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FORMAL OPENING

Welcoming delegates to the 1992 Mid-Term Meeting (MTM92), Mr. Erkan Benli, Under-Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Government of Turkey, described how CGIAR centers had worked with their Turkish counterparts to improve domestic agriculture.

He commended the CGIAR system for its major contribution to alleviating world hunger, and for its effective support to the continued development of Turkey's agriculture.

He pointed out that agriculture is an important sector of the Turkish economy. Some 41 percent of the country's economy is rural based, and agriculture employs 49 percent of the national workforce. It provides 17.5 percent of GDP and 18.1 percent of all export earnings. Half of all exports are derived from agricultural material.

In keeping with the economic importance of agriculture the government in 1920 established a comprehensive agricultural research system which had developed into the existing structure. The various components of this structure maintained a continuing relationship with CGIAR centers.

Collaboration began at the time of the green revolution, when several improved Mexican varieties of wheat were introduced to Turkey on a large scale. As a result, wheat yields in Turkey increased considerably in the more favorable environments of the coastal areas. This relationship has expanded and diversified since, to include many crops and centers. CIMMYT, CIAT, CIP, ICARDA, IFPRI and ICRISAT are among Turkey's partners. An important benefit of these linkages has been capacity building.

He said that Turkey enjoys a special relationship with ICARDA, "our next door neighbor." Collaboration with CIMMYT is governed by a formal agreement which provides for joint research on the development of winter wheat germplasm. In the early 1980s, ICARDA used Turkish institutions in central Anatolia for advanced testing of its cereal and food legume germplasm and since the late 1980s, ICARDA has supported the efforts in wheat research by the Turkish Government and CIMMYT has provided support services in areas such as pathology, stress tolerance, etc.

The Under-Secretary pointed out that following the emergence of the new Turkish speaking and neighboring republics of western and central Asia, Turkey had made contact and attempted to develop research linkages with agricultural institutions in those regions. Turkey would encourage the participation of CGIAR centers and donor agencies in this activity.

Looking toward the future he said that Turkey intends to further strengthen its national research capacity by means of a major new national project. This will be partially funded by the World Bank and will cover such activities as training, infrastructure development and the formulation of a 10-year strategic plan for agricultural research. This new activity will undoubtedly help Turkey develop further its partnership activities with international agricultural organizations.

He concluded by announcing that Turkey was considering an invitation to join the CGIAR.

The CGIAR Chairman said that presentations on Turkey's agricultural development made the previous day at Yalova, combined with the Under-Secretary's account of the policy perspectives that govern those efforts, reinforced the impression that Turkey is committed to using its agricultural heritage as the basis for growth and development in the present and the future.

Turkey's agricultural policies and programs, and the strong efforts made by researchers, farmers and policymakers to strengthen the farming sector, provided a fitting context for the MTM92 to be held in Istanbul. This was made possible by an invitation from the Government of Turkey, and by the cooperation of officials from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs during several months of planning. The Chairman thanked the Government, the Under-Secretary, Ministry officials and others who helped with arrangements for the meeting.

The Chairman added that successful collaboration in planning and arranging the CGIAR Mid-Term Meeting was in keeping with the sense of partnership that has developed over several years between Turkey's national agricultural research system and CGIAR centers. Pointing out that several CGIAR centers were involved in these collaborative efforts, the Chairman summarized the highlights of research collaboration between Turkey's scientists and these centers.

On the basis of this well-established partnership, he said, it was fitting that Turkey should move from being a participant in and beneficiary of CGIAR-supported research to becoming an active sponsor of the CGIAR system.

Turkey is a country with a strong agricultural tradition, a growing research sector and already with a variety of linkages with CGIAR centers. Membership in the CGIAR will in no way reduce the benefits that Turkey receives through collaboration with CGIAR centers but would intensify Turkey's role in the global agricultural research community.

As the CGIAR continues to play its role as a catalyst of development, the Chairman concluded, it must also continue to
grow with the assistance of dedicated and resourceful new members. He looked forward to Turkey becoming a member of the CGIAR and being part of this growth.

**CHAIRMAN’S REMARKS**

Opening the business sessions of MTM92, the Chairman said that during his short period in office, members of the Group had helped him to gain insights into the workings of the CGIAR system. The consultation he convened in London (February 1992) sharpened his perception of the challenges facing the system and the opportunities ahead. His visits to four CGIAR centers were particularly rewarding.

The interests and responsibilities of IFPRI, ICRISAT, CIAT and ICARDA vary. They are nevertheless characterized by commonality of purpose, a strong sense of dedication and an immense commitment to the goals and objectives of the system.

He was pleased to find that research at these centers was oriented to addressing practical problems faced by countries in different situations. There was clear evidence, too, of intercenter collaboration and of interaction between centers and national research systems.

