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IPCC – Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPGRI – International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
IU – International Undertaking
IWMI – International Water Management Institute
NARS – National Agricultural Research System(s)
NGOC – NGO Committee
OC – Oversight Committee
PSC – Private Sector Committee
SPAAR – Special Program for African Agricultural Research
SPC – Science Partnership Committee
SPIA – Standing Panel on Impact Assessment
SRO – Sub-regional Organization
TAC – Technical Advisory Committee
1. Introduction: Agricultural Research Week

The Republic of South Africa observed the period of the 2001 CGIAR Mid-Term Meeting (MTM01) as “Agricultural Research Week,” with events in Durban and elsewhere.

South Africa Agricultural Research Day (May 21) and Sub-Saharan Africa Agricultural Research Day (May 22) preceded the CGIAR business meeting (May 23-25). The Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, Ms. Thoko Didiza, the Director General of Agriculture, Ms. Bongiwe Njoe, and CGIAR Chairman Ian Johnson were associated with these events.

South Africa Agricultural Research Day, held at the Cedara Agricultural Centre about 60 miles from Durban, highlighted the programs and achievements of national agricultural research, as well as of collaborative research between South African and CGIAR scientists.

Grace and ZM521, two new varieties of maize produced through collaborative research between CIMMYT’s scientists and their South African colleagues, were released to mark the event. Maize is a major item of food in South Africa, and accounts for over 40 percent of cereal production in Sub-Saharan Africa. The new varieties are capable of 30-50 percent higher yields than traditional varieties.

The main event on Sub-Saharan Africa Agricultural Research Day was a symposium involving distinguished speakers and participants from the region and from international organizations. This was the culmination of a series of consultations among African NARS, SROs and SPAAR/FARA. Speakers at the symposium sought to determine how best the research community working with farmers’ organizations and others can help reach the target set by African research leaders for agricultural production (crops, livestock, fisheries, and forestry) to grow by 6 percent annually through 2020, without further degrading the natural resource base. The symposium adopted “The Durban Statement.” The full text of the statement is posted on the CGIAR web site.

Chairman Ian Johnson presided over the CGIAR business meeting. Its principal focus was the decision-making phase of the change initiative launched at the preceding International Centers Week (ICW2000). Four major decisions were reached (see page 9) based on the report and recommendations (Doc. MTM/01/05) of a Change Design and Management Team. The first meeting of the CGIAR Interim Executive Council created at MTM01 met in Durban. The IEC’s decisions are on pages 10 and 11.

Other issues on the agenda of the business meeting included (in alphabetical order) Climate Change and Agriculture; the Impact of Disease on Livestock Production and Trade; Integrated Natural Resources Management, including Water Management; Regional Priority Setting; and Research Agenda and Funding Requirements.

2. CGIAR Business Meeting, Agenda Item 1: Opening Session

(a) Chairman’s Announcements

The Chairman’s Announcements (see CGIAR web site) opened with condolences to the family of C. Subramaniam, India’s former Minister of Agriculture, who died last November, aged 90. Other
announcements included honors received by individuals and institutions; a welcome to those attending a CGIAR meeting for the first time as well as persons taking up office; and farewell to those leaving the CGIAR System.

(b) Adoption of Agenda

The draft agenda set out in Document MTM/01/01 was adopted.

(c) Chairman's Opening Statement

The Chairman outlined major challenges facing the development community that affected the CGIAR. “Without much greater effort,” he said, “the world will not be able to meet the international development targets of halving the number of people who live in poverty, halving the number of the hungry, and reversing the loss of environmental resources, by 2015.” Clearly, a special effort was needed in Africa. The critical importance of agriculture in these efforts is that it could help to:

- Contribute to economic growth and increase the wealth of the poor;
- Create food security;
- Improve nutrition and health;
- Protect natural resources.

