International Centers Week

1989

Summary of Proceedings and Decisions

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) held its annual meeting, international centers week, from October 30 to November 3, 1989 at the International Monetary Fund auditorium, Washington D.C. Mr. W. David Hopper, chairman, presided. A summary of the main decisions reached or announced and a summary of proceedings appear on the pages that follow.

Issued by the CGIAR Secretariat
The World Bank
Washington D.C.
December 1989
# Table of Contents

Summary Report ............................................................................................................. 1  
Summary of Proceedings .............................................................................................. 5  
Chairman's opening remarks ....................................................................................... 5  
Adoption of the agenda ............................................................................................... 5  
TAC chairman's report ............................................................................................... 5  
Report by the chairman of board chairpersons ........................................................ 7  
Report by the chairman of the center directors committee ........................................ 8  
Medium term programs .............................................................................................. 9  
CIMMYT ..................................................................................................................... 9  
ICARDA .................................................................................................................... 11  
IRRI .......................................................................................................................... 12  
Center presentations ................................................................................................. 14  
Proposed expansion of the CGIAR ............................................................................ 14  
Report of the Africa Task Force ................................................................................ 17  
Report of the Task Force on Biotechnology (BIOTASK) ........................................... 18  
TAC Secretariat review ............................................................................................ 18  
IBPGR committee -- progress report ....................................................................... 20  
Future meetings ......................................................................................................... 21  
Approval of 1990 programs ...................................................................................... 21  
Pledging session ......................................................................................................... 22  
Other matters ............................................................................................................ 22  

Breeders rights ........................................................................................................... 22  
Condolences ............................................................................................................... 22  
Documentation ......................................................................................................... 22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant quarantine</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special activities</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables research</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive session</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's closing remarks</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 1 -- Provisional Agenda</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 2 -- Statement by the Center Directors Committee</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 3 -- List of Participants</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A summary of the main conclusions reached and decisions announced at the annual meetings of the CGIAR, 1989. Items are presented in alphabetical order.

Africa Task Force -- final report

The main themes of the final report of the CGIAR Task Force on Africa were endorsed, and tribute was paid to Guy Camus for the quality of his leadership as head of the task force.

The main proposals of the task force were that:

- the initiatives started in Southern Africa and West Africa should be endorsed,

- External program and management reviews of centers working in Africa should specifically examine the relationship of those centers with national research systems,

- the center directors standing committee on Africa should be the lead group within the system for facilitating relations with African research systems, and between centers working in the same country,

- SPAAR should continue to be the chief agency for coordinating donor resources,

- the CGIAR secretariat should report to the Group every two years on these and related issues, and

- the task force should be disbanded.

The issues raised by the task force will be taken up by the Group at a subsequent meeting.

Biotechnology Task Force -- progress report

The Group heard a progress report from Mr. Hans Wessels on the second meeting of the CGIAR's Biotechnology Task Force. The task force had agreed that its objective was to make CGIAR members more aware of the issues involved in integrating modern biology into the programs of both international agricultural research centers and national agricultural research systems. The Group endorsed the intention of the task force to pursue initiatives in the following areas -- an inventory of biotechnology activities at the centers, information systems, regulatory issues and environmental release, public/private sector collaboration, enabling technologies, and cross-center collaboration.

Board chairs

Presenting the report of the committee of board chairs (CBC) to the Group, committee chairperson Lawrence Wilson (IITA) reported that for the sake of continuity, the CBC had asked center boards of trustees to consider a CBC Guideline Statement on Balanced Rotation of Board Members and Chairs with Special Reference to the Terms of the Chairman. The statement proposes minimum periods of tenure of three years for board chairs and two years for the CBC chair, as far as is possible, within the normal tenure of board members.

Mr. Henri Carsalade (ISNAR) has been selected as chairman of the CBC for 89/90. Mr. Frederick Hutchinson (CIAT) will be Vice Chairman.

Center directors

Mr. Laurence Stifel (IITA), chairman of the center directors committee, presenting a report from the committee, conveyed a consensus of views from center directors on criteria that should be considered when possible expansion of the system was being further reviewed. The center directors recommended that as far as possible the CGIAR should consider the addition of activities as opposed to institutions. Complementary activities should be merged. A balance should be maintained between the advantages of scale and possible dis-economies of excess size or complexity. Center directors urged that the system's primary focus on food production should not be compromised. They also felt that agroforestry could make an important contribution to the sustainability perspective that all centers were increasingly incorporating into their research.

Mr. Donald Winkelmann (CIMMYT) will be chair-
man of the committee in 89/90. Mr. John Walsh (ILCA) will take over from him in 1991.

Center presentations

Presentations were made to the Group by CIP, IITA, ILCA, and ISNAR, and were the subject of lively discussions on the research programs underway or planned.

Chairman's retirement

CGIAR chairman W. David Hopper announced that he would be retiring from the position of senior vice president for Policy, Planning and Research at the World Bank. The Bank's president had nominated Mr. Wilfried P. Thalwitz, vice president for Europe, the Middle East and North Africa, to succeed him as senior vice president.

When donors held an executive session, they noted with satisfaction that a senior Bank official with appropriate expertise and experience would be available to serve as CGIAR chairman. They welcomed the impending appointment of Mr. Thalwitz. Mr. Hopper will continue to serve as CGIAR chairman until the Group's mid-term meeting in May 1990 to ensure a smooth transition.

Condolences

The Group extended condolences to the family of ICLARM director general Ian Smith, whose death was announced during centers week.

Expansion of the system

Proposed expansion of the CGIAR system was discussed under four broad headings: the global context in which the CGIAR functions, TAC's review of 10 non-associated centers which are being considered for possible incorporation in the CGIAR, the inclusion of tropical forestry on the research mandate of the CGIAR, and a proposed restructuring of TAC.

TAC's examination of the global context of agricultural research will provide the framework within which specific recommendations for expanding or strengthening the CGIAR will be made. The global review will also serve as the basis for a new strategy and priorities paper that TAC will submit to the Group in 1991. TAC's examination of regional priorities as a key step toward moving into a global assessment was commended.

TAC chairman Alex McCalla reported on progress in TAC's assessment of 10 non-associated centers. Special panels that had been set up to carry out this task would, in their next round of inquiries, focus on the programmatic and institutional aspects of these centers. They would seek to establish whether there is a fit between the CGIAR system's future research needs and the activities of the non-associated centers. The subject matter areas of the non-associated centers under study are bananas and plantains, vegetables, fisheries and aquaculture, livestock diseases, crop protection, natural resource conservation and management, and forestry. A comprehensive set of recommendations will be submitted by the TAC chairman at centers week 1990.

The Group took note of steps taken by TAC, following the decision at Canberra that forestry should be included on the research mandate of the CGIAR. TAC has consulted widely with leading forestry and agriculture scientists, with FAO and with NGOs. Priority areas of research have been examined and a review of institutional options has begun. A full progress report will be presented by TAC at the mid-term meeting next year.

The Group agreed that foresters should be added to TAC, raising the current membership of the committee to 18. The question of TAC's size will be re-visited by the Group in 1991.

Future meetings

Next year's mid-term meeting will be held at the Hague from May 21-25, and centers week meetings will take place at Washington D.C. from October 29-November 2. The mid-term meeting in 1991 will be held from May 20-24 in Paris, and centers week meetings will take place at Washington D.C. from October 28-November 1. The dates for 1992 will be May 18-22 (mid-term), and October 26-30 (centers week).
IBPGR - progress report

The Group heard a progress report from Mr. Nyle Brady, chairman of the ad hoc committee appointed by the CGIAR chairman to facilitate negotiations between the IBPGR and FAO, and to provide the Group with insights into the outcome of those negotiations. Mr. Brady reported that the two institutions had interacted closely, and had demonstrated the will to deal with the issues at hand in an expeditious manner. The basis of a memorandum of understanding that would govern relations between the two institutions after they had been administratively separated was available as a draft.

The IBPGR board of trustees had also appointed a committee of the board to review the location issue. The board wished that a small group of CGIAR members be delegated to assist that committee. The IBPGR board also sought the assistance of the Group to establish the international status of the IBPGR. The Group indicated its strong preference for Rome as the location of the IBPGR headquarters. The Group agreed that the ad hoc committee should continue its work, with any necessary restructuring, and that two or three members of the committee should be named to work with the IBPGR's location committee.

Mr. Brady will continue to chair the ad hoc committee which will be restructured. Mr. Adetunji, Mr. Brady, and Mr. Schurig will liaise on behalf of donors with the IBPGR site selection committee.

Medium-term programs

On the recommendation of TAC, the medium term programs of CIMMYT, ICARDA, and IRRI were approved.

Pledging session

At current exchange rates, the amount pledged by donors for 1990 is approximately $240 million, up 6 per cent from last year. The total pledged for 1990 is nevertheless some $35 million short of the close to $276 million centers-wide budget for essential activity approved by the Group.

Resource reviews

Three committees will be examining different aspects of CGIAR resources.

A panel under the chairmanship of Jim McWilliam is reviewing the current resource allocation process which has completed its first cycle. The panel has met once, and will meet again on January 8 and 9, 1990. Its report will be considered by TAC in March, and submitted to the Group in May.

An ad hoc committee will work under the chairmanship of Michel Petit to re-examine the mismatch between the centers funding needs and the availability of funds for 1990 if a gap exists even after final indications are in from donors who could not commit themselves at the pledging session. The committee's proposals will be communicated to members of the Group on a "no objection" basis in mid-January 1990.

Following a discussion of resource issues at the executive session of donors, a group of donors was named to assess the overall implications of significant changes in the resources available to the CGIAR. This group will meet once early next year to discuss an analytical paper by a consultant to be commissioned by the CGIAR Secretariat.

Review of the TAC Secretariat

The review of the TAC Secretariat was formally presented to the Group. Mr. McCalla in association with FAO will monitor developments based on the review.