He had seen great potential for the development of agricultural strategies in individual countries derived from the new knowledge produced in the centers. And yet, the Chairman added, this linkage is not often made.

Turning to the Mid-Term Meeting the Chairman said that, in keeping with the wishes of the Group expressed earlier, the substance of the agenda is issues-oriented and the number of participants is relatively low.

In such a setting, a vigorous exchange of views can take place, leading to “closure” on agenda items that have been on the table for some time, and to clarity on new items.

His comments were not a request for haste, the Chairman said, but for productive use of the time that CGIAR members generously allocate to the enterprise.

The MTM92 agenda was both interesting and complex. Some agenda items were of direct relevance to shaping the future of the CGIAR. These included priorities, strategies, completion of the expansion exercise, resource allocation and the Group’s decisionmaking process. Two external reviews were up for discussion as well. Other issues such as intellectual property rights, biotechnology and UNCED had implications which extended beyond the CGIAR. Both sets of issues challenged members to define priorities that could determine the impact of CGIAR centers for many years to come, the Chairman said.

Describing CGIAR priorities and strategies as “the centerpiece of this MTM agenda,” he suggested it might be helpful to all participants if he placed the priorities-setting exercise in perspective with the following brief recapitulation.

- TAC’s most recent review resulted in a preliminary set of proposals that were presented to the Group at ICW91.
- Even before that, however, new directions, and a new mission statement were agreed upon at ICW90, in connection with the expansion of the CGIAR system.
- Two major issues raised at ICW90 — ecoregional research and linkages with national agricultural research systems — were re-examined the following year (Paris, MTM91).
- At ICW91, TAC’s proposals on CGIAR priorities were extensively discussed. Broad agreement was reached in most areas, but some differences of approach or perception were also evident.

This record makes it clear, he said, that the examination at Istanbul of TAC’s proposed priorities moves the Group toward the conclusion of a process. In dealing with these recommendations, the Group would in fact be reaffirming principles already enunciated and fully discussed. Thus, on the topic of priorities, closure was possible and desirable.

Strategy formulation would be the obvious next step from that of reaffirming priorities. Strategy formulation was the subject of the informal CGIAR consultation at London. A summary report on that consultation has been circulated. Mr. Walter Falcon, who moderated that consultation, would report further at Istanbul, setting the stage for a wider discussion under two broad headings: strategies and structure; and resource envelopes for CGIAR centers.

Pointing out that questions which involve the inter-linked issues of strategies, structure and resource allocation can be settled only with full consultation among all those involved, including the centers, the Chairman suggested that at Istanbul the Group might seek to provide TAC with clear guidelines rather than attempt to reach definitive conclusions. This will help the committee to develop its recommendations into their final form.

On the financial resources side, too, the Chairman said, discussion will be of a preliminary nature probably leading to approval in principle of TAC’s resource envelope proposals. TAC and the centers will both feel more comfortable launching the next round of budgetary discussions on that basis.

If members could make more optimistic predictions for the future about their own contributions, TAC would, of course, need to revise its estimates and will no doubt be pleased to do so.

Two agenda items, those concerning forestry and fisheries, were part of the CGIAR expansion process. The Group would receive a report on CIFOR (Centre for International Forestry Research) from ACIAR (Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research), the agency appointed to implement CGIAR decisions on forestry, and an external review of ICLARM (International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management).

Consideration of those items (i.e., CIFOR and ICLARM) would in effect bring to a close the current phase of expansion.
The decision to include vegetables research in the CGIAR and to recognize the contribution made by AVRDC (Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center) remains unchanged but action on this front would take place only when political circumstances permit. The CGIAR Secretariat has been active in seeking to bring this matter to closure and no doubt will continue to pursue all legitimate possibilities.

During the past four years, the Chairman said, the CGIAR experienced a certain element of ferment. It went through two priority setting exercises — one in connection with the expansion of the system; the other, more formal, now reaching finality. The system’s traditional accent on productivity was redefined to keep it in balance with environmental protection. International developments including questions of trade, the loss of genetic diversity and biotechnology had thrust themselves on the CGIAR. The number of CGIAR centers has jumped rapidly from 13 to 16, possibly soon to be 18. All this had a long-term impact on the CGIAR. The number of CGIAR centers has jumped rapidly from 13 to 16, possibly soon to be 18. All this took place against the background of increased international competition for development assistance funds.

Change is usually exciting, but can be daunting as well. Some of the changes that have taken place in and around the CGIAR have, therefore, tended to cause disquiet particularly among CGIAR scientists. Change, and even an element of turbulence, are inevitable in dealing with agriculture which is related to human needs and, therefore, cannot be static. But between periods of change or ferment there must also be periods of tranquility in which effective agricultural research can take place.