To meet these goals, the CGIAR needed to have a clear vision of its future, and to re-create itself in terms of fulfilling that vision. CDMT recommendations would help the CGIAR undertake that transformation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CGIAR – A Vision of the Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excerpted from “Building Blocks of Change,” the CGIAR Chairman’s Opening Statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CGIAR System of our vision is much more than the sum of 58 members and sixteen international centers. It is a global community of institutions and people. It is a system both collaborative and competitive, whose impact is local, regional and global. It is committed to diversity at all levels. It protects the core scientific competencies of the Future Harvest Centers that must remain the cornerstone of the CGIAR. It is a pre-eminent creator of global public goods. It responds to the high priority needs of today while, at the same, nurturing the skill and imagination to prepare for the unforeseen needs of tomorrow.

The Future Harvest Centers will provide a cohesive force internally, and will have a well-developed external orientation, and will be capable of working with many partner organizations from developed and developing countries.

The CGIAR will travel comfortably through the value-chain of agricultural research from consumer to farmer to national, regional, and global institutions, and back again, in a two-way relationship.

Stakeholder returns will be as important as shareholder returns. NARS will provide essential stewardship to the CGIAR. Broad-based local, national, and regional fora will under-write the direction, strategy and relevance of CGIAR efforts.

The CGIAR must respond to the expressed needs of the South – at the farmer, local, national, and regional levels. Its research goals and priorities are aligned with the development goals of the international community. It contributes to economic growth through sustainable agricultural development involving productivity gains and ecological responsibility. It is a CGIAR System that can mobilize knowledge, people, and funds on behalf of the poor and vulnerable, and has the agility to decide swiftly and effectively how best its resources should be used.

(The full text of “Building Blocks of Change” is on the CGIAR web site.)
3. Agenda Item 2: Change Design and Management in the CGIAR

**Introduction**

The report of the Change Design and Management Team, which was guided by an ad hoc Steering Group of stakeholders, was the central focus of MTM01. The Chairman headed the Steering Group. Ms. Margaret Catley-Carlson, former president of Canada’s International Development Agency (CIDA), chaired the CDMT.

The CGIAR Chairman said that the CDMT brought a breadth of knowledge and experience to its task. He thanked the CDMT Chair and members of the team for the participatory manner in which they conducted their work, for producing a practical and well-informed report, and for meeting a short deadline.

Ms. Catley-Carlson summarized the substance of the report. The CGIAR was already endowed with a proud record of achievement, she said, so the main task of the CDMT was to help the CGIAR reach its full potential in a changing external environment. That was the rationale that sustained the entire report. She drew attention to highlights of the report, and advised that it be discussed as a composite, because the recommendations formed an interlinked package.

**CDMT Recommendations**

The CDMT recommendations, presented in seven clusters, were:

1. Adoption of a programmatic approach to research activities; the development and implementation of Global Challenge Programs in association with partners.
2. Enhancing and fully mobilizing the capabilities of NARS.
3. Transforming TAC into a Science Council that will advise the CGIAR on major science policy questions, and ensure that the science practiced in the System meets world class standards.
4. A fund-raising canvas of potential new donors and other measures to strengthen and expand resource mobilization.
5. Reduction of the annual meetings of the Group from two to one; creation of an Executive Council representing shareholders, and with *ex-officio* members.
6. Establishment of a System Office with an integrated communication program, with Centers determining among themselves how they wish to improve the organization of common services.
7. Adoption of an evolutionary approach to restructuring the Centers.

**Four Pillars of Change**

The CGIAR Chairman reported that his intensive consultations with shareholders and stakeholders had resulted in broad consensus on the following four “pillars of change”:

- Adoption of a programmatic approach to CGIAR research, and endorsement of Challenge Programs;
- Approval of an annual general meeting, and creation of an Executive Council;
- Transformation of TAC into a Science Council;
- Establishment of a System Office with an integrated communications strategy.
Agreement on these issues did not preclude consideration and approval of the rest of the CDMT report. However, he said that closure on these issues would be “an indispensable minimum, now, if we are to guarantee and enhance the future relevance, impact, and viability of the CGIAR. By acting on these key issues, taking the first step, we can quickly move over the next three days to discuss how best our decisions should be implemented.”

