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Summary of main conclusions

(A summary of the main conclusions reached at the CGIAR meetings held during international centers week 1988 appears below. Items are presented in alphabetical order.)

Continuity on center boards

Responding to a suggestion from Mr. Jack Meagher, chairman of the committee of board chairpersons (CBC), the Group agreed that the CGIAR secretariat would prepare and circulate a paper outlining the options available for ensuring both the continuity of tenure of each board chairperson over an appropriate period of time and the balanced rotation of membership on center boards.

Executive Secretary

The appointment of Mr. Alexander von der Osten as Executive Secretary of the CGIAR Secretariat on the retirement of Mr. Curtis Farrar was announced and received with acclamation.

Funding requirements

The Group accepted TAC's proposals and approved center budgets for 1989 in the core/essential category requiring funding of $238.4 million. Donor pledges were estimated by the CGIAR secretariat at $228 million, or 95 per cent.

Future CGIAR meetings

The Group's mid-term meeting in 1989 will be held at Canberra, Australia, from May 29-June 2. Donor delegations, regional representatives, one representative each from center boards and center directors, and others directly involved in the agenda will participate in the Canberra meeting. No other observers will be invited. Donors will hold a half-day session in camera. International centers week will be held at Washington DC from October 30-November 3.

The 1990 mid-term meeting will be held at the Hague, the Netherlands, from May 21-25. International centers week will be at Washington DC, October 29-November 2.

In 1991, the mid-term meeting is scheduled for May 20-24, with Paris as the tentative venue. International centers week will be in Washington DC, October 28-November 1.

ICARDA Reviews

The chairman pointed out that the ICARDA board and management deserved respect for bringing the center to maturity while facing turmoil in the Middle
East. Summing up the discussion, he said that ICARDA should consider very carefully whether the changes now required could be made without strengthening the management team. There was a consensus that an interim management review, perhaps in two years, should determine whether the measures to deal with issues raised in the management review were on track. The program review was positively received by both the center and the Group, although some strategic issues remain for resolution in further interaction between ICARDA and TAC.

**IRRI**

Progress made by IRRI in the management area was noted with satisfaction. As proposed by the CGIAR secretariat, IRRI will report at ICW89 on the further progress made in implementing recommendations of the 1987 external management review.

**Medium term programs**

The Group approved the medium term programs of IITA, ILCA, and CIAT as recommended by TAC.

**Oversight Committee on the CGIAR secretariat**

The work of the Oversight Committee which examined the operations of the CGIAR secretariat was commended, and its recommendations were endorsed, with some reservations on specific proposals.

Concerning a policy council proposed by the committee, the Group was informed that the donors, meeting separately, had decided to meet "in camera" hereafter during international centers week and mid year meetings, to discuss policy issues and advise the CGIAR chairman. These donor meetings will substitute for the policy council. The chairman could also ask for meetings of donors to be convened between scheduled meetings of the Group. These new arrangements will be reviewed in a year or so. The chairman will continue to appoint ad hoc committees to advise him and/or the Group on specific issues.

The Oversight Committee's recommendation that the TAC secretariat be combined with the CGIAR secretariat within the framework of the World Bank was postponed for consideration in connection with a review of the TAC secretariat that was being organized by FAO on behalf of cosponsors.

**Plant genetic resources, and Biotechnology**

The Group adopted a policy statement on plant genetic resources prepared by TAC. The CGIAR supports and will continue to support work on plant genetic resources "to ensure that the diversity of germplasm is safely maintained and made available for use in programs of research and crop improvement for the long term benefit of all people." The Group also approved a TAC document on biotechnology which followed closely a statement made on behalf of TAC at Berlin (May 1988).
Three ad hoc groups will continue work on related issues: a committee of center scientists responsible for genetic resources to focus on inter-center collaboration; a joint TAC-center directors working group to monitor implementation of CGIAR policy; and a task force composed of donor, TAC and center representatives, which will be convened by Mr. Hans Wessels, to follow the broader political and legal issues connected with biotechnology and to bring these to the attention of TAC and the CGIAR.

Relations with non-associated centers

The Group considered an outline prepared by the TAC chairman of possible approaches to expansion, and comments by the TAC on the outline. It generally approved the suggested approach of preparing a summary description of the global context in which the CGIAR will operate, and concurrently asking TAC panels reinforced by additional experts to review the research areas covered by the non-associated centers in relation to CGIAR programs. There was a clear consensus that these studies should also consider possibilities of cutting back on lower priority activities presently financed by the CGIAR.

As it moves forward, TAC will consider the many detailed suggestions made during the discussion concerning the process and the issues to be addressed. Various other TAC activities may either be delayed or dovetailed into the work on expansion. The TAC chairman expects to submit TAC recommendations on stage one of the exercise at ICW89. Stage two, the consideration of specific proposals, will follow the Group’s decision on stage one.

Review processes in the CGIAR

The Group discussed and approved a paper prepared by TAC and the CGIAR secretariat describing a fine tuning of review processes within the CGIAR.

Sharing responsibilities among centers

The Group approved a paper submitted by TAC on this subject. Where research responsibilities involve more than one center, and it is desirable for the responsibilities of such centers to be revised and clarified, the centers concerned will in the first instance be encouraged to work out an appropriate sharing of responsibilities, as several have already done. If that approach fails, TAC will initiate a step-by-step process of consultations and review, leading to agreement between or among centers. TAC and center managements will interact with each other throughout this process.
Summary of proceedings

Chairman's opening remarks

1. In his formal opening remarks, CGIAR chairman W. David Hopper pointed out that international centers week (ICW88) was taking place against a backdrop of international concern about declining food supplies, and fears that the global outlook for food was threatened by many factors, some of them man made. The CGIAR should neither be complacent nor discouraged. Much had been achieved. Much remained to be done. And that was what international centers week was all about.

2. Ironically, Mr. Hopper said, the good news on the food front came mainly from Asia, which was once almost written off as a collectively incurable "basket case." Perhaps it was not just a coincidence that the impact of international agricultural research on post-colonial societies was first felt in Asia, when unprecedented wheat harvests were recorded in the late 'sixties. The tasks facing the current Group were somewhat different and in some ways more complex than those of the past. But the CG system as a whole could respond to changing circumstances and demands because of the caliber, dynamism, and sense of caring demonstrated by its component parts.

3. Reviewing the agenda for centers week, Mr. Hopper said that some innovations had been made in the structure of meetings. For example, parallel sessions had been arranged at which IFPRI, ILRAD, IRRI, and WARDA would be heard concurrently. There would also be an "open" session on the last day of ICW88, when invitees would join the Group for the morning's proceedings.

4. Mr. Hopper said that some items on the agenda could lead to decisions affecting the future of the entire system. These included a possible expansion of the CGIAR; review processes within the system; the sharing of responsibilities among centers; and a policy statement on plant genetic resources.

5. As always, Mr. Hopper continued, the pledging session was a key element of the agenda. The "free ride" provided by exchange rates that worked in the system's favor was over. The CG system had to depend on the magnitude of donor generosity and the strength of their commitment to what the CGIAR stood for. That, too, Mr. Hopper said, was what international centers week was all about.

Report by the chairman of the committee of board chairpersons

6. Responding to a suggestion from Mr. Jack Meagher, chairman of the committee of board chairpersons (CBC), the Group agreed that the CGIAR secretariat would prepare and circulate a paper outlining the options available for ensuring both the continuity of tenure of each board chairperson over an appropriate period of time and the balanced rotation of membership on center boards.
7. Presenting the annual report of the CBC, Mr. Meagher stressed the importance of interaction between board chairpersons and other components of the Group including center directors, the technical advisory committee (TAC), and the CGIAR secretariat. In addition, meetings of the CBC itself provided opportunities for contact and consultation between and among centers. The CBC also served as another source of those checks and balances operating through consensus that make the CGIAR a unique system.