After four fairly hectic years, it is time to move away from continuing ferment at the consultative level, providing CGIAR centers with breathing space for continued research efforts, he added. This would provide the CGIAR with more opportunities for informal, thought-provoking consultations of the kind that were experienced in London. The long-term impact of all these efforts would substantially benefit the world’s poor and hungry.

**CGIAR PRIORITIES, STRATEGIES AND RESOURCES**

**Context and Consultation**

At MTM92, the Group resumed discussion of TAC’s proposals for priorities, strategies, structure and resource allocation in the CGIAR system.

Discussion began at ICW91 when the Group considered two documents prepared by TAC, *A Review of CGIAR Priorities: Advanced Working Draft*, which provided a framework for assigning relative priorities by activities, agroecologies, regions, production sectors and commodities; and a second paper which was a summary of the first.

After a searching discussion of TAC’s draft proposals, the Group reached broad agreement on several themes, raised a number of questions that needed further examination and agreed that a final set of proposed priorities should be presented at MTM92.

These final proposals would be presented in the context of their translation into five-year resource envelopes, and their longer-term implications for the structure of the CGIAR system. Endorsement by the Group of the proposed resource envelopes would allow preparation of five-year program plans by the centers.

Also at ICW91, there was a strong feeling among all sections of the CGIAR system for working toward the redefinition of a system-wide strategy. There was a consensus that a synthesizing exercise by a small group could move the process along.

Consequently, the CGIAR Chairman convened a consultation at London in February 1992. A report on that consultation has been distributed within the system.

At MTM92, Mr. Walter Falcon who served as Moderator at the consultation, reported on its main outcomes.

Mr. Falcon said that he would summarize the major themes that emerged from the consultation under 10 points which focused on some organizational issues, some funding issues, some substantive issues and some communications issues. Most of them were actually talked about. Some were in the undercurrent and in the back rooms. Almost all start with the phrase “a concern about” or “a concern with.”

- There was genuinely a concern at the London meeting that “business as usual” was not going to work any more.
- This is because the CGIAR system was at a new point in its history that had to do with the proposed expansion, and with the fact that the system was facing new serious budget constraints of the kind that it had not dealt with for a very long time in its history. Adding to this, was the bureaucratization of the system and the maturity problems that arise when an institution such as the CGIAR moves from a first generation to a second generation of leadership, at all levels.

Under the same rubric of “business as usual won’t work” is the need to come to grips with environmental and natural resource issues, and to define the system’s most effective relationship with environmental groups.

The system also had to take note of the fact that with surpluses and declining real prices of commodities in the developed world, the CGIAR system with its emphasis on agricultural growth in developing countries is a “tough sell” among donors.

To deal with this concern, Mr. Falcon suggested that the CGIAR system badly needs a new crisp 15 page statement pointing the way to the future.

- There was a general concern that the success stories, of which there are many, had not been told well enough, widely enough and clearly enough.

The whole question of impact in telling that story better is a major conclusion of the London group, and it is probably a focus that external management and program review teams

---

need to deal with much more than they have done in the past.

- There was concern about the administrative structure of
  the system.

Pointing out that there was great unhappiness at ICW91 on
this score, Mr. Falcon suggested that some of the problems
noted could be handled by the establishment of an executive
committee.

In the absence of an executive committee, everything falls
to TAC. TAC does five-year planning and strategy, annual
reviews of programs, budget allocations and so on. To say this
is not to condemn TAC. Alex McCalla and his colleagues
perform exceptionally well, but they are caught up in the
wrong structure, with too many functions.

If an executive committee is not in the cards, he asked,
would the Group think about at least creating five standing
committees, to deal with key functions such as strategies,
programs, fund raising, resource allocation and public aware-
ness? That would streamline TAC and permit it to be more of
a technical advisory group.

- There is a concern with International Centers Week,
  particularly with the size of this undertaking. It is not centers
  week anymore, it is approaching centers month. In terms of
  participation, it is very hard to get above pro-forma set
  speeches. Given the growing importance of regional activities,
  and the growing importance, potentially, of the regional
development banks, and the fact that some of the ecoregional
activities are going to have to be done on a regional basis
perhaps the answer is to hold a couple of parallel sessions
running by region at ICW.

- There was great concern on funding levels, and on the
  need to develop processes that match supply and demand for
  funds.

Uniformly, the urgent need was recognized to match plans
and budgets.

There was also a feeling, that it is not possible to cut center
budgets or hold them constant in real terms or add centers, and
expect the centers to do more on a net basis.

- There was concern about resource allocation processes.

It was hoped that the envelope system planned by TAC
would move toward an equitable process. It was agreed, as
well, that the continued role of the World Bank as "donor of
last resort" is essential.

- The seventh point was the role of the private sector. There
  was general agreement that much could be learned from the
  private sector, and that this issue needed to be explored further
perhaps with an in-depth discussion at ICW.