Four working groups considered the main issues outlined by the CGIAR Chairman for decision, with each group guided by a chair and represented in plenary by a rapporteur as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Rapporteur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Programs</td>
<td>Bongiwe Njobe</td>
<td>Andrew Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>Hans-Jochen de Haas</td>
<td>Eliseo Ponce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Council</td>
<td>Joseph Mukiibi</td>
<td>Ian Beuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Office</td>
<td>Gilles St. Martin</td>
<td>Meryl Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working Groups’ Views**

The four “pillars of change” were endorsed, and some cautions were expressed as to how best this decision should be implemented. Rapporteur Andrew Bennett (Challenge Programs), for instance, noted that while the trend was positive in the working group he chaired, there were both “yes, but” and “no, but” responses during the discussion. A similar trend was noted by Rapporteur Ian Bege (Science Council). Rapporteurs Eliseo Ponce (Executive Council) and Meryl Williams (System Office) reported that both working groups had agreed with the recommendations they dealt with, and made specific suggestions about implementation. The main points made at the working groups are summarized below:

**Challenge Programs:**
- Should be developed in the context of the CGIAR’s vision and strategy;
- Should complement centers’ continuing research programs and build on their core competencies;
- Should increase the visibility of the CGIAR research agenda, with qualitative and quantitative elements which are significantly different from the current *modus operandi*;
- Should be developed on an evolutionary basis (learning from experience with different models);
- Bottom-up participatory planning, including the work by regional fora, should be combined with a global strategic analysis of problems and opportunities in the development of challenge programs;
- Should be reviewed by the Science Council for their scientific priority and coherence;
- Should seek to mobilize significant new funding;
- Involvement of non-CGIAR institutions (including the use of creative modalities, e.g., competitive funding) should be significant.

**Executive Council:**
- Executive Council meetings should be open to CGIAR members as observers, and documentation for and from the Council will be shared with all members in advance of the meeting;
- The Executive Council should develop rules of procedure on conflict of interest and a code of conduct for its members;
- Alignment, roles and functions of the Executive Council and the Science Council should be clarified;
• Should be supported by all System components, using *ad hoc* task forces as necessary;
• Should have staggered rotation of members, ensuring the inclusion of all perspectives at all times;
• The Council should examine how to improve representation of farmers’ perspectives in the CGIAR;
• The Council should consider the representation of regional development banks in its membership.

**Science Council:**
• Build upon the current strengths of TAC in creating the Science Council;
• Clarify the Science Council’s role in strategic planning, priority setting, and review of program and budget proposals;
• Learn from the experience of world class national and international Science Councils;
• Ensure quality and relevance of science in the CGIAR through mechanisms such as peer reviews.

**System Office:**
• Headquartered in Washington DC, using out-sourcing, decentralized operations, and virtual modes;
• Should aim for net cost savings;
• Should aim to ensure sound management and enhancement of all System assets (political, financial, intellectual, and local partners/investors);
• Should encompass the System’s communications/information functions;
• Stock should be taken of the work in the System encompassing communications and information functions, to introduce greater synergy, cohesion and integration;
• Future legal status of the System Office should be examined;
• Cost of the System Office could be broadly shared.

**Decisions**

The consensus that emerged at the working groups was the basis of a broad ranging discussion in plenary, and resulted in the following decisions:

**POLICY:**

1. **Challenge Programs**

The CGIAR will incorporate a programmatic approach to research planning and funding, to complement existing approaches, and initiate the formulation and implementation of Challenge Programs.

2. **Executive Council**

(a) The CGIAR as a whole will meet once a year. The CGIAR will create an Executive Council, which will report to and carry out responsibilities delegated to it by the Group.

(b) The Interim Executive Council will consist of the Cosponsors, the CGIAR Director, members of the current Oversight and Finance Committees, and the Chairs of CBC, CDC, TAC, NGOC, PSC and GFAR.
(c) The Interim Executive Council will function from May to October 2001 and be dissolved upon the appointment of the Executive Council at the 2001 Annual General Meeting.

3. **Science Council**

TAC will be transformed into a Science Council.

4. **System Office**

(a) The CGIAR will establish a System Office.