8. Some 150 highly-qualified and well-informed members of the international agricultural community served as trustees or governors of center boards whose good performance was crucial to the CGIAR system. Board chairs, drawn from that group, came from 11 nations. They were in a unique position to reflect the views and opinions of the world's scientific community; to be both proactive and reactive.

9. The CBC could help to strengthen the leadership of center boards, and to represent the views of all board members at meetings with TAC, center directors, the CGIAR secretariat, and other components of the system. The CBC had also developed its own agenda, both on matters of management and of special scientific interest. They had examined issues as wide ranging as compensation at centers, and the advantages to be gained from biotechnology.

10. Experience had shown, however, that discontinuity of tenure hampered board chairs in their efforts to play a system-wide role within the CGIAR. Many chairpersons came to their position late in their six-year terms (of membership on a board) and the chance to participate outside their own center was therefore limited. After examining different aspects of discontinuity, and how it impaired the effectiveness of boards and board chairs, the CBC had concluded that some modification of board statutes may be required to provide greater flexibility.

11. Summarizing the views of the CBC on this issue, Mr. Meagher said: "It is suggested that boards should consider the possibility of making some exceptions to the rule of two terms each of three years and that boards should so arrange their statutes to ensure that when elected, a chairperson should be able to serve for a minimum of three years, or even four years, providing that reappointment is considered by the board on either an annual or biennial basis. This, of course, may require some extension to the normal period of six years' service. And for similar reasons of continuity, it may also be preferable for the chairperson of the board chairs to remain in that position for a two year period."

12. Mr. Meagher commended the leadership role of TAC within the CGIAR system. He also applauded efforts by the CGIAR secretariat to expand and upgrade the data base from which possible board members could be identified.

13. Mr. Meagher announced that the CBC had elected Mr. Lawrence Wilson (IITA) to succeed him as chairman. CBC. Mr. Henri Carsalade (ISNAR) would be vice chairman.
14. During the discussion that followed, the Group agreed that continuity should be ensured on boards and on the CBC, but there was no consensus on how exactly board statutes should be amended. The question was also raised as to whether the performance of board chairs was periodically assessed. Mr. Meagher described the "auditing" process used by some boards, in response.

15. Mr. Hopper said that his experience with many boards made him feel that six years is a short time. He offered the view that all available options for ensuring continuity should be set down in a position paper prepared by the CG secretariat for study by the Group. The proposal was accepted without dissent.

Report by the chairman of center directors

16. Mr. Ross Gray, presenting his report as chairman of center directors general, said that the year under review had been exceptional, with directors general meeting four times as a full group -- at Maui, Bad-Homburg, Hyderabad (at ICRISAT) and Washington DC (IFPRI). Center directors had also completed the final two weeks of a three week management training course organized by the CGIAR secretariat.

17. On the basis of their list of activities and meetings, there should be no doubt about their ability to cooperate and work together. If occasionally they appeared reluctant to take on new tasks, that was because of the need to set priorities, and also because of their concern, perhaps obsession, to give their full attention to their primary responsibility: guiding and managing the programs and affairs of specific international agricultural research centers.

18. At their business meetings, center directors monitored and appraised the progress of inter-center activities. They also generated or considered proposals for new inter-center activity, because it was one of their ground rules that any inter-center initiative had to be unanimously "blessed" by center directors. Center directors also decided how to respond to the demands of the environment in which they functioned.

19. Several subcommittees of center directors dealt with a range of activities, and the work of these groups was also reviewed by center directors meeting as a group. Sustainable agriculture, staff pensions and insurance, fund raising, public awareness, the CGIAR preservation project, and the conditions under which scientists seconded by donors could work at the centers were among the subjects reviewed. Some center directors had also served on the Oversight Committee on the CGIAR secretariat.

20. The subcommittee on Africa was continuing to compile information on inter-center activities on that continent. Their areas of concentration included relations with national research systems, training, and region-specific research. The subcommittee was working in consultation with the Africa Task Force under the chairmanship of Guy Camus.

21. Mr. Gray announced that the chairman of center directors from November 4 would be Mr. Alexander von der Osten (ISNAR). The chairman-elect for 1990 was
Mr. Larry Stifel (IITA). (Note: These arrangements were changed following the appointment of Mr. von der Osten as Executive Secretary-elect of the CGIAR. Mr. Stifel is the new chairman of center directors, and Mr. Donald Winkelmann (CIMMYT) is chairman-elect.)

TAC chairman's report

22. Mr. McCalla reported on TAC 46 held at ICRISAT in Hyderabad, India, and TAC 47 held immediately preceding ICW88 in Washington. He said that the work program of TAC was significantly affected by the decision of the Group to proceed with a review of non-associated centers. Among the items postponed are strategic analysis of specific commodities and activities, completion of the paper on CGIAR centers and the private sector, and decisions on aquaculture and coconut, although the work on aquaculture will feed in to the review of non-associated centers. The revised TAC paper on priorities and strategies promised for 1991 will not be ready before 1992. Rather than start with reviews of individual commodities, the priority exercise will start with the CGIAR in a global context, which will serve both for the non-associated center exercise and the revised research strategy.

23. Regular reviews of centers were continuing: the CIMMYT EPR and EMR were discussed during TAC 47; reviews of CIP and CIAT were planned for 1989. TAC was also proceeding with the medium term resource allocation process. Initial discussions had been held with ICRISAT and WARDA. To deal with these and other continuing matters, TAC had established three standing committees, to deal with priorities and strategies, external reviews, and resource allocation.

24. TAC remains convinced that the resource allocation process is far superior to the old process, but there is some uneasiness about the rates of growth in the programs being approved. Issues of critical mass and scale remain unresolved, as well as the consistent use of the terms "essential" and "desirable". The TAC standing committee is already at work on these questions, and the TAC will take them up as soon as the entire set of centers has been through the new review process.

25. The latter issue was the focus of several comments from members of the Group. No disagreement was expressed with TAC's view that a resource constraint should not be introduced in the middle of the first round of the new process. A number of donors, however, gave voice to their concern that the approval of center budgets without considering resource implications would lead to a program level identified as "essential" for which resources could not be found. A guideline on the level of real growth was suggested. A donor said there needed to be an interim method of dealing with a lack of sufficient resources to provide for programs which the Group had declared to be essential, which also took account of the fact that there were five centers whose programs were not increasing because they had yet to undergo the medium term budget review process.

26. Several speakers objected to the deferral until Canberra of the TAC paper on relations between centers and national research systems. This paper
was ready for Group discussion so far as TAC was concerned, but was deferred because of a crowded agenda. This was a topic on which a good deal was happening, for example seminars on increasing the efficiency of the global system by sharing responsibilities between the centers and more advanced national systems.

27. Others were concerned about the deferral of important questions which seemed closely linked with other issues before TAC, or were of special importance. Mr. McCalla replied that TAC was keeping such issues in view, and some of them would be easier to deal with later because they would be handled partially in the course of other business. He added that the medium term program process, and the strategic planning centers were doing, helped considerably in dealing with a range of questions before TAC, for example the issue of responsibility for rice in Africa.