- There was concern about substantive focus.

There was absolutely no doubt on two fundamental points:
germlasm is one pillar on which the system rests, and
sustainability is the second. To be quite clear, it was under-
stood that to talk about sustainability, without talking about
productivity, was irrelevant.

Other matters discussed under substance included the
possibility of including Eastern Europe and nations of the
former Soviet Union in the CGIAR orbit. There was a long
discussion about livestock, as well, and about the need for
clarity in upstream/downstream issues.

- There was a concern about strategic research. This was
  most evident during discussions on the ecoregional concept. It
  was generally felt that clarity was needed on how the existing
centers would and should take on the ecoregional resource and
environmental systems questions.

- There was concern about communication.

The really good thing about the consultation at London was
that 25 people around a table for three days in an information
setting could really go at the issues. They found that a lot of
apparent disagreements were simply due to the fact that they
did not understand one another.

Extending this experience across the system, it is clear that
in terms of impact analysis, in terms of ecoregional contact, in
terms of organizing meetings and of external relations, much
needs to be done. Communication within the system, and in
external relations, is crucial.

Delegates commended the Chairman for convening the
London consultation. They complimented Mr. Falcon both for
his written report on the consultation (distributed in advance of
MTM92) and for a succinct presentation at Istanbul.

In several interventions, support was expressed for restruc-
turing CGIAR meetings, and for new approaches to dissemi-
nating information about the CGIAR.

Some delegates regretted the omission of relations with
national research systems in the highlights of the consultation
presented at the Mid-Term Meeting.

In this connection, it was emphatically said that several
donors would be unable to continue contributing to the CGIAR
system unless specific requests for funding were made by
beneficiary countries.

Priorities

At MTM 92 the Group adopted a comprehensive set of
priorities arranged by activity, region, production sector and
commodity. These priorities will guide the evolution of the
system's programs over the next decade. As a by-product, the
Group endorsed a new approach to priority setting developed
by TAC and described in its report, Review of CGIAR
Priorities and Strategies - Part I. This section of the report
covers TAC's analysis, conclusions and recommendations on
priorities. Part II of the report deals with the impact of CGIAR
priorities on strategies, structure and resource allocation.

A summary of TAC's analysis follows:

Activities. TAC's analysis showed that the current
constellation of activities in the expanded CGIAR is largely
congruent with present and future research and research-related
activity needs, but that much greater emphasis still needs to be
given to natural resource conservation and management.
TAC listed five clusters of activities and made recommendations for each.

Conservation and Management of Natural Resources. TAC recommended an increase in this area, with approximately equal weight for ecosystem conservation and management, and germplasm collection, conservation, characterization and evaluation.

Germplasm Enhancement and Breeding. CGIAR centers have an established record of success in this activity, and TAC recommended a slight increase, particularly in Asia where research could help to raise the yield ceilings of food crops.

Development and Management of Production Systems. TAC recommended a reduction in these activities over the long term, as national research systems should take over much of this work which is location specific.

Socioeconomic, Public Policy and Public Management Research. TAC recommended increased priority for these activities for which there is an increasing need in all developing regions. Among the issues that need to be addressed are land use, sustainability, poverty alleviation and self-reliance in food.

Institution Building (including Training, Information, Organization and Management Counseling and Networks). TAC emphasized the need for supporting institution building in developing countries, but recommended a reduction in some of these activities, particularly technical assistance.

Agroecologies. TAC recommended an emphasis on tropical agroecological zones, and the cool subtropics. For forestry, priority was recommended for tropical zones.

Regions. For the long term, TAC's recommendation is that the emphasis be shifted from Africa to Asia. The shift will begin in the short term, and evolve to the proposed levels over time.

Production Sectors. TAC indicated that the magnitude of value of production is greatest in agriculture, followed by forestry, then by fisheries. New initiatives in forestry and fisheries should not be at the expense of agricultural research.

Commodities. A detailed analysis of commodity priorities was presented for agriculture, forestry and fisheries. This included increased emphasis on root and tubers, oil crops, vegetables, bananas and plantain, and forestry research thrusts endorsed by the 1988 Bellagio Task Force on Forestry.

Reviewing this final version of TAC's recommendations presented for discussion at MTM92, Mr. McCalla said that they reflected views expressed by CGIAR members at ICW91 as well as calculations resulting from updated data.

The revised document was not very different from the version discussed at ICW91. The methodology and general approach are unchanged. Some numbers are different, however, partly because of new pricing data, but also because projections were made (in the revised version) for 17 centers, not 13 as before.

Mr. McCalla said that a major recommendation from TAC was that there should be a substantial increase in priority allocation to the conservation and management of natural resources including germplasm conservation, and an increased emphasis on socioeconomic, public policy and public management research. These emphases, he added, were endorsed by the Group at ICW91.