TAC chairman's report

Mr. McCalla commented on matters not dealt with at the TAC 48 and TAC 49.

The Group endorsed his proposal outlining revised terms of reference for external program reviews. These were intended to link the program review process more closely with the resource allocation process.

Dealing with the complex relationship between centers and national systems, Mr. McCalla announced that
he would be setting up a small task force to examine this issue.

The Group noted with satisfaction that TAC was working toward the production of a revised priorities paper by 1991.
Chairman's opening remarks

CGIAR chairman W. David Hopper inaugurated international centers week at 9 a.m. on Monday, October 30.

In his opening statement Mr. Hopper said that there was something symbolic about the fog which had enveloped Washington on the first morning of their meetings. In the CGIAR, too, members saw plenty of gray, and when they saw beautiful landscapes they did so only dimly.

He said that the Group would be confronted with an array of very crucial policy decisions during their current deliberations, and again in Holland next May and at international centers week 1990. In many respects, therefore, the future of the CGIAR would rest on a set of decisions made by them in Washington over the next few days.

Mr. Hopper added that later in the day he would ask TAC chairman Alex McCalla to lead the discussion on an agenda item that would probably attract the most comment -- expansion of the CGIAR. The Group would be taking a look at how TAC viewed the importance of regional perspectives in relation to the CGIAR research agenda. They would examine preliminary proposals on how to proceed toward final determination of whether 10 non-associated centers should be drawn into the CGIAR. They would consider how best to implement their own Declaration of Intent to include tropical forestry research in the CGIAR mandate, in the context of the efficient management of natural resources. Particularly important to all those discussions would be Mr. McCalla's proposals for restructuring TAC.

Mr. Hopper briefly reviewed the centers week agenda as a whole and acknowledged the advice he had received from an ad hoc committee of donors on how best the agenda might be structured. He also reported on the work of the cosponsors in the period since the mid-term meeting at Canberra.

Finally, he said it was no secret that sometime during the week World Bank president Barber Conable would be recommending to the Bank's Executive Board a successor for Mr. Hopper's position as senior vice president for policy, planning and research (PPR). Mr. Hopper reached the Bank's retirement age earlier this year, but was asked to remain in office until a replacement was named. He had informed Mr. Conable that he would prefer not to stay on after March 1, 1990.

[Note: While centers week was in progress, Mr. Conable nominated Mr. Wilfried P. Thalwitz, vice president for Europe, the Middle East and North Africa, to succeed Mr. Hopper as senior vice president. When CGIAR donors met in executive session, they noted with satisfaction that a senior Bank official with appropriate expertise and experience would be available to serve as CGIAR chairman. They welcomed the impending appointment of Mr. Thalwitz as CGIAR chairman. The "change of gavel" was expected to take place at the Hague in May 1990.]

Adoption of the agenda

The provisional agenda was adopted, with the addition of a progress report on the CGIAR plant quarantine project, which would be taken up under Other Business.

TAC chairman's report

TAC chairman Alex McCalla said that the year under review had been busy, and he wished to pay special tribute to members of the committee for all they had done. He also commended the TAC Secretariat, and said he appreciated the great assistance received from the CGIAR Secretariat.

The minutes of TAC 48 held at CIMMYT in March and of TAC 49 held at Rome in June had already been seen by members of the Group. Accordingly, he would comment and bring them up to date on matters outside those reports.

The first of these concerned revised terms of reference for the panels of experts who conducted external program reviews (EPRs) of the centers. The CGIAR Secretariat had also revised its terms of reference for external management reviews (EMRs). The revised EPR terms of reference were intended to link the program review process more closely with the resource allocation process. They were expected to make the EPR process less expensive, and to take less time. An annex to the EPR terms of reference contained a general set of questions. Panel members would also be given other documents including the CGIAR policy papers on biotechnology, genetic resources, and sustainability.

Conducting EPRs was one of TAC's continuing re-
sponsibilities, and was a busy function in 1989 as before. A review of CIAT was completed. A CIP review will be completed in November. ICRISAT, IITA and IFPRI will be reviewed in 1990; IBPGR and ILCA in 1991. The CIAT review was not up for comment, but it should be recorded that the program review panel and the management review panel both found CIAT to be a well managed and healthy institution.

A second issue on which Mr. McCalla commented was the management by CGIAR centers of funds from donors earmarked for national systems. TAC had conducted discussions with center directors to find out whether the practice of donors passing funds to national centers through international centers was widespread. Three types of funding mechanisms were identified. Sometimes, a center simply acted as a conduit for funds. This was considered inappropriate. There were also situations in which a center carried out collaborative field trials with national programs, and would sometimes provide the national institutes with supplies that the latter could not otherwise receive. This was considered appropriate. A third situation was exemplified by collaborative networks in which centers played a co-ordinating role. This would be appropriate if no other institution was available to perform the tasks. But the center should not be perceived as a donor agency.

The relationship between centers and national systems was a very difficult and complex issue, Mr. McCalla said, and he planned to establish a small task force that would look explicitly at this issue in the context of TAC's review of non-associated centers.

Mr. McCalla briefly traced the evolution of the current resource allocation process which involved the preparation by each center of a five-year budget with annual appropriations within that budget cycle. The process began with a review of three centers in 1987 and will be completed at centers week 1989. As promised from the beginning, the resource allocation process will be reviewed now that it has completed a cycle.

The review had been entrusted to a committee which Mr. McCalla and Mr. Alexander von der Osten, executive secretary of the CGIAR, had appointed under the chairmanship of Jim McWilliam. The committee would next meet in Washington on January 8 and 9. They would appreciate suggestions and comments from donors. The committee's report will be submitted to the Group at the mid-term meeting next May.

Mr. McCalla said that one of TAC's responsibilities was to provide the Group with guidance on long term priorities and strategies. The previous TAC paper on priorities and strategies was adopted by the Group in 1986. A year later, TAC undertook to present the Group with a new paper at centers week in 1991. The process of working towards that deadline had begun.

Ideally, the process should have been completed before TAC began looking at the question of expansion. As that could not be done for a variety of reasons, TAC had tried to keep the two activities parallel.

The attention of TAC's standing committee on priorities and strategies which was substantially responsible for the document that the Group will examine when it reaches the agenda item covering expansion of the system will now be switched to the new priorities paper. TAC will ask for written comments on the current document from donors, regional representatives, cosponsors, directors of national programs, and the centers. With that material in hand, the standing committee will formulate a priorities paper which TAC expects to table for discussion at centers week 1991.

Mr. McCalla said that in pulling together the new policy paper on research priorities he hoped to tap many resources including the CGIAR Secretariat. He also paid tribute to the standing committee chairman Mr. Gustavo Nores who would be succeeding Mr. John Nickel as director general of CIAT. The new chairman of the TAC standing committee would be Mr. Kees de Wit.

Following Mr. McCalla's presentation, TAC was commended for the exemplary manner in which it had carried out its exacting and important responsibilities.

The TAC chair's announcement about a review of the resource allocation process served as the take off point for a lively discussion on aspects of the process, and on the larger question of resources. Some delegations continued to have difficulties with the terms "essential" and "desirable." Others felt that terms were less important than the concepts TAC was attempting to embody in the allocation process.

The resources question, separate from the allocation
process, evoked considerable comment, and some indication of anxiety. There was a need to be aware of supply constraints, and to be guided by some notion of how much exactly was available for programs, in the view of several delegates. The need was stated, too, for a strong monitoring mechanism to ensure that the Group's decisions were carried out, and that new initiatives at centers or by boards were based strictly on the availability of resources. Both donors and centers should demonstrate transparency and discipline. The Group decided that this range of issues relating to resources should be taken up at the executive session of donors.

On another aspect of the TAC chairman's report, there was general agreement on the importance of relations between centers and national systems, and TAC's attempts to grapple with such linkages was supported.

**Report by the chairman of board chairpersons**

Mr. Lawrence A. Wilson (IITA), chairman of the committee of board chairs (CBC) reported on the activities, emphases, and concerns of the committee. He presented the major subject areas dealt with by the CBC under three headings: CBC issues, center issues, and system issues.

Reporting on CBC issues, Mr. Wilson said that the committee which had decided to take a proactive stance in dealing with certain system-wide issues found that its capacity to do so depended on continuity of board membership, because complex issues required sustained discussion. The continuity of a board chairman's term was particularly important. Therefore, the committee had asked individual boards to consider a CBC guideline statement on the balanced rotation of board members and chairs with special reference to the terms of the chairman.

The CBC statement suggested minimum periods of tenure of three years for board chairs and two years for the CBC chair as far as is possible within the normal terms of board members.

Dealing with appointments to boards and board performance, Mr. Wilson said the committee supported the data bank approach proposed in the Dillon Report, and recommended the Candidate Information System proposed by the CGIAR Secretariat on the basis of that report.

In a review of center issues, he said the committee felt the new strategic and medium-term planning process was effective, but that it could be improved with greater attention to the amount of time taken to complete the process, the number of meetings with TAC that were required, and the length of documents produced in many cases.

The CBC was also concerned with maintaining the quality of science at the centers, and with the levels and quality of scientific and managerial leadership. These issues had been examined in the context of a draft paper from Mr. Ingemar Maansson (ILRAD) on ensuring the quality of science in the CGIAR system, and a report from Mr. Ralph Cummings (ILCA) on procedural guidelines for evaluation of a director general's performance. Criteria and standards that could be applied in both areas were discussed, and will form part of the agenda for further discussions with the committee of center directors.

The CBC's deliberations on system-wide issues had included a close examination of the background against which a possible expansion of the CGIAR system was being considered. The CBC stressed the importance of maintaining the original production-oriented principles of the CGIAR, while at the same time moving more strongly in the direction of environmental concerns. CGIAR centers already conducted research on diverse environmental problems, Mr. Wilson pointed out.