28. At the end of this discussion, a speaker raised the issue of what kind of TAC the system needed. The chairman of the CGIAR responded that the cosponsors had been concerned about the overburdening of TAC. The committee had retained the broad scope established by Sir John Crawford as the first TAC chairman, which took it beyond technical levels. As the CG evolved and the complexities of the world evolved, TAC now had to confront a colossal job. It was doing well, but could not be expected to continue to expand its work without some change. If a further increase in the number of TAC members was rejected, as threatening disruption of a smooth working process, perhaps there could be subject matter committees including non-TAC members which would work for an appropriate period and report to the TAC, permitting it to draw on a wider range of specialties and remain in overall control without actually growing in size. An example of the kind of demand in the offering was the proposal for a forestry research activity, which would go beyond the present areas of TAC's expertise. Mr. McCalla made clear that TAC itself had not yet had a chance to discuss this proposal. There was clearly a problem of range of expertise, and TAC would be glad to give its advice on it. Two donors found the idea worthy of consideration. Mr. Hopper said that he would discuss it further at the dinner meeting of heads of delegations.

Center presentations

29. Responding to the wishes of the Group expressed at Berlin for innovations in the style and structure of international centers week meetings, presentations were made by IFPRI, ILRAD, IRRI and WARDA at parallel sessions. The IFPRI and ILRAD presentations were heard at one venue; those by IRRI and WARDA at another.

30. 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 discussion.

31. During the discussion on the IRRI presentation, progress made in the management area was noted with satisfaction. As proposed earlier by the CGIAR secretariat, IRRI will report at ICW89 on the further progress made in implementing the recommendations of the 1987 external management review.
Relations with non-associated centers

32. The Group considered an outline [Document: AGR/TAC:IAR/88/24] prepared by the TAC chairman of possible approaches to expansion and comments by the TAC on that outline. It generally approved the suggested approach of preparing a summary description of the global context in which the CGIAR will operate, and concurrently asking TAC panels reinforced by additional experts to review the research areas covered by the non-associated centers in relation to CGIAR programs. There was a clear consensus that these studies should also consider possibilities of cutting back on lower priority activities presently financed by the CGIAR.

33. As it moves forward, TAC will consider the many detailed suggestions made during the discussion concerning the process and the issues to be addressed. Various other TAC activities may be either delayed or dovetailed into the work on expansion. The TAC chairman expects to submit TAC recommendations on stage one of the exercise at ICW89. Stage two, the consideration of specific proposals, will follow the Group's decisions on stage one.

34. Mr. McCalla explained the genesis of his paper, which was prepared after discussions with TAC, and with contributions from several TAC members, but without any kind of formal TAC approval. Part one outlined the global context for decisions about future roles for the CGIAR. Mr. McCalla said that TAC had some doubts about his proposal for a think tank looking at trends to the year 2035, and he would set that proposal aside. (A number, but not all of the speakers in the discussion agreed with this decision.) TAC also had some doubts about the availability of data for the various tables proposed to help in focussing on the constraints to improved production and consumption of food, and the research approaches to those constraints. Otherwise, he reported that TAC had generally endorsed this background activity.

35. In the discussion of part one, there was some criticism of the need to make such a complete background study. Mr. McCalla said that there was little original research involved here, mainly summarizing analyses done by others and drawing it together into a coherent framework for CGIAR decision-making. Others also voiced doubts about the practicality of completing the tables as proposed. The general outcome, however, was acceptance of the approach proposed for TAC. Numerous substantive comments were made, for example the suggestion that attention should be given to the alleviation of poverty, rather than to the poor. All of these comments, Mr. McCalla said, will be taken into account by the TAC as it proceeds.

36. Part two of the paper was process oriented, and described the general approach TAC would take to consideration of the work of non-associated centers in relation to that of the CGIAR. Mr. McCalla said that TAC had rejected the idea of simply considering non-associated centers one by one and reaching a favorable or unfavorable decision on that basis. A more likely approach would also consider the choices of adoption with changes, and support to programs but not to the institutions presently involved. Moreover, there had to be
some element of a clean slate approach, thinking about the most efficient way to pursue certain objectives independently of existing institutions. Members cited the first three of the four options. The first two, i.e. the clean slate approach, and considering the areas of work of non-associated centers rather than the institutional entities as such, were endorsed as appropriate modes of thought to be considered in the exercise, and several endorsed the third, which reads:

- to admit in the CG as entities those that fill major gaps, but
- with recommendations as to how their programs should be adjusted to meet CG objectives better, including recommendations on specific linkages and interfaces with existing CG centers.

One donor suggested the creation of a special fund to promote linkages of a collaborative and subject matter nature among centers.

37. The process TAC appeared to favor was in two stages: the first stage would involve several panels, perhaps two or three, looking across the program areas of a number of non-associated centers and coming to broad conclusions about the appropriateness of CGIAR support and the relationship among them and existing activities. These panels would involve some specialists in areas not well represented on the TAC. Their reports would contribute to the completion of part one of the paper. Part one plus the panel reports from stage one of part two would be brought to the Group for approval in ICW89, and if approved would constitute the framework for stage two in which TAC would look at specific organizational alternatives, going in detail into research and management questions.

38. A number of speakers expressed the fear that discussion of the "expansion" of the system would dissipate the selective character of the CGIAR which had been its great strength. Others thought that the availability of funding warranted considering the exercise as more "restructuring" than "expansion", and argued for a clean slate approach. It should not be assumed that a new research program required a new, global center. One should look at other models involving institutions in and outside of the CGIAR. No explicit constraints on the size or form of the resulting CGIAR system were suggested, however. One donor approved of the idea of being given options to consider, and a round of points on resource constraints clustered around the belief that TAC should be aware of resource limitations without the imposition of specific constraints on the exercise. One conclusion was that the donor members should give TAC specific guidance on this issue at an appropriate, later time.

39. Many of those entering the discussion stressed the importance of considering the roles of organizations outside of the CGIAR very fully. All aspects of the relationship with national systems were stressed, with particular emphasis placed on national research systems performing functions previously or currently among the tasks handled by CGIAR centers. Other aspects of research where the centers did not have a clear comparative advantage should be delegated to national institutions in the industrialized countries. There was also insistence on the importance of a regional focus,
that is on the differing needs of the different regions. Opinions varied on whether the CGIAR should support regional institutions as such. Some mentioned CATIE and CARDI as non-associated centers which should be added to the list for consideration.

40. Several expressed concern that this large exercise not be conducted inwardly, but that it should constantly be related to the broad international framework, and the goals of development, which gave meaning to the CGIAR and its purposes. Several speakers searched their souls, hoping to find a means of reducing the scale of the task, and particularly the time required, but there seemed ultimately to be no divergence from Mr. McCalla's conclusion that unless an answer were to be decided in advance, the process would need to be fully implemented in order to have the basis for a set of decisions in which the Group could have confidence.

41. Concern was expressed about the number of other important issues being considered at the same time, for example the effort to spell out in concrete detail the implications of the new commitment to sustainable agriculture, and the medium term resource allocation exercise. It was recognized that some of the business of appraising the role of non-associated centers involved doing things that TAC and the Group needed to be doing constantly in any case, such as searching the trends of international agricultural development for shifts in overall priorities. There was no choice but to go ahead, and to do so as quickly as possible in order to avoid the potential damage to the system and the non-associated centers which could be done by prolonged uncertainty. One speaker urged that specific thought be given to the transitional period, and to steps that could be taken to reduce any risks that it might entail.

Future structure of the Group

42. This subject was covered in the paper prepared by the TAC chairman on relations with non-associated centers, as he explained because he could not think about the topic without some consideration of structural implications for the CGIAR. Comments were made during the consideration of this paper, often reflecting concern of the speakers about the possibility of continuing an effective CGIAR if there were to be considerable expansion. The comment of the CGIAR executive secretary on the report of the Oversight Committee also contained some discussion of the implications for the secretariat of proposed change. The subject as a whole was carried forward for later consideration.

Medium term programs

The Group approved the medium term programs of IITA, ILCA, and CIAT.