(b) A single, integrated communication strategy, for coherent communication and fund-raising, should be developed by the System Office, the Centers, and Future Harvest.

**NEXT STEPS:**

1. **Interim Executive Council**

(a) The Interim Executive Council should hold its first meeting on Friday, May 25 in Durban.

(b) The Interim Executive Council should present proposals for approval by the CGIAR at its annual general meeting in October 2001 on:

   - the composition of the Executive Council, i.e., post-October 2001, and its working procedures;
   - the process for development, preparation and implementation of Challenge Programs;
   - the creation of a Science Council, based on the recommendations of a Task Force established by the Interim Executive Council; and
   - the functions and modalities of the System Office.

2. **Evolutionary Approach to Restructuring**

(a) The evolutionary approach to restructuring as described in the CDMT report is endorsed.

(b) The System should work to accelerate the ongoing process of enhancing efficiencies and increasing effectiveness throughout the System.

**First Meeting of the Interim Executive Council**

CGIAR Chairman Ian Johnson presided at the first meeting of the Interim Executive Council, held on May 25 in the Royal Hotel, Durban. Selcuk Ozgediz was elected Secretary, IEC. The IEC decided that:

1. Task Forces should be established to draft action proposals as outlined below on each of the four reform pillars approved at MTM01:

   **Challenge Programs**: key aspects of the development and implementation of such programs, focusing on design, selection criteria, and process issues. The Task Force would not select or recommend any specific Challenge Programs.
Executive Council: composition and working procedures of the Council. The Task Force would also comment, as necessary, on other aspects of CGIAR governance, including management processes.

Science Council: terms-of-reference, composition, appointment process, and working procedures of the council that will replace TAC.

System Office: key aspects of the establishment of a System Office.

2. The following will be invited to serve as Task Force co-chairs and backstops:

Challenge Programs: Eliseo Ponce, Klaas Tamminga (Co-Chairs), Selcuk Ozgediz (Backstop);

Executive Council: Emmy Simmons, Gilles St. Martin (Co-Chairs), Francisco Reifschneider (Backstop);

Science Council: Lauritz Holm-Nielson, Joseph Mukiibi (Co-chairs), Manuel Lantin (Backstop);

System Office: Meryl Williams, Juan L. Restrepo1 (Co-chairs), Backstop to be named from outside the CGIAR Secretariat.

3. Co-chairs will be responsible for forming the Task Forces, and the CGIAR Chair will inform IEC members of the composition of Task Forces.

4. All IEC members are entitled to serve on a Task Force of their choice. Emil Javier and Jeff Sayer will be invited to work as resource persons with the Science Council and Challenge Programs Task Forces, respectively. Task Forces could also rely on the CDMT as a resource.

5. All Task Force reports will be reviewed by the IEC and submitted to the CGIAR meeting in October.

6. Special web sites and list-servers should be created to facilitate the work of the IEC and the Task Forces, foster information sharing regarding the work of the IEC, and enable the IEC to receive feedback from shareholders/stakeholders.

4. Agenda Item 3: Research Agenda and Funding Requirements

Issues

This is the fifth year under the MTP process adopted at MTM97. Centers prepared plans for 2002-2004 in the context of 2001-2003 MTPs reviewed last year, and the likely financial outcomes in 2001. TAC reviewed the proposals in March 2001. TAC’s observations are available in “2002 CGIAR Research Agenda and Initial Proposals for 2004”, (SDR/TAC: IAR/00/16). TAC recommended extension of the 2001-2003 MTP to 2004. Approval of the 2002 research agenda and funding requirements as agreed on by TAC and the Finance Committee were sought. The need to stabilize long-term funding, and the strategic value of World Bank support, were emphasized by CGIAR members.

---

1 Meryl Williams and Hans-Jochen de Haas are the Co-chairs of this Task Force as Juan L. Restrepo was unable to accept the invitation, due to scheduling conflicts.
Decisions

Research Agenda:
Extension of the 2001-2003 MTP to 2004 approved.

Funding:
2001
2001 CGIAR financing plan confirmed at the approved level of $340 million.