The CBC had concluded that environmental concerns could be accommodated within the framework of existing CGIAR objectives by broadening the Group's mandate to include issues such as forestry, agroforestry, and water use. The CBC noted that at Canberra the Group had adopted a Declaration of Intent to include research on the utilization of renewable resources related to agriculture and specifically to forestry within its mandate. The CBC reviewed the implications of this decision, and supported the initiatives taken by TAC toward strengthening its competence in the area of forestry research. Competence in other subject areas would also have to included in TAC if the CGIAR system was to be expanded.

The CBC, having considered a paper on university linkages from Mr. Wilson, supported the view of the CGIAR Sustainability Committee headed by Mr. Leslie Swindale (ICRISAT) that co-operation among national research systems, international centers and developing country universities could evolve into a powerful mechanism.
Mr. Wilson announced that Mr. Henri Carsalade (ISNAR) will be the CBC's chairman in 1989/90. Mr. Frederick Hutchinson (CIAT) will be vice chairman.

Questions were asked by delegates about the quality of individual scientists at the centers, and also about the quality of the boards themselves. How were the quality and performance of the latter to be assessed? Mr. Wilson described some of the safeguards that had been established to ensure quality in both instances. Mr. von der Osten said that, in addition, the Secretariat had three mechanisms in place. As mentioned by Mr. Wilson, an induction program was carried out to sensitize boards to important issues. This led to a process of self-assessment. Second, a study on the performance of boards was in process. The third mechanism was the Candidate Information System -- also mentioned by Mr. Wilson -- which was a systematic effort to cast the net more widely when trying to gather in people of quality to serve on boards. Mr. McCalla added that each EMR contains an explicit evaluation of the structure, conduct and performance of boards.

Some delegates raised the "gender issue" as it applied to boards. The issue had been broadly discussed by the Group some years ago, but no action seemed to have resulted. The number of women on center boards was not overwhelming. Extra efforts had been made to find board members from developing countries and those efforts had proved worthwhile. Extra efforts to find more women to serve on boards would also turn out to be worthwhile. A request was made for a list or table that shows the number of women and men on center boards. It was suggested that the information required was already to be found in the "blue book" -- the CGIAR Secretariat's publication that presents data on members of center boards.

Delegates also asked how much attention was paid to assessing the performance of research in terms of value for money. Others welcomed the CBC's interest in the environment, and in relations with national systems. The possibility of closer working relations with developing country universities was supported.

Report by the chairman of the center directors committee

Mr. Laurence D. Stifel (IITA) recalled that the mantle of chairman of the center directors committee had fallen on him unexpectedly when the chairman-elect for 1989 was appointed executive secretary. Center directors were pleased that one of their alumni was in that position, and an excellent collegial working relationship had already been established with Mr. von der Osten in his new role.

Although the "change of guard" took place unexpectedly, the committee had maintained a momentum of activity partly because of its decision to establish a small executive committee consisting of past, current and future chairs. He was indebted to his colleagues on that committee -- Ross Gray (1988) and Don Winkelmann (1990). The chairman-designate for 1991 is John Walsh.

Mr. Stifel reported that in response to suggestions that center directors should participate more actively in the system's strategic thinking, they had set up small working groups on selected issues to formulate positions and determine how best these should be communicated throughout the system. The groups currently at work covered relations with the private sector (chaired by Richard Sawyer), the role of biotechnology at CGIAR centers (Dick van Sloten), donor-center relations and communications (Eugene Terry), and broadening the mandate of the CGIAR (John Nickel).

Mr. Stifel went on to report progress in seven areas that had particularly interested center directors. One was public awareness. A public awareness association had achieved excellent participation. It was making major progress on several projects such as a North American seminar and fellowship program for journalists, a CGIAR exhibit at a horticultural exposition in Osaka, an article on plant genetic resources for the National Geographic magazine, the establishment of an European Information Service, a journalism fellowship program for German-speaking journalists, and a Latin American media program on plant genetic resources in collaboration with the Rome-based Interpress Service.

In a second area of concentration, library and documentation officers of the centers and at the Secretariat had developed a joint action plan to improve the delivery of information services to national systems. An African network for agricultural information services was initiated. Existing networks were strengthened in Latin America, the Near East, and North Africa. Arrangements were made to
ensure that national systems needing information would need to contact only one or two centers to fulfill their needs. With donor support, the project to make center documents available on optical discs was progressing.

Center directors had met with several environmental groups in the US and elsewhere to describe CGIAR contributions to the goal of sustainable agriculture. Center directors would convene again to explore additional opportunities for inter-center co-operation, to review plans to strengthen links with national systems including universities, and to learn what each center is doing to fill the gaps in sustainability research identified by the Swindale Committee.

The center directors' human resources initiative provided examples of inter-center co-operation. A major effort was made to improve training at the centers and within national systems. Lead centers were making progress with specific projects which included assessing the needs of national systems (with ISNAR as the lead center), a worldwide retrospective survey of CGIAR training (ILCA), and the sharing of management training material (ISNAR).

The ad hoc inter-center working group on plant genetic resources had undertaken several activities including the preparation of publications that were available at centers week. Center directors had also approved a program of collaboration on germplasm exchange, beginning with a concentration on seed borne diseases. The combined TAC-center directors working group had begun an assessment of the duplication of center germplasm collections inside a center's host country and outside. They had continued to investigate the technical aspects of an international seed storage facility in a permafrost area of Norway.

Finance and administrative officers from the centers had met in Washington immediately before centers week to discuss a range of measures aimed at improving efficiency and reducing costs. They will continue to communicate on these issues through electronic mail.

Eugene Terry had been appointed chairman of the center directors Standing Committee on Africa for a three year term. With the winding down of the CGIAR Task Force on Africa, center directors expected that their standing committee would intensify efforts to increase the effectiveness of the Group's very large investment in Africa.

Mr. Stifel also conveyed to the Group the consensus among center directors on a possible expansion of the CGIAR system. Center directors agreed that the CGIAR could not take a "business as usual" approach to their responsibilities. While recognizing the need for change, center directors suggested that three principles be considered in any approach to expansion:

(i) As far as possible, activities rather than institutions should be added to the system, with complementary activities merged, and a balance maintained between advantages of scale and possible diseconomies of excess size,

(ii) The system's primary focus on food production should not be compromised, and,

(iii) Productivity should be increased on existing lands as an important contribution toward alleviating pressure on more fragile ecosystems.

(The center directors position on expansion, compiled by a working group led by John Nickel, is published as an annex to this summary of proceedings.)

Medium-term programs

As recommended by TAC, the medium-term programs of ICARDA, IRRI, and CIMMYT were approved.

**CIMMYT**

Mr. Burt Matthews, chairman of CIMMYT's executive and finance committee, introduced the center's medium-term program on behalf of Mr. Lucio Reca who was unavoidably absent. A detailed presentation by director general Don Winkelman followed.

Mr. Matthews said that much had been accomplished since CIMMYT's presentation to the CGIAR in 1987. The center had acquired international status, and was working with its Mexican hosts to complete transitional administrative arrangements. After protracted discussions, CIMMYT's relationships with ICARDA and IITA had been redrawn and revitalized.

National programs had participated in drawing up the medium-term program, and this had opened the way toward the decentralization of some activities, and the development of collaborative projects. The board, too, had been fully involved in the strategic planning exercise. The
board was encouraged by CIMMYT's pursuit of purposeful, planned change and would follow events closely over the coming months.

Mr. Winkelmann said that 12 criteria were used in preparing CIMMYT's proposed budget. Six of those criteria pertained to the CGIAR system's interest in efficiency, four to concern for the poor, one to sustaining natural resources, and one to the special needs of sub-Saharan Africa.

He explained how CIMMYT planned to make optimum use of resources selected on the basis of the 12 criteria. As an example, he pointed out that under the category of efficiency, germplasm resources were most effectively used with mega-environments, where CIMMYT focused on improving materials for large areas, perhaps covering millions of hectares.

He said that the most conspicuous innovation of CIMMYT's budget was its analytical framework for classifying activities as either essential or desirable. The center's essential category includes only activities that have high expected rates of return and that are unlikely to be transferred to others during the next five years. Desirable activities differed from essential ones with respect to cost and returns.

CIMMYT would be emphasizing research and moving away from certain forms of direct support to national programs. The latter had themselves asked that CIMMYT should work more closely with them in research, provide more advanced training opportunities, and change the nature of its consultations. The center would spend more time on generating scientific information and less on providing advisory services to national programs.

Changes envisaged in training activities would mean that national systems would have more access to advanced level training and less to entry level instruction, especially in crop management research. This would open the way to more collaborative research. Germplasm improvement will increase with the gradual shift to upstream research. Resources devoted to biotechnology would also be increased during the next five years, but CIMMYT's increased commitment in this area should be seen as relative to its established work.

Mr. Winkelmann said there were some anxieties among staff as a result of CIMMYT's change of emphases. The management and board were working to reduce those anxieties.

Mr. Winkelmann provided the Group with several examples -- drawn mainly from CIMMYT's wheat, maize and economics programs -- of "the more exciting endeavors underway."

Many of the center's activities related to the CGIAR system's interest in sustaining natural resources over the longer term. Programs on rice-wheat rotation conducted in association with IRRI were notable in this effort. Some 9 million hectares on the Indian sub-continent are involved. Productivity has been declining in parts of this area. CIMMYT and IRRI will mount a major international effort focused on the problems of this rotation. Researchers from national systems and the two centers will work together. CIMMYT considered this planned activity an innovative effort to sustain the productivity of resources in a major production environment.

A common thread in CIMMYT endeavors was the practice of aspects of research being passed on to national systems. The maize program had strengthened its breeding work by decentralizing to various locations where specific diseases occurred. The wheat program had success with shuttle breeding in which several sites were used in sequence to incorporate stress tolerance specific to those sites. Partnerships in wheat research -- with contractual arrangements, joint planning, and execution -- were underway with China, India, Mexico, and Turkey.