IITA

43. Introducing the IITA presentation, board chairperson Lawrence A. Wilson placed the center's activities in the context of projected population growth, with sub-Saharan Africa's 1985 population of 460 million expected to reach 1 billion by 2010 or earlier. Consequently, agricultural production, employment
opportunities and social services would have to increase at a rate of over 3 per cent per year, just to remain at their 1980 levels.

44. The rapidity of this required increase would place great pressure on agricultural and other resources. It was in this race against time that IITA had made substantial adjustments in financial and personnel administration, in research, and in training and outreach programs, so as to increase its institutional capability as an instrument of agricultural development. Those adjustments were at the hear of IITA's medium term plan.

45. IITA director Larry Stifel said that the three major themes of the plan were focus, integration, and cooperation.

46. Focus: IITA would seek to increase the productivity of the small scale farmer in Africa; to improve the farming systems of the humid and sub-humid tropics of west and central Africa; to concentrate on the major agroecologies of the region by establishing small research substations in those ecologies; and to sharpen its research on commodity improvement.

47. Integration: The organizational structure at IITA had integrated three major thrusts -- resource management research, commodity improvement research, and crop management. IITA had also accepted the challenge of inculcating the entire institute with a farming systems orientation, to ensure that the technology generated by research would be productive in the real world of the African farmer.

48. Cooperation: Partnerships with national systems would be built and strengthened, enabling them to create and use technology that would satisfy their own needs. IITA expected to operate more downstream over the next five years than was customary for an international center. The main mechanisms for promoting such partnerships would be research liaison scientists, resident scientist teams, and training.

49. Mr. Stifel also elaborated on IITA's programs for developing sustainable agriculture, and on its successful and highly acclaimed program of biological control which was protecting the forest zone's most important food source, cassava, from the losses caused by the cassava mealybug.

50. Several speakers congratulated IITA for having produced a good program and a lucid presentation, and endorsed its orientation and details. The center was congratulated on what it had already achieved, and urged to continue with its work on biological control.

51. Several questions were raised on IITA's plans for substations and resident scientist teams. Mr. Mc Calla pointed out that while TAC considered the work of resident scientists a desirable activity, IITA considered them essential. A speaker cautioned that the concept of resident scientists came close to technical assistance, raising the issue of assimilation with national programs, which did not always happen. The cost-effectiveness of substations was also questioned.
52. Mr. Stifel said that the substations would be "very small," with two or three scientists involved. He pointed out that half of the countries in the region served by IITA spent less than $3 million each year on research. Most of the national systems did not have the capacity to work effectively with IITA, so the center felt that special measures were necessary. Mr. Stifel and Mr. McCalla agreed that the mix between "desirable" and "essential" categories could be resolved through continuing consultation -- already strong and productive -- between the center and TAC.

53. Speakers also referred to the relatively high increase of expenditure in the first year of the five year period. They urged that IITA should cooperate with other centers in the area of biological control, and said that in attempting to concentrate on west and central Africa, IITA should not withdraw completely from breeding crops of area wide significance.

54. Responding to a number of comments that moved on to wider questions of funding, Mr. Hopper said it was clear that the system needed to examine more closely the linkage between bilateral assistance to strengthen national systems and the activities of the CG centers that had the same objective. A major set of questions had to be addressed, and he hoped that the subject could in the not too distant future be a separate item on the agenda.

ILCA

55. Board chairperson Ralph Cummings described in some detail the process of planning and consultation leading up to the preparation and presentation of ILCA's medium term program. Center management, staff, the board, and representatives of national systems had all been involved. TAC was consulted at various points along the line. Finally, a week of intensive staff discussion followed by a three day meeting of ILCA's program committee produced and endorsed the final document.

56. The groundwork was laid systematically and soundly, implementation had begun, and significant contributions to livestock production and to the welfare of farm families in subSaharan Africa was possible.

57. Mr. Cummings said that ILCA had limited itself to three major ruminant animals -- cattle, sheep, and goats -- and had focussed on four ecological zones: the semi-arid, sub-humid, humid, and highland regions. Work was carried forward at ILCA's headquarters, at several other locations in the four ecological zones, and in networks for cooperation with partners in national systems.

58. ILCA divided its activities into six major thrusts: small ruminant meat and milk, cattle meat and milk, draft power, animal feed resources, animal health, and resource utilization and policy. Themes were developed within the thrusts, so that work could be carried out across disciplines.

59. Explaining the relationship between research thrusts and themes, ILCA's deputy director general for research, Kurt Peters, used the example of the cattle meat and milk thrust. The objectives of this thrust were pursued under
six major themes: reproductive wastage and hygiene management; feeding and management systems development; milk preservation and processing; economics of cattle production; breed evaluation and improvement; and network coordination. These and related details enabled ILCA to measure output and success, taking into account such factors as quantity, quality, time and location.

60. Center director John Walsh analyzed ILCA's efforts and achievements of the recent past, relating them to the present and the future. The center's work in 1987 emphasized management in terms of donor relations, board management and communications, and program planning. All the center's resources were realigned and strengthened in 1988, and ILCA was now poised to move further forward. Mr. Walsh went over some of ILCA's program highlights in the past year. These included research towards reducing reproductive waste in cattle; on-farm trials of animal traction-based technology; research on crop residues as animal feed; research in genetic resistance to trypanosomiasis; and training.

61. Mr. Walsh paid tribute to the work of Mr. Moustapha Sall, the head of ILCA's Outreach Department. Mr. Sall, who was with the director general, was responsible for ILCA's relationships with African nations. Those links were strengthened by the center's farming systems approach; through collaborative and contract research arrangements with national systems; and in the establishment of research networks. ILCA aimed at building one continent-wide network for each of its research thrust areas.

62. Several speakers congratulated ILCA both for the meticulous planning process it had carried out, and for the product of that process. ILCA was to be commended, they said, for an outstanding, clear, and informative plan and presentation. ILCA's relations with national systems was endorsed.

63. Some participants wondered whether ILCA was attempting too much; whether its plan was too ambitious. Some suggested that perhaps ILCA's strategy would be to work in several areas and subsequently pick out a few for concentration. Mr. Walsh said that the "ambitious" nature of ILCA's program was relative to the dimensions of activity that ILCA would create outside of itself, and that meant especially the relationships it would establish with national organizations. ILCA did not see its work as an ILCA-only proposition, but as a program that could be achieved by ILCA and its partners working together. Other issues raised included ILCA's allocation of resources for trypanotolerance research, and staffing.

CIAT

64. Center director John Nickel combined CIAT's medium term program with its biennial presentation when he gave the Group what some delegates described as an inspiring exposition, particularly on CIAT's approach to the issue of agricultural sustainability. Mr. Nickel announced as well that he would be leaving the center in 1990. In the intervening period CIAT would go through an external management review and an external program review, and would prepare a new strategic plan.
65. Leading up to Mr. Nickel's presentation, board chairperson Fred Hutchinson said that the board was relatively satisfied with progress at the center. Board members were very satisfied with the management, and they felt that good progress was being made on its mandate commodities. They were pleased with CIAT's physical plant. They could also report that the board together with management had consistently sought to integrate the social science aspects of their work with the rest of the center's programs.

66. Mr. Nickel made his presentation under three broad themes: progress through partnership (including training), contributions to sustainable production systems, and new solutions to old problems. Those issues were important, he said, and at the same time they were the areas in which most of the center's budgetary growth would take place. He provided numerous examples under each heading to demonstrate the extent and depth of CIAT's programs.

67. He referred to various aspects of regional commodity research, integrated commodity development, and the involvement of farmers in research and seed production, and showed how they were helping to build partnerships and also supporting the center's end-users. Staff sent out by CIAT to work with the stronger national programs in each region had helped local scientists develop their own varieties. This relationship also facilitated material and information sharing.