He reminded the Group that at ICW91 TAC had said that on the basis of its analysis it could not find compelling reasons for a continued adjustment of CGIAR resources in the direction of Africa and away from Asia. Further analysis had confirmed that view.

In the broad area of commodities research, TAC was not recommending major changes, he added. TAC's analysis suggested that there was overinvestment in livestock research. This issue would be re-examined, however, on the basis of the external program and management reviews of ILCA and ILRAD, and the livestock study led by Winrock International.

Mr. McCalla reminded the Group that they were engaged in a sequential process. They had to move on from setting priorities to defining strategies and structure and allocating resources.

The Chairman drew attention to this point as well, reminding the Group that because proposals for strategies, structure and resource allocation were based on priorities, it would be difficult to move ahead with further discussion until agreement was reached on a set of priorities.

Delegates commended TAC for the thoroughness of its approach, for its transparency and for establishing a priority-setting methodology which some CGIAR members might even wish to adopt in their own institutions.

They were living through a period of stringency in the availability of overseas development assistance funds. Efforts, such as those undertaken by TAC, to place ODA funding on a rational basis helped to bring about clarity in donor countries and institutions.

TAC's analysis was uniformly well received. TAC's recommendation for re-emphasizing natural resource management was fully endorsed. The need to devise new and concrete research methodology in this area was accepted. At the same time, it was viewed as a high priority for the CGIAR, perhaps requiring reorientation and innovation at centers.

Concern was expressed that livestock research might be downgraded in the CGIAR, despite its importance to the farming sector in many developing countries. The interaction of livestock with other aspects of farming should also be considered, in the view of some delegates.
There was general acceptance of the principles underlying TAC's approach to national systems. It was stressed, however, that linkages between CGIAR centers and national systems should not be weakened. More ways should be found — through networks, for instance — by which the centers could benefit from their interactions with national systems.

The importance of the relationship with national systems was emphasized by both the representatives of board chairpersons and center directors. The latter would be meeting with 46 leaders of Sub-Saharan Africa for a two-day meeting in June.

Mr. McCalla took note of the views expressed, and said that TAC would continue its examination of some of these issues.

The Chairman observed that broad consensus had emerged on TAC's proposals. The priorities recommended by TAC and endorsed by the Group could, therefore, serve as the basis for a discussion of strategies and structure.

**Strategies and Structure**

The Group completed a first round of discussion on TAC's proposals for strategies and structure, contained in Chapter 13 of the Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies - Part II. The Group agreed that TAC's proposals should serve as the working basis for further elaboration, clarification and development. This will be done in consultation with the centers and other stakeholders.

TAC's approach to strategies and structure flows from its medium- and medium/long-term vision for the evolution of the CGIAR system which was presented to the Group when it was engaged in expanding the CGIAR system. TAC defines the medium term as covering five years, the medium/long term as 20 years and the long term as extending toward a horizon about which detailed discussion is not practicable.

In the medium/long term, TAC envisions the CGIAR system undertaking two separate but complementary research activities — global and ecoregional.

Global programs will concentrate on strategic research on an agreed slate of commodities and subjects. Global research will be conducted with close attention to regional requirements and programs.

Ecoregional activities will cover strategic and applied research on natural resource conservation and management, production systems and location-specific aspects of commodity improvement. TAC proposed the establishment of six ecoregional programs — two in Sub-Saharan Africa, one in the West Asia/North Africa region, two in Asia and one in Latin America.

TAC went on to offer some preliminary ideas on the institutional and structural options for carrying out these activities; the capacities available and those required for the future. TAC stressed that the relationships between global and ecoregional mechanisms would be "entirely complementary."

The Chairman reminded the Group that TAC's proposals should be considered as being in the form of a draft. Vigorous and incisive comment would help TAC as it reviewed its own proposals and as it continued its dialogue with centers, the leaders of national systems and others.

Some centers have begun to play a stronger ecoregional role. They would benefit from the Group's endorsement of that role and from suggestions for how best it should be carried out. An important element of ecoregional activities at CGIAR centers should be interaction with national systems. Endorsement and clarification of this connection would be helpful, the Chairman suggested.

In a brief overview, Mr. McCalla said that an important characteristic of Chapter 13 was that it fleshed out with even greater detail than before the parameters of ecoregional research, particularly the specific range of expected outputs, the relationship to natural resource management and linkages with national programs.

The current iteration would not satisfy everybody, Mr. McCalla said, but it was a further step forward. The next set of responses would be from the centers which were closely examining the concept itself as well as the operational aspect of the concept. The centers, Mr. McCalla suggested, were better suited than TAC to provide definitions in detail.

Mr. McCalla also shared with the Group the process by which TAC selected a set of ecoregions for concentration. TAC's conclusions were based on a match between the needs of ecoregions and actual or potential activities in existing centers.

