembled there. A very important component in the second study is the existing and evolving network of the IBPGR. The study, which is still in draft, has been discussed by a group of consultants and the first public discussion will take place in the Committee of Agriculture.
of the FAO in March 1983. Dr. Bommer stated that the IBPGR had made inputs at various stages through the FAO Genetic Resources Center and was to see the first draft during its Executive Committee Meeting following International Centers Week. The Committee of Agriculture in FAO will decide if further work is needed.

30. A number of speakers expressed their concern that because of the creation of the IBPGR, work by the centers might be decreasing in this important area. In response to questions Dr. Plucknett observed that the centers' view of their role in germplasm work varied considerably from one to another. In some cases it was spelled out in the mandates and therefore was not subject to interpretation. Some centers had been designated as base collection centers by the IBPGR for various crops. Initially some centers may have misunderstood the role of the IBPGR, thinking that it would play a stronger funding role on a continuing basis than was in fact the case. It also seemed possible that during a period of financial stringency funding for germplasm work was vulnerable to reduction.

31. Dr. Williams stated that the IBPGR was particularly interested in population samples and broader genetic variability but limitations were imposed by the number of staff and funding. In certain cases the IBPGR could be said to be making breeders' reference collections. The institute had not provided in its long-term plan for the setting up of genebanks for timber trees and so on. The Board's priorities included a number of industrial crops, such as cotton or bananas, but these were relatively limited and the amount of funds spent on them was small compared to that spent on staple food crops. Dr. Williams stated that the Board's modus operandi is to work with all organizations but without duplicating efforts. The Board could not fund many activities but did seek bilateral funding for certain programs such as those that Dr. Treitz mentioned as financed with German bilateral aid. Dr. Williams also welcomed the initiative by the delegate of Australia who offered to make Australia's genebanks available to the system. The priorities established by the Board had been done on a worldwide basis and were described in the IBPGR's long-term plan. The crops had all been carefully selected and were continually reviewed. Dr. Williams stated that in recent months FAO had sought documentary evidence of restrictions in exchanges of germplasm. Most of these appeared to be related to industrial plants and there seemed to be little or no evidence of restrictions on the availability of food crops.

32. Professor Camus mentioned that there had been a fruitful discussion between the scientific adviser of the CG Secretariat and members of TAC in Mexico in June on the first part of the Integrative Report. If the Group so requested, TAC could undertake a study of the broad issues of germplasm conservation such as mandates, relations between centers and the national structures, etc. However, it would have to be put on TAC's agenda for future review at a convenient time.

33. Mr. Lejeune presented the second part of the Integrative Report dealing with funding issues. Funding in 1982 had been very much at the level expected at the May Meeting in Paris. For 1983, TAC had decided to
approve the programs of the centers within a financial bracket for each center. The bottom of the bracket represented a very serious trimming back of what the centers required and TAC believed that any amount below the bottom of the bracket represented a danger point. Professor Camus explained the process by which TAC examined the programs and budgets of the centers at its 28th Meeting in Mexico. He stated that the examinations were done in more depth than in the previous year because the submissions from the centers were more elaborate and informative. Professor Camus stressed that in order to maintain programs within the top of the bracket TAC had already had to set aside many elements from the budget requests which would have deserved full attention and full support had the funding prospects been more favorable. In fact, some of the programs that were reduced had been approved by TAC in preceding years. Any level of funding above the top of the bracket, or within the bracket, could be accommodated on an equal percentage basis among centers. If there were to be a shortfall in 1983 funding that would require a further downward adjustment below the bottom of the bracket, TAC would have to meet again in March 1983 to attempt to adjust the budgets on the basis of additional information from the centers. TAC had cut programs on the basis of scientific considerations according to the decreasing list of priorities of each center. TAC also took into consideration the global activities of the system and worked on the total staffing pattern of each institute.

34. During a discussion on whether special projects could be moved into the core program in order to obtain the incremental proportional funding from the USAID and the World Bank, the Chairman of the Group said that because of the fixed life span of most special projects, which affected the continuity of funding, and other reasons, TAC would have to review each special project on its merits before deciding whether it should be included in the core budget of a center. A donor said that the members of the Group were unable to convey to TAC the priorities that the donors felt should be given weight in the work of the centers, so that certain projects could only be included in the center's work program via special project funding which was often undesirable. The Chairman agreed that this point should be noted as one of the central dilemmas in the present funding process and should be a main component of the funding study. A speaker applauded the lack of rigidity in definition of special projects and considered that some flexibility should be allowed to centers. The Chairman indicated that the First and Second Review Committees had specific definitions for special projects but not all the special projects currently being financed by donors were consistent with either of those definitions. At the end of the discussion on this section of the Integrative Report, the programs and budgets of the centers were approved subject to the availability of funds.

35. Under the next item of business the donors indicated the level of their financial support in 1983 and in some case in 1984. The total amount that the Secretariat estimated was pledged, at current exchange rates was $162 million. This estimate is based on the pledges at the meetings plus estimates for donors who were unable to provide firm pledges or who were absent. The Secretariat estimated that this funding was slightly below the bottom of the bracket recommended by TAC, but that minor
savings in the programs, plus the expectation that some donors might be able to increase their pledges during the course of the year, would make it unnecessary for TAC to meet again in 1983 to reduce even further the programs and budgets approved in Mexico in June 1982. The Secretariat pointed out that the strength of the US dollar reduced in current terms what had in fact been a substantial increase in the local currency value of the pledges made by the donors.