These were strong national systems which could consistently take over research responsibilities. In other situations, where decentralization was attempted but the national systems were weak and stumbled under the load they attempted to carry, CIMMYT was always there with a helping hand, Mr. Winkelmann pointed out.

During the discussion that followed, Mr. Winkelmann was joined by CIMMYT's director of research (Roger Rowe) and the head of CIMMYT's wheat program (Anthony Fisher).

Mr. Winkelmann received wide acclaim for the work conducted at CIMMYT and for the comprehensiveness as well as transparency of his report. The picture that emerged from his presentation was of a dynamic center, responding and adapting to new situations while trying to maintain those programs whose continuity had to be preserved. CIMMYT's analytical approach to the budget process was commended, and several donors commented
favorably on the center’s conscious effort to share with donors the criteria by which activities were judged to be essential or desirable.

Donors also noted with interest that CIMMYT planned to move upstream with its research, and hoped that as this process unfolded, more of the center’s responsibilities would be passed on to national systems. Donors felt that CIMMYT already had established strong working relations with many national programs, and hoped that such arrangements would continue to grow. Mr. Winklemann drew the attention of donors to the participation in CIMMYT’s planning process of national systems. This was an indication of how closely the views and needs of national programs were integrated with CIMMYT’s work.

In response to a question on how much attention CIMMYT was paying to soil in its research, Mr. Fisher said that although investment in disciplinary research on soil might appear relatively low, that area of research had not been neglected. He added that as CIMMYT’s crop management research grew, there was no way in which the center could avoid questions of soil chemical and physical fertility and soil pathology.

On the issue of maintenance of facilities, Mr. Rowe said that a small amount in the annual budget was reserved for maintenance and replacement. A committee was looking into the special problems of experimental stations.

**ICARDA**

The ICARDA program was introduced by Enrico Porceddu, chairman, and presented in detail by Nasrat R. Fadda, director general.

Mr. Porceddu thanked members of the Group for the opportunity to present ICARDA’s strategy and plans to them. He paid tribute to the TAC chairman and members for the help they had rendered through their probing and rigorous analysis of the proposals submitted to them by ICARDA. The proposals before the Group, he said, were the product of a collective effort by ICARDA’s staff, management, and board. They had sought to respond to the views and expectations of national systems in formulating their plans.

The medium-term strategy reflected ICARDA’s perception of its future character. ICARDA would retain its mandate and mission in the future while adding some new dimensions to its activities, as Mr. Fadda would show.

Mr. Fadda said that in keeping with the structure of the strategy document his presentation would be under three broad themes. The first would describe the physical and human environment in which the center operates. The second would present ICARDA’s approach to its work and the highlights of its first decade. The third would focus on the strategic issues affecting all aspects of the center’s operations in the foreseeable future.

He went on to describe the physical features, the population, and the food needs of the West Asia and North Africa region, encompassing 24 countries, served by ICARDA. The total area of the region was some 17 million sq km, 80 per cent greater than that of the USA. Almost 70 per cent of the land was desert. Eight per cent of the land is currently considered arable.

Forty years ago, the region was a net exporter of food. Today it is the largest food importing region in the developing world. Population growth, rising income in many instances, and sluggish agriculture had combined to bring about this reversal.

ICARDA had concluded that food self-sufficiency will be impossible within this century and beyond for all but a handful of producers in the region. Nevertheless, self-reliance in food can be enhanced through a combination of new technology, better farm practices, more favorable government policies, and a more rational use of land. The challenge before ICARDA in the years ahead was that of contributing fully toward the achievement of these goals.

Mr. Fadda said that to serve its research needs, and to work effectively with the beneficiaries of its work, ICARDA had developed an organizational structure that was responsive to the center’s research program which fell into multi-disciplinary commodity areas, namely, cereals, food legumes, pasture, forage, and livestock. A farm resources management program integrated the results of the work that concentrated on commodities. Inter-disciplinary linkages were maintained through joint planning and the provision of joint research services in shared laboratories. ICARDA was fully engaged with national systems in the region, and emphasized the training and networking aspects of its work.
Highlighting ICARDA's efforts and achievements in the past decade, Mr. Fadda pointed out that ways had been sought to halt environmental degradation, and to improve steppe and native pasture. Work had been done on wheat based systems, barley/livestock systems, and horticultural crops. Promising advances had been made in chickpea research where ICARDA scientists had developed new cultivars tolerant to cold and resistant to ascochyta blight. The advances made in faba bean research had led to many successes by national systems. The use of pasture and forage legumes was developed as a link between crop and livestock production.

Mr. Fadda also described a major effort launched by ICARDA to collect, conserve, and characterize germplasm. Total accessions were 86,591 of which 53,094 had been evaluated.

Looking ahead, Mr. Fadda said that in its strategies for the future ICARDA would concentrate on three major thrusts: agro-ecological, commodity, and activity. Sustainability issues and productivity would both be emphasized.

As part of its agro-ecological thrust, ICARDA would be giving greater attention to the drier areas and highlands which were extensive in the region, and were exploited by smaller and poorer farmers. No major changes were proposed in the list of commodities that would be part of the center's commodity thrust -- wheat, barley, chickpea, lentil, faba bean, and pasture and forage crops. For its activity thrust, ICARDA had identified seven integrative activities. These were agro-ecological characterization, germplasm conservation, germplasm enhancement, farm resource management, training and networking, information dissemination, and impact assessment.

Donors were appreciative of the way in which ICARDA had carried out its work under difficult circumstances, and also for its responsiveness to earlier suggestions for strengthening its organizational structure. The broad sweep of ICARDA's approach to its past and present research tasks drew wide acceptance, with most of the questions raised being of a technical nature.

A donor was interested, for instance, in ICARDA's experience with biological nitrogen fixation, and Mr. Fadda responded that ICARDA had measured substantial increases of nitrogen resulting from biological fixation. Responding to a question on biotechnology, he said that ICARDA's role was that of monitoring, probing and where appropriate, adapting in association with national systems.

When work on the faba bean came up for discussion, Mr. Fadda said he was pleased that ICARDA's decision to center that work in a national system, at Morocco, was considered positive. There was need now to ensure continuity of the program, and to be certain that regional application of the research would take place.

Other topics raised from the floor included the cooperation ICARDA received from its sister international centers, its linkages with universities, and the close attention it paid to gender issues in the region.

Several questions were asked about irrigation. In response, Mr. Fadda said that with TAC's blessing ICARDA was working in a limited area of irrigation -- water harvesting and supplemental irrigation.

**IRRI**

When IRRI's medium-term program came up for discussion Mr. McCalla intervened briefly to remind the Group that TAC had submitted the external program and management review of IRRI to the Group in 1987 with what was then considered an interim commentary. That was because the center did not have a board-approved strategic plan at the time. Such a plan was now in place. As a matter of procedure, he felt he should assure the Group that TAC was satisfied with the plan and would not be revising its commentary.

IRRI's medium-term program was introduced by board chair Walter P. Falcon, and presented in detail by director general Klaus Lampe. Mr. Hubert Zandstra, IRRI's deputy director general for research, and Mr. Edward Sayegh, director of finance, were associated with Mr. Lampe.

Mr. Falcon, making his first appearance before the group as board chair, said that the board was fully engaged in all aspects of the center's work. He hoped the Group would appreciate the board's participation and the results it had produced.

He reminded the Group that IRRI's EMR had said that the center should place management issues on a par with scientific issues. The EMR had also said that IRRI should
become a leaner but still vibrant organization. He would explain how IRRI had responded to both suggestions.

On the management side, he continued, two key measures had been taken. First, the board had reorganized itself to be more proactive on management issues and inter alia had set up an administration committee chaired by him. That committee had already dealt with such matters as strengthening internal auditing, computerization, and reorganization of the accounting system. Second, a new management team was installed at the center.

To make the center more lean while keeping it vibrant, new personnel policies had been introduced. IRRI was moving to a system of fixed term contracts for international staff. Even the slightest hint of tenure had been removed. Nationally recruited staff would be reduced by some 15 per cent. This posed a difficult problem, particularly difficult in current local circumstances, but the board was grappling with it.

Encapsulating IRRI’s strategy for the next decade, Mr. Lampe said that the aims of the center would be to increase productivity while enhancing sustainability; securing yield gains and at the same time seeking new thresholds in all ecosystems. IRRI would collaborate with national systems to achieve these aims, especially in the less favorable ecosystems. IRRI would also move upstream in its research endeavors, working with advanced laboratories all over the world.

IRRI had to make its decisions and plan its strategy against the background of a rapidly increasing population. An increase of some 60 per cent or about 400 million people was expected in the urban population of Asia’s 14 major rice growing countries by the turn of the century. IRRI was scared by those figures but could not run away from them or from the responsibility of helping to feed the people.

Mr. Lampe pointed out that 50 per cent of rice lands are irrigated and 70 per cent of total production comes from this ecosystem. The other 30 per cent is produced from the remaining half of the world’s rice lands -- rainfed lowland, the upland and the deep water rice ecosystem. These ecosystems were fragile, and it was necessary to ensure that increased productivity in these ecosystems would be on a sustainable basis. As in the past, IRRI would continue to concentrate its work on Asia where more than 90 per cent of the world’s rice is grown. IRRI would work in Latin America through CIAT and in West Africa through WARDA.

IRRI would maintain its commitment to strengthen national systems of agricultural research, but the relationship between IRRI and national systems would change from one of support to one of collaboration. For example, the center’s program leader for deep water and tidal wetland rice would be stationed in Thailand, because IRRI planned to develop a research consortium for deep water rice linking several stations in India, Bangladesh, Myanmar (formerly Burma), Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Another upland rice research consortium would link Indonesia, the Philippines, India, and Thailand together, with its focal point in Indonesia -- again, not at IRRI.