2002
Financial planning target for 2002 should be set at $340 million.
Centers should proceed with preparing 2002 financing plans for submission to the CGIAR at the 2001 annual general meeting. The CGIAR Secretariat will issue guidelines by June 30, 2001.

World Bank Funds:
2000 and 2001
World Bank funds allocated as matching funds at the start of the 2000 would be recalculated based on actual results for the year.

2001
Allocation of $2.8 million of World Bank funds, set aside at ICW00, as described in the Report of the Finance Committee.

2002
In preparing their financing plans, Centers should assume that World Bank will match funding from other investors at a 10% matching ratio in 2002. In this context, the proposed System Office would be asked to prepare an analysis of the impact on Center finances, of issues such as the balance between unrestricted and restricted financing, coverage of fixed costs etc., particularly for those Centers in difficult financial positions. The Interim Executive Council should review this analysis.

Financial Policies:
The proposed draft financial guidelines on indirect cost allocation (FG5) and Audit (FG3) will be circulated to the membership by July 2001, with a view to their adoption as CGIAR policies by September 2001, subject to modifications based on comments received from the membership.

5. Agenda Item 4: Program Developments

(a) Climate Change
IPCC Chair Bob Watson, presented the panel's most recent findings (for details of the panel's work, see www.ipcc.ch). Pedro Sanchez, Director General, ICRAF, and Chairman, Inter-Center Working Group on Climate Change, reported on the work of the Centers in this area. Mr. Watson said that climate change will have adverse impacts, especially on agriculture, biodiversity, forestry, coral reefs, mangrove systems, and possibly open seas fisheries. Developing countries would suffer most, in terms of health, food, water, and other resources. The challenge, therefore, is to conduct more and better research that will identify technologies, practices, and policies that can reduce vulnerabilities to climate change, as well as mitigate climate change. Mr. Sanchez outlined the research priorities that
Centers had worked out to meet the objectives of sharpening their tools to predict the effect of climate change; adapt plant and animal species, production system and institutions to cope with climate change; and to develop mitigation strategies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He described how the Centers had worked together in a systemic approach to a global problem, and suggested that a “challenge program” would be a logical next step. Both speakers were complimented for presentations that would probably turn out to be the most prescient of those made at MTM01. Some technical aspects of research were clarified. The need was stressed for the substance of the presentations to be “packaged” in a format that would attract attention, commitment, and funding – including funding from the private sector.

(b) Integrated Natural Resources Management

CIAT Director General Joachim Voss, who heads the Inter-Center Task Force on Integrated Natural Resources Management, presented an update on the work carried out at the Centers under the leadership of the Task Force. The topics covered included INRM’s contribution to attaining CGIAR priorities; data management for INRM; research management paradigms/cultures; systemic impact assessment, and the future INRM agenda. Mr. Voss said that INRM was a process by which multiple aspects of natural resources use were incorporated into a system of sustainable management to meet the production goals of farmers, and to provide broader environmental and social benefits. INRM, he added, is where research meets development. It enabled the Centers to look more closely and effectively at the links among poverty, environment, and INRM. Knowledge sharing was a critical element of successful INRM. An important lesson learned by the Task Force, he said, is that “once size does not fit all.” The diversity of problems and of partners has to be taken into account. Decentralized decision-making, problem-focused collaboration as a driving force, and a culture of feedback were among the keys that contributed to effective INRM.

(c) Water Management

Mr. David Molden, IWMI, and Mr. Frank Rijsberman, Director General, IWMI, reviewed water issues. They set out the rationale for changing from an approach that concentrated on efficiency in the use of water to one that centered on the productivity of water in sustainable agriculture. Access to water needed to be ensured, as well. They pointed out that the Centers had a package of solutions that could be used to increase water productivity: These included improved varieties, better nutrient management, better soil-water management, supplemental irrigation on rain fed lands, and better policies. What the CGIAR can do for the future is to develop the best possible technological and policy options, so that people are able to make the appropriate choices. A starting point of an integrated approach by the Centers was the creation of a truly System-wide agenda, the Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in agriculture. That assessment was an ambitious and serious attempt to look at all the costs and benefits of major investments of water management and agriculture in the past, and to consider new solutions in the future. Several additional examples of work underway were noted, during the ensuing discussion. The need to take into account the effect of industrialization and urbanization on water issues was raised. Overall, there was agreement that research on water issues should continue in an integrated way, in partnership with the growing body of institutions outside the CGIAR that were already engaged in confronting water issues.