The Five-Year Plan for the CGIAR

36. There was considerable discussion on the utility of the CG's five-year indicative plan. This plan is shown in Table 11 of the Integrative Report and in the Executive Summary of this report. Several donors indicated their reservations about a plan that was in their view overly optimistic. However, a majority of the donors favored the planning process and indicated that without an indicative plan they would have difficulty in calculating their contributions to the system or, in the case of TAC, in having a planning framework within which to work. The plan had in fact been scaled down considerably in recent years. Use of a bracket would allow for upward or downward adjustments in the level of funding for the system as a whole, without the unfavorable effects of a single figure that might be either too high and not attained, thus leading to substantial cuts in the programs during the course of the year, or too low and consequently had a disturbing impact on the morale of the centers by being published as an apparent target figure. In his summary the Chairman pointed out that no donor had questioned any of the assumptions that lie behind the plan. On the contrary the assumptions had been recognized to be conservative, implying virtually no growth. In this context several donors urged that the lack of growth be used to encourage centers to examine their priorities very carefully so as to eliminate marginal programs and to allow room for the introduction of programs that were considered essential to the work of the center or of the system.

Items Arising During the Course of the Discussion

37. The Impact Study. The delegate from Sweden proposed that the CG Secretariat should organize a study that would show the impact of the research work of the system on the developing countries. The study was considered by several donors to be an excellent suggestion and an important means of influencing agencies in the donor countries that supply funds for the CG system. It was also considered by the Chairman of TAC as an important input into TAC's program to review the centers' mandates and establish priorities for the system as a whole both within centers and across centers. Several delegates followed the Swedish example of offering to contribute resources to the study, either financial or in kind. The CG Secretariat was charged with the responsibility of following up on these suggestions.

38. Funding Studies. A number of issues were raised regarding the possibilities of improving methods of financing the activities of the Group. The question of the inclusion of special projects in the core budget as a means to obtain the incremental proportional funding of the
USAID and the World Bank was discussed again. It was decided that the CG Secretariat would obtain better information from the centers on the special projects that each was carrying out and that TAC would be asked to review each one of these on their merits. The question of establishing the appropriate size and the timing of donors' contributions was the subject of comment from the IDB and from Canada. The IDB was particularly concerned about exploring alternative sources of funds, and the Canadian delegate about long-term pledging on a firmer basis to reduce uncertainty. Both delegations analyzed the options facing members of the system. The Chairman of the Group suggested that the characteristics of the donors were so different in the case of the CG that it was impossible to establish a homogeneous formula as a measure of the appropriate level of contributions, as was done in some other institutions. The IDB expressed its willingness to propose multi-year pledging to its Board if other donors were prepared to do likewise. The IDB further expressed its willingness to cooperate on a special task force to study the financial issues facing the system. The Chairman indicated that the issues raised by these two delegations and by others would be useful inputs for the terms of reference of the study on funding that the CG Secretariat was charged with organizing as part of the recommendations of the Second Review Committee.

39. Donor Contributions. The Chairman thanked two delegations in particular during the pledging session for their special efforts in funding of the CG system. The Italian contribution for 1983 represented such a quantum leap over its previous contributions that the Chairman asked that the donors express their appreciation. Secondly, the US contribution had been raised from a straight 25% of total contributions in 1982 to 25% of the level originally expected to be contributed by the Group. The World Bank's contribution of US$19 million also represented a substantial rounding up of its normal contribution of 10% of approved budgets.

Time and Place of Next Meeting

40. The Chairman pointed out that normally this was a routine matter, but in this case a specific policy decision was, required of the Group. The issue was addressed in the paper from the Secretariat [ICW/82/21] which resulted from a poll of the membership. A variety of preferences had been expressed by the Group as to where the mid-term meeting and ICW should be held. However, a consensus had been identified for the proposition that ICW should normally but not always be held in Washington. The mid-year meeting should normally but not always be held outside Washington, with Paris as a preferred location, but that the Group should feel free on occasion to vary the venue of either of those meetings, but not vary both in the same year. The specific suggestion for 1983 was that the present arrangements be maintained, which would mean a May Meeting in Paris and the ICW meeting in Washington. However, the Secretariat would examine the possibility of moving the May Meeting in 1984 to a different location since this was the closest meeting on the planning horizon (which was necessarily long term) and was also the easiest one in terms of logistics to move. The Group approved these suggestions and the timing of the 1983 May Meeting in Paris was established as May 25-27 and that of ICW as October 31-November 4.
Other Business

41. Dr. Bommer asked the Group on behalf of the Cosponsors to adopt a resolution as follows: "The members of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research wish to record their gratitude to Michael Lejeune and Philippe Mahler for their outstanding service as Executive Secretaries of the CGIAR and of TAC, respectively, and their appreciation of the wide knowledge, deep understanding, and tireless devotion with which they have served." The Group adopted the resolution and scrolls were presented to Messrs. Lejeune and Mahler reflecting this resolution. Mr. Lejeune retired from his post as Executive Secretary at the end of the session and Mr. Mahler took up new duties on the first of December.

42. Dr. Iyamabo of Nigeria announced that a member of the IITA staff, Dr. San Ting Han, the leader of the tube and root improvement program in IITA had been honored with the Guiness Award for scientific achievement for his work on cassava.

43. The Chairman of the Group noted the award of the King Baudouin International Agricultural Research Award to IRRI earlier in the week. IRRI was selected to be the first recipient of this award by members of TAC for its work on IR-36. The award was established by the Consultative Group with the prize money received by the Group as a whole in 1980, when it received the first King Baudouin International Development Prize.
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