Explaining that IRRI would also be more service oriented in the future, Mr. Lampe pointed out however that many of its activities were already in that category. IRRI’s germplasm center, its library, and its international rice testing program were all illustrations of its role as a research service institution of the first order.

Mr. Lampe went into the question of maintaining, repairing, and/or replacing structures and equipment. Much of the existing plant was of museum vintage. A contractor had estimated that it would take $40,000 to repair a small section of plumbing that had deteriorated badly, but the repairs would be carried out on a do-it-yourself basis by IRRI staff for $5,000. There was other equipment whose replacement would need greater expenditure. Temporary solutions would not help very much, he added.

He also informed the Group that public opinion about IRRI in the Philippines had improved dramatically. So had the research climate. President Aquino had signed an Act which made research in biotechnology possible, and IRRI was part of a national program in biosafety.

Mr. Zandstra provided the Group with technical details of research that would take place as part of IRRI’s new strategy.

Donors commended Mr. Lampe and his colleagues at IRRI for presenting their objectives with clarity, and for meeting head on the diverse challenges they faced. They appreciated the frankness of Mr. Lampe’s financial analysis and the supporting illustrations he presented.

Several donors felt, however, that while they had been
giving most of their attention in the past to the substance of IRRI's research they now faced crucial questions of funding. Clearly, the replacement of plant was not going to be cheap. The scale of IRRI's establishment and the financial commitment it required was also commented on. Donors said they realized there were always costs at the end of the tunnel, but the real questions at IRRI now were management and financial.

The new research directions to be pursued by IRRI were positively received. Donors generally shared the viewpoint that the center's strategy and plan were an excellent response to changing circumstances. IRRI's decision to base its research on ecosystems was commended. IRRI's relations with national systems were widely appreciated. The representative from China paid tribute to how IRRI had helped in the establishment of China's National Rice Research Institute.

Mr. Lampe also said that IRRI was already committed to impact assessment, as suggested by donors. IRRI would also continue to monitor the administrative and management side of its activities with care.

Center presentations

In keeping with the principle of accountability in the CGIAR system, full presentations are made in rotation at centers week. For 1989, CIP, IITA, ILCA, and ISNAR, made presentations in which the programs and priorities of each center were introduced by the board chairperson, and described in detail by the center director. This was followed by questions and a broad ranging discussion. All four centers were commended both for their presentations and for the impressive programs of research they were undertaking.

Proposed expansion of the CGIAR

Four connected sets of issues were clustered together when a possible expansion of the CGIAR came up for discussion: the global context of agricultural research, next steps in assessing non-associated centers, forestry, and changes to TAC.

The global context

Leading off the discussion, Mr. McCalla said that the TAC document on expansion was the committee's first substantive report, as opposed to progress reports, offered in connection with their continuing assessment of 10 non-associated centers. At Canberra, Mr. McCalla said, he had reported how a series of position papers, analysis papers and fact finding missions had led to a substantial understanding of the issues. It was that process which enabled TAC to present the Group with a substantive report. He cautioned, however, that the document was a draft or working document. One of the reasons for its presentation at centers week was to elicit comment and observation from members of the Group.

The first part of the paper was an update of the global perspective which had appeared in the TAC priorities paper of 1985/86. It addressed the three main factors that drive the demand for food — population growth, income growth, and urbanization. It also examined some of the issues on the demand side. That overview would enable them to have a fairly clear understanding of how the pressures of supply and demand had to be balanced.

Another chapter of the paper broke from past practice which emphasized the analysis of global themes and, instead, made regional perspectives the starting point of a global analysis. Four regional essays, each covering agriculture, forestry, and natural resource constraints, will serve as the foundation for TAC's assessment of global research needs. This technique would enable TAC to look at major research needs with greater focus but also in a more diversified way, possibly giving them a comprehensive picture of issues facing the global agricultural research system over the next quarter of a century.

Mr. McCalla pointed out, too, that the TAC paper attempts a preliminary analysis of the kinds of research categories the CGIAR should support and, based on those assumptions, examines the implications to the system of TAC's emerging conclusions. TAC hoped to receive the Group's comments at centers week itself, but would also be contacting all components of the system for detailed responses later. They would want responses no later than January 15, 1990.

Mr. McCalla's presentation served in effect as the
launching pad for a vigorous debate in which both the breadth of TAC's policy paper and its attention to detail were commended. TAC's decision to emphasize regional priorities as a key step in the direction of a global assessment of agricultural research priorities was widely supported. The paper's treatment of environmental and sustainability issues was considered thorough and particularly well done.

Some delegates felt, however, that there were some omissions in the paper. These included an assessment of the impact on agriculture of global climatic change, and of increases in the cost of energy. Questions relating to water restoration and the rehabilitation of degraded land had not been addressed. Others thought that a program dealing with environmental research needs should be outlined as soon as possible. There was a feeling articulated as well that when dealing with plans for expanding the CGIAR it was advisable for TAC to point out how these could be affected by "supply constraints."

The chairman intervened during the discussion to say that they could not expect TAC to provide them with answers to questions for which answers were still being widely sought. He invited participants to send him information about the state of research in some of the areas that had been discussed. He would share this data with other delegations through his periodic Chairman's Letter.

Several participants sought clarification of TAC's treatment of the questions: urban versus rural, favored versus less favored. Mr. McCalla responded that poor farmers and poor consumers lived in both rural and urban areas, and that poor farmers existed in both favored and non-favored areas. If they were concerned with feeding an increased world population, with a quadrupled urban population in developing countries by 2025, then they had to include the sustenance and the increase of the productive capacity of favored areas.

Clarification was also sought on the issue of food self-reliance as a CGIAR goal. Mr. McCalla responded that the system needed to be open in thinking about the subject. The question made the choices before the Group more difficult, but also more realistic.

Non-associated centers

The Group moved on from consideration of the priorities/strategy exercise to the specifics of where TAC stood -- and where and how it would proceed -- in its assessment of 10 non-associated centers. Mr. McCalla said that TAC was converging on an operational definition of the criteria that should be used to evaluate both the subjects of research conducted by the non-associated centers and the institutions dealing with those subject matter areas.

These criteria would cover the contribution that could be made to the enhanced goals of the CGIAR, the non-associated centers' modes of operation and their appropriateness to international research, relations between the centers and national programs, the budget process, and governance/management. These criteria would be used by the panels which have already participated in the review process, and which will now look more closely at the subject matter areas represented by the non-associated centers.

Mr. McCalla listed these areas as bananas and plantains, vegetables, fisheries and aquaculture, livestock diseases in Africa, crop protection, natural resources management, and forestry.

The panels would meet next March after a major desk analysis had been completed by the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats, and it was possible that a special TAC meeting would have to be convened in September to formulate recommendations based on their reports. Another small panel would meanwhile assess in generic terms the relationships between international centers and national programs.

From the floor, it was said that because the CGIAR had access to a finite pool of money, it would be useful for donors to know what activities the CGIAR centers might be winding down as others were added on to the system. Without that information, donors were confronted with the thought that what was planned was only an additive process.

The question was also asked whether it might not be better to defer decisions on the non-associated centers until the planned review of priorities was completed. A donor who funds non-associated centers countered that delays in the assessment process would cause a lot of problems. Timetables agreed upon should be maintained. There was a pressing need, in fact, to speed up those segments of the
review process connected with resources and the environment because donors faced political pressure for action on both fronts.

Another point raised concerned the connections between subject matter areas. Fisheries and aquaculture, natural resource management, and forestry, had much in common. There might be some merit in examining the common elements in these three areas.

Delegates also wondered what the post-assessment repercussions would be for non-associated centers. Non-associated centers should not feel that failure to be considered for CGIAR membership was a condemnation. On the other hand, centers might face a particular difficulty if only part of their programs were selected for inclusion.

Mr. McCalla agreed that it would have been best to complete the priorities exercise first and then get on to the final stages of assessing the non-associated centers. Circumstances prevented that. The next best alternative had been adopted. As he had pointed out earlier, the two processes were proceeding in parallel, and a great deal of information on which to base final judgments would be available as a result. He noted the suggestion about common themes and said that panels working on compatible issues would be served by common members. As to the post-assessment situation, Mr. McCalla reminded the Group that while TAC would make recommendations final decisions would lie with donors.

Forestry

The Group discussed forestry research against the background of its adoption at Canberra of a Declaration of Intent to include the management of renewable resources on its research agenda. Mr. John Spears, the CGIAR Secretariat's senior advisor on natural resources, reported that considerable progress had been made since the Group met at Canberra in the process of developing an inventory of forestry research for the CGIAR. This was done primarily by TAC working in consultation with the forestry community, FAO, and IUFRO/SPDC.

Mr. Spears said that the technical group set up under the auspices of TAC to move the forestry initiative forward had taken a purely scientific approach, avoiding some of the emotional issues connected with the environmental problems of forestry. The Group had sought to determine what areas of forestry research could increase productivity and contribute to sustainability. Among the areas they identified were --

- genetics and tree breeding improvement, because there will be a great need in the developing world over the next 15 years for multi-purpose species which are suitable for fodder, fuelwood, etc.,
- soil microbiology, based on the work already in progress which was trying to establish whether forests could be regenerated by the reintroduction of mycorrhiza,
- policy and socioeconomic research, in areas ranging from settlement policy through tax laws to land tenure, because all these had a strong impact on forestry, and
- utilization, so that research could look at how forest products could be used in a way that served sustainability while also serving the needs of indigenous peoples.

Mr. Spears said that the forestry community was comfortable with the way in which their dialogue with the CGIAR was proceeding, and this point was reinforced by Mr. Hollis Murray of FAO. He commended the CGIAR for its Declaration of Intent, and said the forestry research community was enthusiastic about it.

He commented on the role that FAO had already played and would continue to play in such areas as strengthening the capacity of national systems, establishing research networks, and developing regional institutional support programs. He planned to pull these activities together in a major conference early in 1990.