68. Mr. Nickel pointed out that the subject of sustainable increases in agricultural production was a complex of many concerns. He felt that those most relevant to CIAT's work were soil erosion and depletion, deforestation, rational use of savannas, misuse of agricultural chemicals, and the depletion of natural resources. He gave detailed and specific explanations of how CIAT's research and training programs were helping to solve problems in each of those areas.

69. He said that new advances in biological sciences offered new tools that could resolve important production constraints. To demonstrate the value of those tools, Mr. Nickel presented examples of progress through "high tech" relating to cassava viruses, cassava germplasm, bean viruses, bean weevil, and anther culture. He also described how CIAT was acting as a catalyst to establish upstream networks.

70. A spirited discussion followed in which participants were very complimentary of CIAT's programs and presentation, but pursued details such as how the various aspects of the center's research program dovetailed with the overarching problem of poverty alleviation. Questions such as incentives, policy formulation, land tenure, and the disparity between private returns and social returns were all explored.

71. While CIAT's approach to collaboration with national systems was widely endorsed, some speakers said they were interested to know how CIAT maintained links with personnel they trained. Questions were also asked as to how strongly national programs emphasized the issue of agricultural sustainability. CIAT representatives responded on all the questions raised.
CCIAR centers in the global context: sharing responsibilities

72. The Group approved a paper prepared by TAC on this subject [Document: AGR/TAC/IAR/87/24Rev.2]. Where research responsibilities involve more than one center, and it is desirable for the responsibilities of such centers to be revised and clarified, the centers concerned will in the first instance be encouraged to work out an appropriate sharing of responsibilities, as several have already done. If that approach fails, TAC will initiate a step-by-step process of consultations and review, leading to agreement between or among centers. TAC and center managements will work closely with each other throughout this process.

73. Introducing the topic, Mr. McCalla recalled that as a followup to discussions at Washington in 1985 and Ottawa in 1986 on TAC priorities and strategies, TAC had set up some continuing subcommittees to review the work of the CGIAR in a global context.

74. They divided the issue into four sections: relationships with national programs; relationships among centers in the CG system; relationships with advanced institutes; and relationships with the private sector. A paper on relationships with advanced institutes was discussed at Montpellier. The second paper in the series was now before the Group, and would be explained by TAC member Amir Muhammed.

75. Mr. Muhammed said that in TAC's view, a basic guiding principle was that a center with global responsibilities for a given commodity should collaborate scientifically and in the most beneficial manner with other centers that have regional or agroecological responsibilities for the same commodity. The primary responsibility for coordination with the national programs should be vested in the center best placed logistically to fulfill that function.

76. He said that through its continuing work on updating priorities and monitoring mechanisms, TAC would be made aware of those activities involving more than one center where a significant revision or clarification of responsibilities would be desirable. To the extent possible, TAC would encourage the centers concerned to reach mutual agreement on sharing responsibilities. If that approach failed, TAC was proposing a step-by-step procedure, from a call for statements/assessments from the centers involved through a review of demand from national systems to an agreement based on a set of recommendations from TAC.

77. Participants welcomed and responded positively to the paper presented. Throughout the discussion, however, several interventions were made on issues connected with the relationship between international centers and national systems. Donors looked forward to the next paper on "sharing responsibilities with national systems." The views of national systems should be sought direct, and not at second hand. The total package of activities and services offered to national systems should be coherent. Agreements between and among centers should be resolutely monitored, because of the implications for national systems. Coordination among centers in the service of national systems was crucial.
Mr. Muhammed, Mr. Hopper and Mr. McCalla commended the centers for the degree and extent of consultation and collaboration among them. Such consultation had already led to agreement -- as, for instance, between CIMMYT and IITA on responsibilities for maize research. At a recent consultation held at CIP on training within the system, there was significant movement towards centers sharing training responsibilities by region. The points made by delegates on relations with national research systems were noted, and would be dealt with adequately.

Review processes in the CGIAR

The Group discussed and approved a paper prepared by TAC and the CGIAR secretariat describing a fine tuning of review processes within the CGIAR [Document: ICW/88/10].

The paper outlined the broad features of a review system which consisted of externally-managed reviews of the centers, internally-managed reviews, inter-center reviews, and system-wide reviews. The paper stressed that the guiding principles which should be observed in carrying out reviews were objectivity, transparency, frankness, flexibility, and participation.

Introducing the paper, TAC chairman Alex McCalla traced its evolution from a 1985 study to its present form. The paper before the Group was a collective document, and Mr. McCalla thanked all those who had made significant contributions towards its preparation.

He reminded the Group that in 1985 TAC and the CGIAR secretariat had commissioned Prof. Vernon Ruttan of the University of Minnesota to conduct a study of review processes within the CGIAR. Mr. Ruttan's report included a proposal that future external program reviews should emphasize strategic rather than operational issues. He also suggested that the interval between external program reviews should be increased to between eight and 10 years, from the existing five to six years.

The Ruttan report was considered by the Group at its mid-year meeting in 1987 (Montpellier). Thereafter, TAC and the CGIAR secretariat set about the task of preparing a paper which could help to simplify and streamline review processes within the system. A draft paper was circulated to the Group at ICW87 for written comments, and the paper tabled for discussion at ICW88 took note of comments from CGIAR members. The paper also benefitted from extensive consultations with center directors and board chairpersons.

During the ensuing discussion, a comment was made on the time that had been taken over the evolution of the paper -- a point to which Mr. McCalla had also referred -- but, in general, the contents of the paper were welcomed.

A suggestion was made that a comparative study of internal processes within the centers should be initiated soon. Donors would be helped to cut back on their own review exercises if "proper" internal review mechanisms, including participation by representatives of national research systems, were
in place. Mr. Hopper said he was concerned that the system should not press too many reviews on the centers. Mr. McCalla said he would encourage a comparative study of internal reviews, but without too much formality.

86. A question was raised as to how review processes might mesh with a possible restructuring of the Group (if the system was expanded). Mr. McCalla responded that he would return to the Group on this point when the system was further along the road to restructuring itself.

TAC Recommendations on Plant Genetic Resources and on the Role of Biotechnology in the CGIAR

87. The Group adopted a policy statement on plant genetic resources prepared by TAC. The CGIAR supports and will continue to support work on plant genetic resources "to ensure that the diversity of germplasm is safely maintained and made available for use in programs of research and crop improvement for the long term benefit of all people." The Group also approved a TAC document on biotechnology which followed closely a statement made on behalf of TAC at Berlin (May 1988).

88. Three ad hoc groups will continue work on related issues: a committee of center scientists responsible for genetic resources to focus on inter-center collaboration; a joint TAC-center directors working group to monitor implementation of CGIAR policy; and a task force composed of donor, TAC, and center representatives, which will be convened by Mr. Hans Wessels, to follow the broader political and legal issues connected with biotechnology and to bring these to the attention of TAC and the CGIAR. [Documents: AGR/TAC: IAR/88/4Rev.2 and AGR/TAC: IAR/88/9Rev.1]

89. Mr. Arnold, on behalf of TAC, summarized the short policy statement on plant genetic resources, which had been on TAC's agenda since 1986. He made clear that it was intended to provide an authoritative statement of the Group's position on a topic of wide interest, not to break any new ground. Members of the Group welcomed the paper, stating that it met a great need in defining the CGIAR position for audiences outside of the Group which were concerned more with the political than the technical aspects of the question. There was a call for a stripe review of this subject, one purpose of which was to gather information on what was being done. This request was set aside for the present to determine whether the need could not be met through other mechanisms. Comments on the paper included several suggesting close collaboration with the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources of the FAO, which was acknowledged to have a much broader remit than the IBPGR or the CGIAR. Relations were appraised to be smooth. Several speakers emphasized the commitment in the paper to consider germplasm not as private property but as held in trust for future generations of research workers worldwide. Mr. Arnold undertook to make small revisions in the paper, following which it will be issued as a Group-approved document.