TAC had undertaken a careful analysis of institutional options for the activities it had recommended; in effect, exploring what structure was best suited to the strategies envisaged. TAC did not present a fixed set of recommendations on structure, however, because the relationship between strategies and structure would have to be carefully reviewed with the centers and others before a definitive set of options was presented.

Mr. McCalla pointed out that the linkages between ecoregional and global activities were complementary in terms of concept and must be complementary in terms of operation. That critical set of linkages would be at the core of TAC's future consultations.

Mr. Eugene Terry, Chairman of the Center Directors Committee (CDC), said that his colleagues would be proactive in meeting the challenges posed by the need for ecoregional research. He said that some of the issues that confronted them as they moved forward with this task were the need to define clearly partnership mechanisms with national systems, the need for additional resources; the need to maintain a judicious balance between crop research and natural resources management research; and ensuring maximum flexibility in putting together the institutions required.

TAC's proposals formed the basis of a vibrant discussion, covering conceptual issues as well as matters of operational detail. TAC's proposals represented a "first cut," and it was
felt that the Group had a long way to go before reaching finality on some of the issues. For that reason, the opportunity to participate in the development of TAC's proposals was welcomed. Overall, the Group supported TAC's approach, while suggesting areas in which further elaboration or clarification are required.

The following major subject areas were covered in the discussion.

**Ecoregional Research.** The ecoregional concept was overwhelmingly re-endorsed, with both TAC and CGIAR centers being encouraged to move from concept to operations. The need for the CGIAR system to intensify research into the management of natural resources was deemed to be crucial. There was general appreciation of the series of efforts that had been made to add substance and working detail to the concept as originally presented. At the same time, it was acknowledged that the responsibility for defining more specifics would continue to challenge the system because there were no established guidelines for natural resources management research. Elaborating the specifics would necessarily involve working out measurements by which the impact and success of ecoregional research could be determined.

**National Systems.** While acknowledging that ecoregional research presents the CGIAR system with a strategic research challenge of international significance, there was general agreement that the tasks facing the system could be effectively carried out only in full collaboration with national systems. A range of responsibilities that might fall on national systems was described. They included participation in setting out the agenda for natural resources management research, elaboration of criteria governing ecoregional research and full participation in research activities. Capacity building in national systems would have to proceed concurrently with collaboration in research. Innovative forms of collaboration would be required. In this connection, the use of networks was supported. Some national systems had proposed that CGIAR centers should work through nationally managed substations. TAC was encouraged to review these issues in consultation with national system representatives as well as within the system.

**Selectivity.** In several interventions, the CGIAR system was cautioned against attempting to do too much. There are many actors in the arena of agricultural research, and the CGIAR should not seek to accomplish more than what its resources and its critical mass of expertise permit. In this connection, TAC's suggestion that, at least initially, the system should concentrate on a few agroecological regions was commended. TAC could rethink the regions it selected — based on suggestions at MTM92 or at other consultations — but the principle of selectivity should remain paramount. TAC and the system were urged to choose carefully what activities should actually be undertaken; and to choose scientifically. These activities, it was felt, should be transferable in terms of concepts, principles and methodology. Similarly, the selection process should be transparent, and related to the mission of the CGIAR.

**Commodities.** The emphasis on ecoregional activity should not detract from commodity activities, an area in which the CGIAR has had great success and in which it has a well-established comparative advantage. Moreover, commodity improvement remained so significant a factor in food productivity that its neglect would mean a loss to the international community. There was a clear sense that natural resources management research and commodity research were not mutually exclusive. They had already been accepted as twin pillars of the system that would foster increased food productivity through sustainable agriculture. It was pointed out, as well, that sustainability concerns should not be restricted to marginal or fragile areas. High potential areas were of equal importance because they would be the source of increased productivity in the foreseeable future.

**Structure.** Streamlining the CGIAR system was seen as, potentially, a positive development. The point was made, however, that proposals made so far appeared more likely to preserve the status quo than to usher in changes. If a large number of options were presented to existing institutions it was likely that each would pick an option with which it felt comfortable; usually, an arrangement closest to its existing method of operations. The question of structure, therefore, needed further scrutiny, on the basis of practicality and systemic judgement. Where changes were required, they should be real and not cosmetic. Old wares should not be repackaged. Many variations were possible as the system sought the most appropriate structure to work on agreed priorities. Some centers might be able to conduct both ecoregional and global research. Existing experience with intercenter collaboration should also be reviewed for any institutional options it might suggest. Notions concerning the amalgamation of existing centers should be cautiously evaluated. Final proposals should be based on a re-examination of options by TAC and the centers.

Mr. McCalla, taking note of the points made, said he interpreted the thrust of the discussion as an authorization to move ahead into the next phase of consultation. He will report back to ICW92 and again at ICW93.