Delegates responded positively to the reports by Mr. Spears and Mr. Murray. Some of them said that the priorities outlined were in keeping with their own national approach to forestry research. There was a suggestion, however, that the research areas mentioned were conventional. The desirability of including natural forest management was suggested. Some questions were asked about the need to grapple with the emotional issues that had been eschewed.

Delegates approved of the process of consultation that was being followed. They were impressed by the intensity of consultation between the CGIAR and the forestry research community and impressed by the level of collaboration within that community. Reference was also made to ITTO, and its potential role in any forestry research program.
Several interventions pointed to the urgency of the need for more forestry research in developing countries, and indicated that funds for such research would be forthcoming. The question was asked as to whether sufficient data would be available for a firm decision by the Group when they met at the Hague. The answer was "no."

Considerable attention was paid to the capacities of national systems. The importance of national research services was undisputed. Yet, there were several indications that many national systems were weak in this area of research and needed support.

Responding to some of the points made during the discussion, Mr. Spears said that there were two or three ways of getting at the issue of natural forestry management. One of them was through soil microbiology and the role of mycorrhiza, and this was already part of the proposed list of priorities.

The difficulty of dealing with the emotional issues, he said, was that they sometimes get completely out of hand. Global warming was an example.

He also said that ITTO would be with the CGIAR in the next stage of dialogue.

Restructuring TAC

The Group considered a proposal for TAC to be restructured with the addition to its current membership of eminent experts from forestry and resource-related subjects. The proposal was a departure from the possibility raised at Canberra that TAC might be restructured to consist of a small, strategic group and standing panels of experts.

Presenting the proposal to the Group, Mr. McCalla said that the change was occasioned by the knowledge that TAC's consistent performance was made possible by the committee as a whole fulfilling a range of tasks and responsibilities. A two-tiered mechanism, conversely, would cause fragmentation and hinder co-ordination. TAC now consisted of 14 experts and to increase that number by a few more members would not make it more unwieldy or less manageable than at present. For those reasons, it was proposed that the committee be augmented by two to four members, with the question of TAC's size to be reviewed a few years later.

The proposal was welcomed as an effective means of integrating forestry expertise with TAC's agricultural expertise. The Group agreed that four foresters would be added to TAC, raising its membership to 18, and that the committee's size would be discussed again in 1991.

Report of the Africa Task Force

Mr. Andrew Bennett introduced the report of the Africa Task Force because Mr. Guy Camus who had led the task force could not be present. Mr. Bennett paid tribute to the leadership provided by Mr. Camus, and to the efforts of the two secretaries (Michael Collinson and Max Rives) who had given the group's report coherence.

The task force set out to examine the relationships between international centers and national agricultural research systems in Africa, and to determine how those relationships could be strengthened so as to improve the impact of the CGIAR system.

The main recommendations of the task force were that:

- the initiatives started in Southern Africa and West Africa should be endorsed;
- External Program and management reviews of centers working in Africa should specifically examine the relationships of those centers with national research systems;
- the center directors standing committee on Africa should be the lead group within the system for facilitating relations with African research systems;
- SPAAR should continue to be the chief agency for coordinating donor resources directed toward national agricultural research systems in Africa;
- the CGIAR Secretariat should report to the Group every two years on these and related issues, and

- the task force should be disbanded.

Mr. Bennett described the process leading to some of these decisions, and explained how different components of the system had come together in this effort. The task force, in addition to working closely with representatives of national systems, had also interacted with the centers and with SPAAR.

An important characteristic of this process was that any semblance of a top-down approach was avoided. Consultation was long and perhaps arduous. It was also comprehensive and rewarding. What emerged from those con-
sultations was a productive consensus which would serve
as the foundation for programs involving African institu-
tions and the international centers in the future.

The task force had to report, too, that there were no
quick fixes for any of the problems confronted -- whether
these were in the areas of priority setting, capacity build-
ing, or co-ordination.

In the discussion that followed, there was general
agreement with the principles and conclusions outlined in
the report of the task force. Most of the issues were com-
plex, both politically and technologically. It would be nec-
essary, therefore, to return to the issues raised by the re-
port. That would be done at a subsequent meeting of the
Group.

The recommendations of the task force were accepted.

Report of the Task Force on Biotechnology
(BIOTASK)

Mr. Hans Wessels, reporting on the most recent meeting of
the task force, said that BIOTASK had defined its target
audience as the different components of the CGIAR.
Members of the group felt strongly that they should take a
proactive stance rather than serve as a monitoring commit-
tee.

BIOTASK would seek to raise awareness among
members of the CGIAR on the issues involved in the inte-
gration of modern biology into the programs of the inter-
national centers and national systems.

To achieve this goal, the task force had identified six
areas of concentration:

-- an annual inventory of biotechnology activities at
  the centers,
-- information services on biotechnology, primarily
  serving policymakers in developing countries and
  managers within the CGIAR system,
-- regulatory issues and environmental release, in
  cluding the establishment of biosafety commit-
tees,
-- public/private sector collaboration,
-- enabling technologies, and
-- cross center collaboration.

Mr. Wessels also reported that the Minister of Devel-
opment Cooperation of the Netherlands was sponsoring a
workshop on "The application of biotechnology to cas-
sava" to be held around March or April 1990. Interested
CGIAR centers would be invited.

The work of BIOTASK was commended. The task
force was urged to collaborate with national systems. It
was also suggested that the findings of the task force
should be brought to the attention of bilateral programs,
because some of the national systems have developed a
human capacity to develop biotechnologies but needed
equipment and laboratory assistance that would keep them
 abreast of current technological developments.

TAC secretariat review

Mr. Emil Javier, chairman of the TAC Secretariat review
team, told the Group that in preparing its report the team
had benefited from consultations with a wide range of
people knowledgeable about the workings of TAC. This
had included officials at FAO, both past and present staff
of the TAC Secretariat, TAC members, and donors.

Members of the team were themselves fully conver-
sant with the issues. He thanked all of them for their time
and efforts. He wanted to make special mention, he said,
of how Joan Joshi, secretary of the team, and Dana Dal-
rymple, had organized the documentation, set the dead-
lines, and created a coherent report out of individual con-
tributions.

The starting point of the team's review was to deter-
mine the TAC Secretariat's functions. The Secretariat it-
self saw itself as fulfilling six functions: to organize the
meetings of TAC and its subcommittees, to prepare for
CGIAR meetings, to bring coherence to their views, to as-
sess and monitor CGIAR priorities and strategies, to sup-
port the resource allocation process, and to identify emerg-
ing issues as well as new initiatives.

Some of these functions were administrative while
others were analytical. The assessment of all those whose
views were canvassed, and the assessment of the review
team itself, was that the Secretariat, past and present, had
done and was doing a good job. Within that overall com-
mandation, however, the Secretariat was seen as carrying
out its administrative role better than it fulfilled its analyti-
cal responsibilities. This was primarily because the TAC
Secretariat had been under-staffed.
Having reviewed the performance of the TAC Secretariat, the review team went on to make a number of recommendations which were shaped by two major assumptions. The first was the vital role of TAC in the structure and governance of the CGIAR. The second was that the CGIAR system was evolving into something larger, more complex, and more dynamic than it had ever been before. It would therefore demand much more of the TAC Secretariat than before. Thus the team's recommendations were forward looking, and directed at enabling the Secretariat to carry out new and added functions in the future.

The team's 14 recommendations were to be found in their report. The most important of them was that the TAC Secretariat should remain at FAO. This preserved the existing balance between cosponsors, and countered the apprehension that if the TAC Secretariat were to be at the World Bank where the CGIAR Secretariat functions, too much authority would be vested in a single cosponsor. At Rome, moreover, the TAC Secretariat had access to FAO's pool of scientific information and expertise.

The team found, however, that under the existing arrangement with FAO the TAC Secretariat was subject to a number of administrative constraints. These were not unusual when a small unit with specialized functions operated within a larger body with controls and procedures. These constraints could be eliminated within the FAO structure if the TAC Secretariat was treated as a special unit with somewhat different norms.

The review team recommended that FAO should give the TAC Secretariat the status of a field project. This arrangement had already been made with the FAO investment center, which is a joint FAO/World Bank project.

Another important recommendation was that the TAC Secretariat should report direct to FAO's assistant director general for agriculture. Such an arrangement would eliminate many operational constraints. It would also be in keeping with the principle of symmetry among cosponsors, because the CGIAR Secretariat reported directly to a senior vice president at the Bank.

The report also recommended that at least two positions in the TAC Secretariat be established with a higher salary range. The Secretariat would then have the option to compete with other potential employers, and attract personnel with seniority and background.

Mr. Javier stressed that the review team's report and his comments should not leave the impression that FAO was not supportive of the TAC Secretariat. FAO and particularly its administrators who were directly responsible for the TAC Secretariat had shown exemplary concern and support.

Invited by the CGIAR chairman to share FAO's perspective with the Group, Mr. Mohamed Zehni commended the review team for a thorough and constructive report. The positive spirit of the review team was appreciated.

FAO saw no difficulty in implementing most of the review team's 14 recommendations, in due course. Some recommendations were especially important and deserved further comment.

The review team recommended that the TAC Secretariat should be repositioned within the FAO hierarchy so that it could report direct to the assistant director general in the Agriculture Department. For many reasons, FAO felt that the TAC Secretariat was best served by remaining within the Research and Technology Development Division, which had institution-wide responsibility and was the focal point for science and technology matters both within and outside the organization. As the CGIAR expands its research mandate to include, for example, forestry, the TAC Secretariat's location within that division would become even more relevant than it is now.

FAO was agreeable to granting field project status to the TAC Secretariat. Negotiations toward this end have commenced, and will reach finality. FAO will also consider on a case-by-case basis the question of higher grade levels for TAC Secretariat staff.

FAO welcomed effective collaboration between the two secretariats of the CGIAR system. There were some concerns about the role of scientific advisors within the CGIAR Secretariat, but the planning exercise recently initiated by the CGIAR executive secretary was expected to eliminate existing ambiguities.