(d) Impact of Disease on Livestock Production and Trade

ILRI Director General Hank Fitzhugh, South Africa’s Chief Director of Agricultural Production Emely Mogajane, and Alex Thierman, President of OIE’s Animal Health Code Commission, analyzed and reviewed the impact of livestock disease on developing countries. Hans Binswanger, Director
(Africa), ESSD, the World Bank, served as moderator. The discussion was held against the backdrop of international interest in livestock disease caused by outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and BSE, in Europe. In developing countries, largely ignored by the headlines, the impact of livestock disease, short and long term, can be devastating. Ms Mogajane pointed out, for example, that South Africa had already spent some $26 million to fight the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, caused by a foreign serotype, in a single province, Kwazulu-Natal. Livelihoods were almost totally destroyed, as a result of embargos against imports from South Africa, and the elimination of affected livestock. Mr. Thierman discussed the importance of animal health in food safety, public health, and international trade. Mr. Fitzhugh assessed the impact that livestock disease has on poverty, food security, and health in developing countries. He analyzed and explored the long-term research required to overcome these problems. Mr. Binswanger commented on technical and policy aspects of the situation, as well as on the broader issue of developing country access to OECD markets. Discussion centered on the importance of livestock to the poor, the problems posed by the movement of livestock, the need for enhancing scientific capacity in developing countries, and questions of global trade and law.

(e) Genetic Resources – Update from GRPC

Geoff Hawtin, Secretary, Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC), reported on its most recent meeting (February 20-23, 2001) which examined a number of issues including the status of renegotiation of the International Undertaking (IU), and its significance for the future activities of the Centers. The negotiations have gone on for six years, and there is now an optimistic mood about their completion. The GRPC re-endorsed the Future Harvest Conservation Trust proposal. The GRPC felt that genetic resources might make a suitable topic for a global challenge program. Reference was made from the floor to the European Initiative on the IU, and the exclusion of tree crops from the IU.

(f) Millennium Ecosystem Assessment – Update

Meryl Williams, Director General, ICLARM, and CGIAR representative on the Assessment’s Board (of management), explained that the project is a four-year international assessment, working at multiple levels from local to global, that will look at present and future ecosystems, and assess their ability to meet the needs of humans. A two-year pilot analysis of global ecosystems has been completed, and the main activity would commence in June. The Director of the Assessment will be located at ICLARM, and the Centers will be closely involved in the project. (For more information on the Assessment, see www.millenniumassessment.org.)

(g) Impact Studies

Guido Gryseels led a TAC/SPIA seminar on the impact of CGIAR-supported research, based on current SPIA reports. See MTM01 under www.cgiar.org.

6. Agenda Item 5: Regional Priority Setting

Emil Javier, Chair, TAC, Fernando Chaparro, GFAR, and Alvaro Urbe, FORAGRO, presented a progress report on implementation of the decision taken at ICW2000 to experiment with a bottom-up priority setting approach in at one least one developing region. Emil Javier outlined the conceptual framework of the exercise. Fernando Chaparro analyzed the challenges of regional priority setting. These included availability of data; securing agreement on how priorities should be determined; differentiating between national and regional priorities; and converting development needs into well focused researchable issues. Alvaro Urbe explained how a pilot project in Meso-America was
attempting to build a strategic framework based on community issues. A research and development portfolio would be created within that framework and this, eventually, could lead to the identification of Challenge Programs. The progress made was commended. The need for rigor in methodology, and for greater involvement of NGOs and farmers’ organizations, were raised as well.