**Resource Allocation**

The Group accepted a recommendation from TAC which links priorities to resource allocation. It endorsed a set of 1998 resource envelopes as the starting point to guide the centers as they draft new five-year plans and for budget-related discussions among TAC, the centers and the Group.

TAC's recommendations are based on a translation of priorities into program efforts across the system, and on an assumption of constant funding with some additionality for agroforestry, forestry and fisheries.
These recommendations are presented as indicative ranges of 1998 core funding for the centers in Chapter 14 of \textit{Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies - Part II}. An indicative resource envelope is presented for each center, and centers were asked to submit to TAC budget proposals and program plans at both 10 percent above and below the resource envelope figure.

Opening the discussion, Mr. McCalla outlined the process by which TAC had moved from a system-level review of funds, with 1991 as a point of reference, to individual recommendations for each center, consistent with the priorities adopted by the Group.

In defining resource envelopes, he said, TAC was mindful of the fact that they were dealing with real well-established institutions (the centers), each with its own programs. The question, therefore, was how to establish the most reasonable interface between a new set of priorities and functioning centers. Mr. McCalla commended his colleagues for the effort they had put into the exercise.

Mr. McCalla pointed out that the resource envelopes represented only an overall number. Translating those numbers into specific programs and budgets, within the framework of established strategies, would be up to each center. The next steps would, therefore, have to be taken by the centers in the context of their medium-term planning. TAC will present its final funding recommendations to the Group at ICW93.

At this point, he said, TAC sought preliminary general endorsement of the resource envelopes. That would trigger the next phase of planning, and TAC-center consultations. Each center could argue its case for more, and TAC would consider these submissions in relation to the criteria on which resource envelopes are based as well as the overall funding situation.

The Chairman reminded the Group that what was expected from them was a close scrutiny of TAC’s proposals, and a preliminary response. This would help both TAC and the centers to move the process along.

TAC was commended for its systematic effort to move sequentially from priorities through strategies and structure to resource allocation, and for providing guidelines with which the centers could proceed with the task of reconciling TAC’s calculations with their requirements. The centers were living institutions and should not be expected to approach this responsibility in a mechanistic way.

In this connection, there was a sense among some donors that the guidelines provided should be amplified and made more explicit. Unless that was done, it was felt, the centers would find it difficult to move from Chapters 12 and 13 of the TAC paper to Chapter 14.

It was acknowledged that the resource allocation process was evolving, and that the situation would become more clear as consultations progressed between TAC and the centers. There would be converging coherence from this process. Nevertheless, further clarification was considered appropriate by some delegates.

Among the questions raised on matters of detail were the reasons for a holdback by TAC, the perception that “older” centers would suffer most, the need to find a place for networks within the CGIAR system and the danger that centers would play off “core” against “complementary” programs and could thereby subvert the allocation process.

A very strong preference was expressed for the continued role of the World Bank as “donor of last resort.”

On behalf of the centers, Mr. Terry said that centers viewed the issues relating to the reduced funding envelopes in terms of a broader problem, that of declining contributions to the CGIAR system. Center directors are sensitive to this problem. They want it to be known that they will be proactive in terms of their efforts to mobilize more resources.

He pointed out, too, that the centers have “many masters” such as donors, boards and partners in national programs. In whatever direction the centers move — whether it be in terms of resource allocation or any other activity — their actions have to be sanctioned by boards relevant to the needs of partners, attractive to donors and consistent with CGIAR priorities and strategies.

As the discussion evolved, two issues were raised for response and action:

- the specifics for ensuring that TAC and the centers would move in tandem toward a final definition of allocations;
- mechanisms by which program thrusts could be reported both by budgetary categories and program categories, thus making it possible for the CGIAR to present a strong external profile on, for instance, its environmental activities.

In response to the first point, Mr. McCalla outlined the following schedule: center directors, the TAC Chairman and others will hold preliminary discussions in June; a TAC-nominated panel would conduct a system-wide review between June 1992 and May 1993 of existing ecoregional activity; and an open workshop will be held at Puerto Rico immediately after MTM93. These arrangements would provide for a high degree of interaction and input.

On the second issue, Mr. McCalla undertook to examine methodologies at the World Bank and at USAID that could facilitate such a reporting mode.

Reviewing the discussion, the Chairman said that convergence was achieved on three broad fronts:

(1) The Group endorsed the financial assumptions for the 1994-1998 planning period, which maintains core funding at the current level in real terms, augmented by additional resources for agroforestry, forestry and fisheries.

(2) The Group endorsed the resource envelopes recommended by TAC as starting points for five-year planning by centers.