Mr. Zehni noted with pleasure that the review team confirmed the high regard enjoyed by the TAC Secretariat among all who are familiar with its activities. He reaffirmed FAO's commitment to the TAC Secretariat's independence and effectiveness.

The TAC chairman said he appreciated the efforts of the review team which had placed on the table a number of
issues that needed to be in the open. The report was correct in saying that the TAC Secretariat is hard working, and that its work is highly appreciated. He looked forward to whatever it takes to make sure that the TAC Secretariat continues to function as well as it has done up to now.

From the floor, it was suggested that given the greater burdens that are likely to be placed on the TAC Secretariat, the system as a whole might at some point in the future think of an overheads formula for defraying a share of the Secretariat's costs. The need to keep the TAC Secretariat's salaries internationally competitive was affirmed. The recommendation that the TAC Secretariat should remain within FAO was commended.

Concluding the discussion, the chairman said that a report of this kind did not require approval. The report was received, and noted, without dissent.

IBPGR committee -- progress report

Mr. Nyle Brady, chairman of the CGIAR ad hoc committee on the IBPGR, reported to the Group on the outcome of negotiations between IBPGR and FAO, as well as on the work of the committee he chaired. The committee consisted of Nyle Brady (chair), Sheriff Adetunji, Michael Arnold, Ernest Corea, J. C. Davies, Thomas Schurig, William Tossell, Moctar Toure, Dick van Sloten, and Manuel Villa-Issa. It met twice, on August 3, 1989 in the FAO headquarters building at Rome, and on October 28 at the World Bank, Washington D.C.

FAO representatives were present at both meetings of the committee, contributing substantially to the discussions. Messrs J. T. Esquinas-Alcazar, Lukas Brader, Philippe Mahler and Chris Bonte-Friedheim attended on August 3. Messrs Lukas Brader and Philippe Mahler were present on October 28.

The consensus that emerged from the committee's discussions was that the FAO and IBPGR had distinct and complementary roles, Mr. Brady said. The two institutions could carry out their responsibilities if they were administratively separated, but substantive collaboration between them was crucial. As a prerequisite for any negotiations for administrative separation, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) concerning the substantive working relationship between the two institutions was essential. The committee had suggested subject areas that should be included in a MOU.

After reviewing criteria that would affect the choice of a location for IBPGR headquarters, members of the committee agreed that the IBPGR headquarters might best be located near FAO in Rome. Failing that, there should be a more deliberate consideration of other sites, including those in developing countries.

Subsequently, the IBPGR board of trustees had approved a draft MOU which had been formulated in close consultation with FAO. The board also appointed a committee comprising members of the board -- D. R. Marshall (chair), Lukas Brader (subject to FAO approval), Ricardo Sevilla-Panizo, R. V. Valmayor, Dick van Sloten and Bill Tossell -- to re-examine and review all aspects of the IBPGR headquarters location issue, and to prepare a short list of suitable sites. The committee will be considering not only potential sites in Europe but elsewhere as well, including developing countries.

Mr. Brady said that the board had indicated its desire for consultation with donors, developing countries and the centers as their location committee carried out its task. In response to this request for interaction, he suggested that the CGIAR chairman appoint three donors to work with the IBPGR committee as it deliberates the headquarters location question.

Mr. Tossell reported that the ad hoc committee was impressed by the closeness of interaction at the working level between IBPGR and FAO. The committee's view, the chairman said, was that the Group should be informed of the outcome of negotiations concerning the MOU, and of the result of the review of the location issue, at the mid-term meeting to be held at the Netherlands next May.

Mr. William Tossell, chairman of the IBPGR board of trustees, emphasized the IBPGR's desire to work in collaboration and consultation with both FAO and the CGIAR. The draft MOU was a product of that process. He thanked the ad hoc committee for its assistance, and paid tribute to FAO for the spirit in which it had entered into discussions with IBPGR.

In response to questions and comments, he said there was no danger of the work of IBPGR coming to a halt while issues connected with its administrative structure were under review and negotiation. IBPGR was endowed
with a good staff, esprit de corps was high, and there was no reason to believe that their work would suffer.

The FAO delegate informed the Group that the working group of the FAO commission on plant genetic resources had reviewed various elements for a MOU during its meeting held on October 16-18. Those elements had been integrated with the IBPGR draft. The draft covered most of the issues, although a few points might still need to be clarified. FAO would now appoint a small working group to conduct negotiations with IBPGR and come up with a final draft.

Delegates commended the work of the ad hoc committee, and the sense of transparency that it had produced. It was suggested that the committee should continue its work until negotiations between the two institutions had been completed. The CGIAR chairman felt that the committee could be smaller. Some delegates proposed that the Italian representative should be named to the committee.

On the question of the location of IBPGR headquarters, most delegates preferred a location in Rome because that would keep IBPGR close to FAO. The CGIAR chairman said that in the light of the views expressed he would urge the IBPGR to treat Rome as the baseline from which all other assessments of possible sites would proceed. The Australian delegate commented, however, that any pressure in the direction of Rome would not be too helpful. The CGIAR chairman said that the reservation would be recorded.

The reconstituted CGIAR committee on the IBPGR will consist of Nyle Brady (chair), Sheriff Adetunji, Mike Arnold, Ernest Corea, J. C. Davies, Rosina Salerno, Thomas Schurig, and a representative from Mexico. Messrs Brady, Adetunji, and Schurig were named to liaise with and advise the IBPGR board's location committee.

Future meetings

The dates proposed for CGIAR meetings in 1992 were confirmed. The mid-term meeting will be held from May 18 to 22, and centers week from October 26 to 30. Dates previously approved for meetings in 1990 and 1991 were reconfirmed. The 1990 mid-term meeting will take place from May 21 to 25, and centers week will be held from October 29 to November 2. In 1991, the mid-term meeting will be held from May 20 to May 24 and centers week will take place from October 28 to November 1.

Throughout, centers week will continue to be held at Washington D.C. Next year's mid-term meeting will be at the Hague. The 1991 mid-term is scheduled for Paris under the sponsorship of the World Bank. No location had so far been volunteered for 1992 and if none is volunteered the mid-term meeting will again be held in Paris.

Mr. Hopper indicated that he would be asking for an agenda that provided for the installation of Mr. Thalwitz as chairman at an early stage early of next year's mid-term meeting at the Hague. He would be convening a chairman's advisory ad hoc committee before that meeting, and felt that Mr. Thalwitz should also participate in those discussions.

Approval of 1990 programs

Mr. von der Osten pointed out that the 1990 programs and budgets of the 13 centers that were before the Group for approval were the outcome of two inter-connected processes: the medium-term planning exercises carried out by the centers, and the resource allocation mechanism of the CGIAR.

This was the first year, he said, that all 13 programs for approval by the Group were part of the centers' five-year medium-term plans. Those plans had all been approved by the Group on separate occasions.

The total budget for those 13 programs in 1990 is $275.7 million. This represents a growth of $40.5 million or 17 per cent in nominal terms from 1989. After accounting for inflation, the real growth is some 12 per cent.

Breaking down the figure into its component parts, Mr. von der Osten said that operational expenditures for essential programs accounted for $257.8 million. This was a growth of $29 million or 11 per cent. Capital expenditures were set at $25.4 million, and here the growth over 1989 was $7.8 million or 45 per cent. The third component was $12 million or 5 per cent for inflation.

He said that one reason for the growth rate was that the medium-term planning process focused on research needs. Second, TAC's review process looks at programs rather than at financial constraints. Third, TAC looks at individual centers and does not make cross-center comparisons.
He confirmed that he and Mr. McCalla had set up a committee headed by Jim McWilliam to review the resource allocation process and its outcome. Another committee would be appointed, depending on the outcome of the pledging session, to determine how to deal with the funding gap. The task of the committee would be to bring the demand side in line with the available supply of funding as a result of this pledging session.

Mr. McCalla explaining the budget and resource allocation process said that TAC examines the five-year programs and budgets of centers, but also reviews their annual requests to determine whether or not the latter were consistent with the material that was in the five-year budget.

The programs and budget were approved.

**Pledging session**

Mr. von der Osten announced that based on commitments made by donors at the pledging session during centers week, on indications given by donors separate from the pledging session, and on the Secretariat's estimate where donors could not make precise commitments, funding for the essential programs of the centers in 1990 would amount to $240 million. This represented a growth of approximately 6 per cent over the estimated amount available for 1989. A growth of 6 per cent was slightly higher than the average growth rate of 5 per cent per year over the preceding three years. On the whole, he said, developments were positive and he expressed his gratitude to donors.

The question that remained was how to match the available funds with the centers' budgets. Approximately $276 million had been approved for system-wide operations and capital expenditures. This left a gap of about $36 million, which had to be bridged.

The chairman commented that a clearer funding picture would appear only after their second largest donor, Japan, had completed its budgetary process and declared its contribution to the CGIAR. If a gap existed even after all indications were in -- from Japan and from others who could not indicate precise amounts at the pledging session -- an ad hoc group would be established to work out a formula that could balance the budget without hitting some centers disproportionately hard. The Secretariat would meanwhile hold discussions with individual centers about possible adjustments.

**Other matters**

**Breeders rights**

The knowledge and experience of CGIAR centers will be incorporated in a study commissioned by the World Bank on the issues of intellectual property rights as they affect different aspects of the Bank's areas of responsibility. The study will include an inquiry into how the issues impinge on biological material and breeders rights.

**Condolences**

The Group extended its condolences to the family of ICLARM director general Ian Smith, whose death was announced during centers week.

**Documentation**

Suggestions were made for streamlining the documentation prepared for centers week, and in the management of the meeting itself. These will be followed up by the CGIAR Secretariat, and by the ad hoc committee of donors the chairman will convene before next May.