7. Agenda Item 6: GFAR Update

GFAR Chairman Raj Paroda referred to the evaluation of GFAR that had been conducted, and GFAR’s continuing efforts to strengthen its effectiveness. He appreciated the support received from a number of like-minded institutions. GFAR’s pioneering work, he pointed out, had strengthened regional research organizations. For the immediate future, GFAR’s aim would be to secure a prominent place for agriculture research and development on the global agenda.

8. Agenda Item 7: Presentation by Future Harvest

Hubert Zandstra, Board Chair, Future Harvest, and Geoff Hawtin, Director, Future Harvest Board, reviewed the history, structure, and impact of Future Harvest activities including development of a web site, commissioning of studies, placement of news items, preparations for fund raising, and establishment of a related effort in the UK. Details were provided about a recent initiative, the Conservation Trust, that is expected to mobilize endowment funds for gene banks and related activity. The work of Future Harvest was commended. The proposed Conservation Trust was endorsed. The need to clarify the role of Future Harvest, and its relationship with the CGIAR, was raised by CGIAR members.

9. Agenda Item 8: Reports and Recommendations from CGIAR Committee

The meeting took note of the work carried out by the Cosponsors Group, OC, FC, TAC, NGOC, PSC, SPC, CBC, and CDC.

10. Agenda Item 9: Johannesburg Earth Summit

Geoff Hawtin, Director General, IPGRI, reported that several Centers were involved in the preparatory processes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development that will be held in Johannesburg next year (Sept. 2-11) – the review of documents on implementation of Agenda 21 (from the Rio Summit), for instance. All Centers are fully committed to engagement in the work of the Summit, contributing in substance, and through public awareness efforts. Towards this end, the Inter-Center Task Force dealing with the Summit would work closely with the CGIAR Secretariat.

11. Agenda Item 10: Other Business, Farewell to Guido Gryseels

The CGIAR Chairman presented a scroll to Guido Gryseels, Deputy Executive Secretary, TAC, expressing the Group’s appreciation of his contributions to TAC and SPIA. Mr. Gryseels responded, and received a standing ovation.

12. Agenda Item 11: Closing Session

The outcome of MTM01 was a very good start, the Chairman said, but much more had to be done for the CGIAR to “recreate our image, redirect our strategies, and rededicate our commitment to open and participatory strategies.” Thus, adoption of the four pillars of change was an effective beginning, but only a beginning.
A crucial question for the future, he said, would be finding the right modalities by which the production of global public goods by the CGIAR could be linked with the interests and activities of the local farmer, the consumer, national scientists, the ecologist, and the private sector.

He urged that as the change program moved forward, the CGIAR should recommit itself to:

- Openness and inclusiveness, based on the principle that science and scientific excellence are about people and knowledge more than they are about buildings or organigrams;
- Strengthening partnerships among all those engaged in the agricultural development;
- Striving to ensure that in the next 30 years Africa will benefit from productivity gains, secured through ecologically responsible technologies, similar to gains achieved in Asia;
- Advocating the need for broad-based, sustainable agriculture to be back on national agendas and on the international agenda, particularly at the Johannesburg Earth Summit.

The Chairman gavelled the meeting to a close.
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The CGIAR expressed with acclamation its appreciation of the support received from South Africa’s Ministry and Departments of Agriculture; CGIAR Director Francisco Reifsneider; members of the CGIAR Secretariat, especially Selcuk Ozgediz and Feroza Vatcha; the interpreters; and the management and staff of the Royal Hotel.
CGIAR-SUPPORTED FUTURE HARVEST CENTERS

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT) • Cali, COLOMBIA
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) • Jakarta, INDONESIA
Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maíz y Trigo (CIMMYT) • Mexico City, MEXICO
Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP) • Lima, PERU
International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) • Aleppo, SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC
International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM) • Penang, MALAYSIA
International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) • Nairobi, KENYA
International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) • Patancheru, INDIA
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) • Washington, DC, USA
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) • Ibadan, NIGERIA
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) • Nairobi, KENYA
International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) • Rome, ITALY
International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) • Los Baños, PHILIPPINES
International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR) • The Hague, NETHERLANDS
International Water Management Institute (IWMI) • Colombo, SRI LANKA
West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA) • Bouaké, CÔTE D'IVOIRE