90. Mr. Arnold also referred to an oral statement be made on behalf of TAC during the extensive discussion in Berlin of modern biology and its
applicability to the CGIAR. He said that the paper presented at this meeting by TAC was essentially similar to that statement, and raised no new issues. This paper also was approved, with relatively little comment by the Group.

91. Most of the discussion, in fact, covered aspects of the two topics which were not specifically addressed, or addressed less completely than some members would have wished. Mr. Arnold pointed to two continuing groups within the system working on these matters. The first is a committee of heads of center genetic resources units, plus representatives of IBPGR and TAC, which has existed for two years, whose terms of reference were distributed to the Group. The second working group, which will deal with issues with more policy content, consists of two center directors and two TAC members. The largest item on its agenda is to monitor developments in legislation concerning intellectual property rights in the products of biotechnology, and the implications for crop improvement in the CG system and the free exchange of germplasm. This topic was expected to be the subject of an in depth discussion by TAC in October 1989.

92. Questions were raised concerning the need for preservation of animal germplasm, a topic being considered actively by UNEP, FAO and others; about the possibility of helping national systems with germplasm conservation more actively, and with the development of plant breeding capacity to enable them to make use of stored germplasm; about the alternative, largely in situ, means of conserving germplasm; and about the need for conservation of germplasm of trees, a topic which might be considered again once the relationship of the CGIAR to work on forestry research has been clarified. There were several voices calling for expanded collaboration with the private sector.

93. Reflecting an apparent felt need to maintain a closer watch on events in the intellectual property field, particularly from the political and policy viewpoint, the CGIAR Chairman asked Mr. Hans Wessels to convene a task force on this issue, composed of donors as well as representatives of centers and TAC. The task force would report as needed to TAC and the Group. It would operate in parallel with the TAC/center directors working group mentioned by Mr. Arnold, which would handle the technical aspects of these issues, besides its other agenda.

94. Those present mentioned a large number of actions being taken, reports written and other activities in this general area, some of which will come to the attention of the Group when completed. In particular, it was suggested that the output of a US National Academy of Sciences study of international germplasm issues, being sponsored by USAID, might be brought to the Group for information when completed in 1989. ACIAR is planning a seminar preceding the Canberra meeting to present the results of a study supported by the World Bank on the implications of biotechnology for agricultural development.

Report of the examination of the CG secretariat

95. The work of the Oversight Committee which examined the operations of the CGIAR secretariat was commended, and its recommendations were endorsed, with some reservations on specific proposals [Document: ICW/88/13].
96. Concerning a policy council proposed by the committee, the Group was informed that the donors, meeting separately, had decided to meet "in camera" hereafter during international centers week and at mid year meetings, to discuss policy issues and advise the CGIAR chairman. These meetings will substitute for the policy council. The new arrangements will be reviewed in a year or so. The chairman could also ask for meetings of the donors to be convened between scheduled meetings of the Group. The chairman will continue to appoint ad hoc committees to advise him and/or the Group on specific issues.

97. The Oversight Committee's recommendation that the TAC secretariat be combined with the CGIAR secretariat within the framework of the World Bank was postponed for consideration in connection with a review of the TAC secretariat that was being organized by FAO on behalf of cosponsors.

98. The recommendations concerning a policy council and the employment relationships of the TAC secretariat having been set aside, Mr. Robert Herdt summarized the other recommendations of the report. He emphasized those points where there was a recommendation for some change, namely:

- the need for clarity and timeliness of documents;
- the secretariat should arrange rooms for the various meetings that piggy-back on meetings of the Group, but provide no other services;
- that a record of decisions taken should be circulated before the adjournment of each meeting of the Group; and
- increased participation in CGIAR boards, TAC and panels through use of consultants, creation of a personnel review committee, annual (rather than more frequent) requests to the members of the Group for nominations, and an improved data base.

99. Concerning science advisors, he said the committee recognized and endorsed the different functions of the secretariat's science advisors from members of the TAC secretariat. It did feel that the work of the science advisors should be planned jointly with the Chairman of TAC. It also suggested a single person in charge of public relations, and a considerable increase in output in this area.

100. Comments generally supported the report, and developed further some of the points it made. There was particular endorsement for the idea of having a report on decisions distributed before the end of Group meetings. One donor urged merger of the two secretariats and sharing of their budgets among all donors. Others amplified the need for more public information, and the responsibility of many elements of the system, including present and former board members, for doing what they could in this area. The importance of having knowledgeable scientists involved in the public affairs work of the
secretariat, as well as in its other endeavors, was stressed. A number of suggestions were made for ways in which the roster of potential board members could be improved, and the secretariat was encouraged to work harder in this area.

101. In comments at the end of the discussion, the TAC chairman and the CGIAR executive secretary pointed to an existing level of cooperation between their staffs, which was critical to the work of the system, and particularly of TAC. Mr. Farrar said that proposals to do a better job of finding candidates for the boards and TAC were being elaborated by Mr. Dillon, and would be implemented soon. The secretariat would listen carefully to what members were saying about documentation, and try to do their best to balance between steering the Group too much, and lack of precision in defining the issues. He and the chairman of the Group cautioned the members that resources were limited, and there would have to be a sense of priorities in choosing what the secretariat should do.

ICARDA -- external program and management reviews

102. The chairman pointed out that the ICARDA board and management deserved respect for bringing the center to maturity while facing turmoil in the Middle East. Summing up the discussions, he said that ICARDA should consider very carefully whether the changes now required could be made without strengthening the management team. There was a consensus that an interim management review, perhaps in two years, should determine whether the measures to deal with issues raised in the management review were on track.

103. Both reviews [Documents: ICW/88/11 and AGR/TAC:IAR/88/18.1] were discussed together. At the outset, Mr. Hopper said that the management review raised several questions as to how the administration of centers was to be assessed. The reviewers had quite rightly in his view raised proper and valid questions about the administration of ICARDA. Their observations and comments deserved the Group's most serious attention. At the same time, however, it was necessary to raise questions about the nature of the environment in which the managers of ICARDA were required to administer the center.

104. Mr. Hopper said it was clear that the Group and the scientists and staff at ICARDA owed Mr. Mohamed Nour (former center director) and his colleagues a vote of thanks and an expression of deep appreciation for their role in guiding the work of the center during times that none of those at ICW88 had known. A similar debt was owed to the successive chairmen and trustees of ICARDA for their contributions to the center's progress in difficult and uncertain times. Having said that, Mr. Hopper continued, the review committee had undoubtedly raised important questions about the management style and procedures at ICARDA. Those questions deserved attention and careful consideration. Mr. Hopper also endorsed a suggestion from the CG secretariat that the program and management of ICARDA be again reviewed in two years.

105. Introducing the program review, Mr. Dieter Bommer said that although ICARDA had faced many difficulties it was now firmly established as an
international center with high quality research and an evolving record of research results.

106. ICARDA had an agroecological mandate which precluded the center from making major contributions in the more favorable areas of West Asia and North Africa. For that reason, risk aversion, stress tolerance, sustainability and resource conservation would have to be given higher priority than food production per se if ICARDA was to fulfill its mandate.

107. Concerning specific crops included in ICARDA's mandate, the review team endorsed the position previously taken by TAC that some of the food legume work should be reduced and that the work on faba beans should be phased out or shifted over to national programs. There was also a need to establish a balance among the three main components of the production system in ICARDA's program -- cereals, livestock, and food legumes. The latter were over funded. There was also a weakness in socio-economic research.