**Gender issues**

Gender issues will be included as an agenda item for the mid-term meeting at the Hague.

**Plant quarantine**

Mr. Hans Wessels reported on the studies conducted, in response to a suggestion by the Group when it met at Montpellier, on reducing phytosanitary risks in the international movement of plant germplasm with special reference to the interests of developing countries. A further report will be made to the Group at the Hague.
Special activities

Mr. von der Osten explained the workings of the Special Activities Account -- its rationale, operations, and status. He pointed out that it was the CGIAR's only mechanism for funding and conducting high priority activities with a system-wide significance. The CGIAR Secretariat limited its proposals to those which were essential, which had been endorsed by donors, and which could not be undertaken through any other mechanism.

He described projects that had been completed, continuing projects and new initiatives. The latter included the CGIAR history and a review of the resource allocation process. The CGIAR Secretariat also expects to undertake a new public information project in consultation with center directors and TAC: a set of "value for money" publications, documenting the impact of CGIAR-supported research in developing countries. Several donors had asked for this.

The available balance in the account was $432,000. Funding needs in 1990 were some $1.5 million. The chairman pointed out in this connection that there was a shortfall of approximately $800,000 for the CD ROM project.

Sustainability

In keeping with the system's continued commitment to sustainable agriculture, current approaches to organic farming and their relevance to the work supported by the CGIAR will be examined. Information and analyses on the subject will be disseminated.

Universities

On the initiative of Mr. Zehni, the role of universities in developing countries, including their potential involvement in agricultural research, will be reviewed by a planning group next January and be the subject of a wider consultation next September. Progress will be reported at centers week 1990.

Vegetables research

The Group heard a status report on a proposal for setting up a vegetables research network in Africa. The proposal is designed to bring about a systematic build up of indigenous research through a collaborative partnership among national research systems, and between those systems and AVRDC. Interested donors met separately to review the proposals.

Executive session

Four major items were covered by donors in executive session: the appointment of the next CGIAR chairman, matters connected with AVRDC, the CGIAR committee on the IBPGR, and resource issues.

The Group endorsed the selection of Mr. Wilfried Thalwitz as its next chairman, noting that his appointment would be consistent with the CGIAR's previously stated position that the chair should be filled by an active senior officer of the Bank. Mr Thalwitz's experience and his interest in the CGIAR were seen as additional advantages. For the future, however, it was felt that a more formal consultative process between the Bank and donors should be established.

Mr. Hopper referred to matters connected with AVRDC. What was necessary, he said, was to ensure that AVRDC is not associated with the political structure in Taiwan. This would result, for instance, in scientists from anywhere in the world having access to AVRDC. He would be making some specific proposals to the authorities both in Taipei and Beijing, and was hopeful that outstanding issues could be satisfactorily resolved.

Donors commended the work of the CGIAR committee dealing with the IBPGR, and noted with appreciation that Nyle Brady would continue to function as chairman of the committee, although he had retired and no longer represented a donor.

Donors covered much ground when they discussed resource issues. Among the topics discussed were definitions used in the budget formulation process ("essential," "desirable" and so on), the reluctance of some institutions to fund "unrestricted core" activities, the impact of CGIAR-supported research, the balance of responsibilities
between international centers and national systems, and
the appropriate extent of centralized management or over-
sight of the system's finances. As the chairman observed,
the atmosphere was not one of crisis but of concern.

Donors felt that several research responsibilities were
rushing at the centers, and they wanted to be assured that
the centers responded to the new challenges with a full
understanding of what resources would be needed, what
would be available, and how best these should be man-
aged. The system was confronted by new challenges at a
time when resources were being more tightly controlled at
their source. Conversely, some donors felt that the realities
of the resource situation were not getting through to the
centers and their boards. The system as a whole could
benefit from an objective assessment of the resource impli-
cations for what the system would be undertaking in the
foreseeable future.

The view was expressed that the centers should ex-
plitly recognize resource constraints when framing their
programs and shaping their budgets. In this connection,
some donors said that centers might consider decentraliz-
ing more of their existing responsibilities to national sys-
tems, and redeploying resources for new activities. The
need to maintain structures and equipment at the centers in
good order was stressed.

The work of existing oversight mechanisms operating
through TAC and the CGIAR secretariat were acknowl-
edged, but there were expressions of interest in reviving
proposals for establishing a centralized management/fi-
nance advisory committee as well. Donors also asked for
more information about the work and impact of the cen-
ters.

In the course of the discussion, the Group was re-
minded that despite the pressures on the system at various
times, the fact was that funds for the system had increased
annually since 1972 except during one year. A donor took
a strongly positive position, stating that circumstances did
not warrant pessimism, particularly because more re-
sources were likely to be available for forestry research
and for research with a sustainability orientation.

Against the background of the various viewpoints ex-
pressed, Mr. Hopper undertook to arrange for the long
term resource position of the system to be examined, and
for a report reflecting that examination to be presented to
the Group at the Hague next year.

Chairman's closing remarks

Mr. Hopper said that as he went through the summary re-
port of their proceedings which had been passed around he
was amazed that the Group could have accomplished so
much in their week of meetings.

He said he would make a longer intervention at the
Hague and that for the present meeting his only parting
comments would be on some of the issues raised during
their consideration of the Africa Task Force report.

In Africa, he continued, they were all confronted with
a situation they had not confronted before, that of charting
an experimental path along which to direct both expertise
and assistance to the national research systems.

During a recent trip to Africa he was impressed by the
fact that African research centers had a much larger pool
of trained manpower than they had 10 or 20 years ago.
But they needed assistance, information tied to equipment,
an opportunity to visit their peers in their own countries
and elsewhere, and to be part of the international research
community.

It was not going to be easy to build strong national
systems. There was a danger, for instance, of strengthen-
ing them beyond the point at which their own governments
could support them. Their isolation could be broken, how-
ever, if they were brought into networks and connected
with international centers.

The role of the international centers, in this connec-
tion, should form an important part of the Group's future
deliberations. The Group had in the past discouraged the
international centers from handling bilateral allocations to
given countries or given activities. This question could be
re-opened. It is not a function of the international centers
to act as a conduit for funds. On the other hand, bilateral
donors including the World Bank were looking for ways
by which they could buttress their transfers of funds to Af-
rican centers with adequate supervision and adequate tech-
nical support.

International centers could be an extraordinary instru-
ment for being able to pass on such resources with maxi-
mum effectiveness if the correct mechanism for doing this
could be found. This was an issue to which they would
have to return at a policy session. For the present he
would remind them that if they maintained their sense of
innovativeness, and did not forego their own tradition of experimentation, the CGIAR could perform a second miracle in the 1990s -- the miracle of feeding Africa.

Mr. Hopper thanked the CGIAR executive secretary, the TAC chairman, the CGIAR Secretariat, and the TAC Secretariat for their contribution to the successful outcome of centers week. He thanked the administrative staff from the Bank and the Fund for making arrangements for the meetings. He thanked cosponsors and members of ad hoc committees for their advice and assistance. He thanked the interpreters for enabling members of the Group to communicate with each other. Above all, Mr. Hopper said, he thanked participants for their co-operation.

The meeting ended at 12.05 p.m. on Friday, November 3.
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Statement by the Center Directors Committee

Broadening the Mandate of the CGIAR System
Important Issues to be Considered

The Directors General of the CGIAR centers recognize that change in the system is both inevitable and desirable. While convinced that a commodity approach concentrated on basic food crops has served the system well over the past several decades, we also recognize that the world has changed during this period. Some nations have developed much stronger national research systems that can take on more responsibilities; food self-reliance through specialization and comparative advantage has replaced food self-sufficiency as a goal; increased purchasing power to permit access to increased food supplies has been revealed as a key issue; and environmental degradation threatens the resource base essential to meet future food needs and support economic growth. The urgency of these issues does not permit a "business as usual" approach. The CGIAR system will have to make bold changes to address these needs. The mandate of the CGIAR must be modified to address the needs of economic development, food self-reliance and natural resources management in an integrated manner. If the CGIAR were to be created de novo to meet the needs of the 21st century, it would probably look quite different than what has evolved.

We believe the CGIAR should develop a long term vision as to what an "ideal" system should look like and make the changes currently being considered in a manner that moves it progressively towards that goal, while striving to maintain the sharpness of focus and clarity of objectives that have contributed to its success. To accomplish this, we suggest that the following issues should be considered.

- The primary focus on food production should not be compromised. This has given the CGIAR a valuable sense of identity, clarity of purpose and shared values. Governments everywhere are judged on their success in delivering increasing amounts of food to their people at reasonable prices. Maintaining a strong emphasis on food production will ensure that commonality of purpose essential to the continued strong links to national agricultural research systems that is vital to our enterprise.

- Basic food production, rural livelihood and poverty alleviation goals are mutually reinforcing. They are also integrally related with sustainability objectives.
- Rural income goals will best be met while maintaining a food production focus by:
  - giving priority to commercialization and value-added benefits in relation to crops already in the mandate of the centers
  - selectively adding crops with preference for those that are important both as food for local consumption and for their export-earning potential.

- Increased productivity on existing lands is an important contribution towards alleviating pressure on more fragile ecosystems. Centers are increasingly incorporating a sustainability perspective into their productivity research. We recognize potential conflict between short-term productivity improvement and longer-term sustainability, and we seek examples of techniques that minimize that conflict. Agroforestry can contribute substantially to this goal.

Addition of some or all of the potential new activities under consideration will have an impact on the management and finances of the CGIAR. Concerns include the efficiency of the use of resources, the effect on the informal nature of the system, the size and nature of CGIAR meetings, and the operation of the TAC. To minimize any negative impact, we suggest the following principles should be kept in mind.

- Addition, whenever feasible, of activities as opposed to institutions.

- Merger of complementary activities -- between non-associated centers; between existing centers; and between non-associated and existing centers.

- Seeking a balance between advantages of scale and possible disadvantages of excess size or complexity.
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