108. The "jewel in the crown" of ICARDA's program was the strength and depth of its relationship with national research systems.

109. Mr. John Dillon, introducing the external management review, noted four issues arising from ICARDA's experience which had system wide relevance. These were:

- If two or three of a center's top management team positions were vacant simultaneously, difficulties in operating the center would be compounded, especially if the board was lacking in pertinent experience;

- Centers could do much more to assist one another by exchanging policy and procedure manuals in management areas such as finance, personnel and purchasing;

- Program and management reviews should be conducted simultaneously by separate panels; and

- Management reviews and the management of centers would be enhanced if the centers themselves conducted a truly realistic self-evaluation of their managerial strengths and weaknesses, successes and failures, as a contribution to the external management review.

110. Referring to ICARDA itself, Mr. Dillon said that the management review team's thoughts were spelled out in 11 strong recommendations, 19 recommendations, and 26 suggestions, all collated as Appendix 1 of their report. The estimated personnel cost of implementing these proposals would be in the region of $280,000.

111. Mr. Dillon particularly drew the Group's attention to the review team's 11 "strong recommendations" which included the formulation of values applicable to each staff member; strengthened performance by the board; budgetary reform; the establishment of a new deputy director general
(operations) position to replace the existing position of deputy director general (international cooperation); the appointment of an internal auditor; the adoption of an organizational table; the development of a performance appraisal system; and negotiations with local authorities to loosen restrictions imposed on ICARDA relative to computing and electronic data transfer, and in particular its access to CGNET.

112. Mr. Dillon noted that disappointing performance in the management area did not seem to have affected the center's research capacity and quality, but that research would soon slip if management was not soon improved.

113. Leading off the center's reactions, board chairperson Jose Cubero said that center management and the board appreciated the constructive nature of the reviews, and the truly collaborative spirit in which they had been conducted. ICARDA had begun work on resolving some of the issues raised even before the reviews were set up. The center was also already implementing some of the proposals made by the review boards. The board would continue to monitor these changes; including changes in its own operations.

114. Center director Nasrat Fadda summarized actions that had been taken in response to the two review reports, and TAC's recommendations based on those reports. Many significant changes had been made in the broad area of management. These included the appointment of new personnel, and the streamlining of administrative (including financial) procedures. Mr. Fadda felt that ICARDA's mandate was sufficiently broad to encompass and flexible enough to accommodate all the necessary adjustments required to strengthen ICARDA's program of work.

115. Commenting on some specific proposals in the program review, he said that an agreement had already been reached under which the National Institute of Agronomic Research in Morocco would host a regional faba bean project, and potential donors had been contacted for support. A study would be made on the value of food legumes in production systems of the region, and on the improvement of lentils. ICARDA was working with other agencies to establish a research network on technological change and socioeconomic transformation in agriculture. The CIMMYT-ICARDA link was being strengthened, as were ICARDA's links with other international research centers and with ACSAD (the Arab Center for the Study of Arid Zones and Dry Lands). ICARDA's training programs were being increased.

116. ICARDA was commended by several speakers for the quality of its relations with national research systems. ICARDA, participants agreed, had established itself as a credible and relevant institution in the area. Its relations with national systems went well beyond its host country and surrounding Arab countries; it had reached out to countries such as Ethiopia, Turkey, and India. ICARDA was an international center working on a mandate of great importance to many parts of the world, and it had an important role to play in the transfer of advanced technology to national systems. It was reported that representatives of some national systems in the region had commented to donors that the impact of ICARDA's work with national systems
went beyond agriculture. Tribute was paid to Mr. Nour for having made all this possible.

117. The satisfaction that donors felt at ICARDA's achievements -- in its own research programs, and in its dealings with national systems -- did not, however, eliminate the concern that was felt about the need for better management at the center. Speakers acknowledged that ICARDA was relatively young and, moreover, that it functioned in a politically volatile environment. Nevertheless, attention should be paid to the concerns expressed by the management review because a prolonged erosion of good management would inevitably damage the center's research programs.

118. Donors needed to be assured that recommendations were acted on, and that issues were worked at until they were resolved. Established management procedures had to be introduced, where they were needed, if necessary with external advice and support. At least over the next few years, more than ordinary attention would have to be given to management issues. Under the circumstances, it was agreed that management issues should be revisited in about two years -- but, speakers stressed, in a constructive and cooperative way, not as a policing exercise.

Approval of 1989 funding requirements of CGIAR centers

119. The Group accepted TAC's proposals and approved center budgets for 1989 in the core/essential category requiring funding of $238.4 million.

120. Referring to the secretariat paper [Document: ICW/88/12], which was rather complex because of the incomplete changeover between resource allocation systems, Mr. Farrar said that the TAC recommendation was for essential and core programs for the 13 centers requiring funding of $238.3 million in 1989, plus $125,000 to meet the costs of travel for regional representatives to the Group. He pointed out that 2.1 per cent of the total, or $4.6 million, represented unfunded real increases in program levels of centers joining the new allocation system in 1989. One donor expressed concern that the new resource allocation system seemed less tied to the mandate of centers than the old core/special project system.

Pledging Session by donors

121. Based on the pledges made and the informal indications given to the secretariat, the funding in prospect for 1989 at current exchange rates is about $228 million, about 95 per cent of the funding required for the approved program level. The Group heard proposals from the executive secretary, which had the general support of TAC, for deviating from the normal equal shares approach of the World Bank, as donor of last resort, given that some centers were on rising curves, while others were flat while awaiting completion of the new resource allocation process. The chairman said that it was too early to discuss options, but that if necessary this could be done in December.

122. Mr. Farrar made clear that the estimate was less firm than usual at this time of year. Beside the exchange rate uncertainties, several donors had not
made their decisions. He urged donors in a position to do so to increase their contributions, and to allocate additional project funds to parts of the essential program, to help overcome the shortfall.

123. A shortfall of this order of magnitude was more or less expected, and a method of dealing with it discussed with the TAC, which was in agreement that a quick review of marginal changes in center programs was not sensible. Mr. Farrar proposed a three stage process:

- initially, the CGIAR secretariat would work with centers to get agreement on the selective postponement of capital items, and technical adjustments which might reduce the funding requirement.

- then, unfunded new activities should be held aside, and World Bank funds allocated so as to bring all centers as close as possible (while observing the Bank's 25 per cent rule) to 98 per cent funding of continuing activities approved for 1989. This would take just about all of the funds in sight.

- any additional funds that became available would be shared equally between new activities and bringing the average funding of centers up to 100 per cent of the approved level.

124. He mentioned additional options which might be available if the exchange rate were to move favorably before the end of the year, or if the Bank would agree to make part of the reserves in the stabilization mechanism available for current funding.

125. One donor responded that the situation was sufficiently serious that some action needed to be taken. He referred to a statement by another donor during the pledging, which called for the establishment of guidelines for the future growth of the system, a means of better assessing value for money, and measuring output performance between centers. Money was scarce and there were important new initiatives for tropical forestry, non-associated centers and support to national research systems. There was need to pay attention to the sustainability of the system before it took on new functions.

Future CGIAR meetings

126. The Group's mid-term meeting in 1989 will be held at Canberra, Australia, from May 29-June 2. Donor delegations, regional representatives, one representative each from center boards and center directors, and others directly involved in the agenda will participate in the Canberra meeting. No other observers will be invited. Donors will hold a half-day session in camera. International centers week will be held at Washington DC from October 30-November 3.
127. The 1990 mid-term meeting will be held at the Hague, the Netherlands, from May 21-25. International centers week will be at Washington DC, October 29-November 2.

128. In 1991, the mid-term meeting is scheduled for May 20-24, with Paris as the tentative venue. International centers week will be in Washington DC, October 28-November 1.

129. Several participants stressed the need for mid-term meetings to be kept small, providing opportunities for donors to interact with each other on items of importance across-the-board. At Canberra, it was pointed out, there would be many such issues to discuss, including budgetary matters, interaction with national research systems, and the relationship between multilateral and bilateral funding. A request was made, as well, for donors to be informed in advance of what subjects would be taken up when donors meet for the first time as a "committee of the whole" to discuss policy issues.

130. Although the Canberra meeting will be oriented more towards policy than presentation, there was no disagreement with Mr. McCalla's view that the medium-term programs of ICRISAT and WARDA, and CIMMYT's external reviews should be discussed. Mr. Farrar suggested that some of the innovations introduced at ICW88 might be evaluated by the donors at Canberra. Mr. Hopper said that as part of the budgetary discussion in Canberra, he would ask Mr. McCalla to "expand a bit on the issues of the essential, the desirable, the unrestricted and the restricted," because those were important allocative mechanisms.

131. On the question of mid-year meetings in 1991 and beyond, Mr. Herdt said that at Berlin he had suggested that a location should be found with the right facilities where mid-term meetings could be held routinely. He was not pressing for Paris, where the World Bank facility had very limited space. Mr. Hopper suggested that the Paris venue should be tentatively reconfirmed, but hoped that another location might be forthcoming.

Other items (in alphabetical order)

Africa Task Force

132. A report from the CGIAR task force on sub-Saharan Africa was tabled. The task force will continue to work during the coming year and will make its final report at ICW89.

CGIAR King Baudouin Award

133. CIMMYT received the biennial CGIAR King Baudouin Award for outstanding research leading to the development of Very S, a spring wheat that yields 10 per cent more than previous varieties, is tolerant of environmental stresses, and shows improved resistance to disease. The extra wheat produced at present is sufficient to provide the cereal requirement of some 8 million people.
(Note: Following a practice begun by Norman Borlaug, CIMMYT names successful wheat crosses after birds. The Veery is a small brown thrush, native to North and South America.)

Forrest Hill fellowship

134. The CG chairman informed the meeting that Forrest Hill, one of the founding giants of the CGIAR, had passed away about a week earlier. Mr. Hill had been a personal mentor of the chairman -- in the South Asian sense, a guru, or teacher without peer -- and an intellectual giant when it came to his vision of world agriculture. It was his press and push that founded IRRI. It was his indomitable belief in the importance of agricultural research and the importance of an international system for agricultural research that put him on the long course to forging the CGIAR. They mourned his passing, Mr. Hopper said, but could not but celebrate the fact that they had known him and lived in his times. At the CG chairman's request, David Kohl, Dean of Agriculture at Cornell University, announced the details of an annual Forrest Hill fellowship that would be established at Cornell. An endowment fund would be sought, and the fellowship would be used to defray the expenses of a scientist from any of the international research centers who wished to spend sabbatical leave at Cornell. The fellowship would be competitive, and would begin in 1990.

Information technology and the CGIAR

135. Presentations on information technology were made by a panel of experts. Ms. Martha Stone, Director, Information Sciences Division, IDRC, who chaired the panel, introduced the speakers and highlighted information issues that concerned policy makers. Mr. Georg Lindsey, CGNET Services, described how international centers in the CG system had adopted particular technologies in the past five years, and examined a small group of new technologies which he thought were particularly appropriate for the centers in the future. Mr. James Brewbaker, University of Hawaii, reviewed the changing uses of microcomputers, from a research scientist's perspective.

Retirement from TAC

136. The Group's gratitude was conveyed to E.T. York, Ola Heide, and Tom Odhamo who were retiring from TAC. Mr. Hopper said that their contributions to the Group's deliberations and to the excellence of TAC reports would be missed.

Special activities account

137. A report on the special activities account was tabled. In the absence of dissent, the program proposed for 1989 was considered to be approved.

Sustainability

138. Following up on a decision taken at Berlin (May 1988), Mr. Leslie Swindale reported that a technical group had been established to determine how
the centers could incorporate to a greater degree the subjects and concerns of agricultural sustainability in their programs of research and training. Mr. Swindale expected a definitive report to be available for discussion in May 1989. Mr. Hopper was working on a Bellagio type meeting to define research issues in the social and economic aspects of sustainability.

Summary of conclusions

139. Donors noted that for the first time a summary of main conclusions was distributed before the end of the meeting, as proposed by the Oversight Committee, and urged that the practice be followed at all meetings of the Group in the future.

Vegetables research

140. Reporting on developments since May when a proposal for vegetables research was discussed at Berlin, Mr. Hopper said that he had visited Taiwan with Mr. Farrar for long and successful discussions with the appropriate authorities. They expected to visit Beijing in January or February to pursue the issue further. Mr. Shen, the representative of China, reviewed some of the outstanding problems and hoped they would be solved.

World agricultural trends

141. IFPRI director John Mellor, addressing the Group and invited guests, said that he looked on the 1990s as a period of grand opportunity. Mr. Mellor was addressing the Group on broader issues for the third time, in response to suggestions from an external program review of IFPRI that the center director should speak before the Group biennially on an over-riding policy issue. Mr. Mellor traced the connections between five elements: poverty reduction, environment, food-cost reduction, trade, and stability. An integration of these elements, Mr. Mellor suggested, would lay the groundwork for growth in the 1990s. He saw a particular opportunity in addressing the needs of the large number of persons in absolute poverty who lived in relatively well endowed areas of poor countries. Mr. Mellor argued that the CG system could play a central role -- as a progenitor of research results, as a role model of research productivity, and as a partner in setting priorities. (Note: The text of Mr. Mellor's address may be obtained from Information Services, IFPRI, 1776, Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington DC 20036, USA. Phone: 1-202-862-5600.)

World Food Prize

142. Mr. Robert F. Chandler, Jr., winner of the World Food Prize for 1988, and founding director of IRRI and AVRDC, addressed the Group on the continuing role of international agricultural research centers in relieving hunger and poverty in the Third World.
Chairman's closing remarks

143. Mr. Hopper said that they had all come together as a group better than in the recent past. Some of the "mental ossification" had begun to loosen up. In that spirit, he hoped that when they met in Canberra they could collectively "dream a bit about the world of international agricultural research, its productivity, and where it ought to go" -- without feeling that they might be compromising their governments or their principals.

144. He announced that he would be forming an ad hoc group of a few persons to join him in studying two issues: how to strengthen national research systems, and how the CGIAR could help them to make productive connections with the research systems of industrialized countries; and the CGIAR system's finances. He hoped that a report would emerge from their discussions, and the report would be circulated to all members of the Group.

145. The Group would also be kept informed of developments connected with international consultation on the question of forestry and proposals for establishing a consultative group for forestry research. He would convene a special session of the Group if he felt that they should assess emerging policy issues as a matter of urgency.

146. Mr. Hopper reminded the Group that ICW was the last centers week which Mr. Curt Farrar would attend as Executive Secretary of the CGIAR secretariat. Mr. Farrar would be in office during next year's mid-year meeting and at Canberra the group would make the appropriate gestures of appreciation. A round of applause for Mr. Farrar was nevertheless due in Washington. Mr. Hopper also paid warm tribute to Mr. Ravi Tadvalkar, who was leaving the CGIAR secretariat for another position at the World Bank.

147. He thanked the co-sponsors for their help behind the scenes; Mr. Curt Farrar and the staff of the CGIAR secretariat, Mr. Alex McCalla, Mr. John Monyo, the staff of TAC and TAC for their hard work and very useful endeavors; and the interpreters for ensuring that the Group is able to communicate across language barriers. Finally, and especially, he thanked the Group for their patience, tolerance, and cooperation at an extraordinarily good meeting.
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