(3) The Group agreed that extensive interactions among TAC, the centers and others should precede final decisions at ICW93.
TAC CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. McCalla, reporting on TAC matters not on the MTM92 agenda, drew the Group's attention to four issues that had engaged the committee — plant genetic resources, biosafety, intellectual property rights and the strategic planning process for the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI), the name by which IBPGR will be known when it reaches full independence.

TAC had reviewed an IBPGR paper on plant genetic resources - as distinct from intellectual property rights and biosafety - in which much greater intercenter cooperation was undertaken in response to changes in global perspectives on plant genetic resources.

He had suggested that this paper should be discussed by center directors at their next meeting (Nairobi, June 1992). Thereafter, it would be re-examined by TAC and could eventually emerge as an updated CGIAR policy paper.

TAC's contribution to system-wide discussion of intellectual property rights and biosafety issues was substantial. Although strategic planning is strictly a matter for centers, TAC had reviewed a draft strategic plan for IPGRI.

TAC continued to be deeply involved in the external review process, with eight to 10 reviews in train at any given moment. Among the reviews in process is an intercenter review on rice. An intercenter review on ecoregional approaches within the program and budget reviews which have to be completed by June 1993 for recommendation to the Group at ICW93.

Mr. McCalla and his colleagues were commended for carrying a heavy work load with rare skill and commitment.

CIFOR - PROGRESS REPORT

Mr. Ian Bevege, representing ACIAR (Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research, the implementing agency for the CGIAR decision to establish a forestry research center), reported to the Group on measures taken toward setting up the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).

The Group expressed its satisfaction with the process followed by ACIAR and agreed that it should continue along the same path. In response to several interventions during the discussion it was agreed that an additional member should be appointed to the CIFOR Board which ACIAR was bringing together. The new board member will represent Europe's expertise in forestry.

The sense of the meeting was that the establishment of CIFOR should not be delayed.

In a written report circulated to CGIAR members in advance of MTM92, ACIAR set out developments that had taken place since ICW91. The report referred, in particular, to governance, a headquarters location for CIFOR, strategic planning and interim research, communications and finance.

At MTM92, Mr. Bevege pointed out that developments toward the establishment of CIFOR were based on wide consultations both within and outside the CGIAR system, including especially the international forestry research community. He thanked those who had made progress possible.

He said that the international interest shown in the imminent establishment of CIFOR was encouraging because it indicated the new institution would begin life with strong support. The intensity and level of interest showed that expectations of what CIFOR and the CGIAR could achieve were high — at a time of great concern over forestry issues. He hoped that CIFOR would not be the source of overexpectation.

Setting up a new international center required sponsorship of the proposed institution by several countries and this process, despite legal complications, was underway. ACIAR had held discussions with Japan and the United States. Other countries were also willing to offer their sponsorship, if that was necessary.

The proposed Board of Trustees which would actually launch CIFOR represented what ACIAR considered a balance in terms of experience, regional interests, scientific subject areas and gender. The composition of the board was preceded by soundings among CGIAR members, and ACIAR's recommendations had been circulated within the Group.

Mr. Bevege sought a response from MTM92 to those recommendations, so that ACIAR could arrange for the board to meet, be formally constituted and get CIFOR off the ground.

The composition of the board was discussed, with some delegates expressing concern that, as originally proposed, the board would not be able to carry out its responsibilities.

The earlier board proposals were viewed as weighted too heavily on the side of technical expertise. It was argued that the need for management and financial expertise were neglected. This could curtail CIFOR's institution-building capacity.

The point was made, too, that Europe was not adequately represented on the proposed board, although the cradle of forest research rests in Europe. Moreover, European donors would probably contribute more than half of CIFOR's finances in the foreseeable future.

In further elaboration of the issue of "balance" within the board, it was suggested that as a result of European under-representation, CIFOR would be missing out on opportunities to benefit fully from the region's worldwide expertise in tropical forestry.

The following points covering other aspects of the progress report came up during the discussion:

- The Group continued to feel strongly, as it had said when deciding to set up a forestry center, that CIFOR should have a modest management structure and follow a decentralized style of operation as close as possible to that of a "center without walls."
- For this reason, the Group agreed that CIFOR should work in close collaboration with existing research institutions, treating some of them as regional nodes.
• The Group felt that this collaborative pattern should be followed with other CGIAR centers, as well as with institutions such as IUFRO. The advisory role played by TAC in the current planning process was welcomed.
• There was a sense that in the short term much of CIFOR’s work would depend on existing knowledge. CIFOR should, therefore, plan on coordinating its programs with ongoing research networks and compatible research activities including those sponsored by FAO.
• Several delegates pointed out the need for utilizing forestry research expertise in developing countries. The body of knowledge available was solid, but the number of developing country experts is small. Care should be taken, therefore, not to denude developing countries of their expertise.
• Those involved in planning the establishment of CIFOR were urged to consult more closely with CGIAR cosponsors and not to take them for granted.
• CIFOR was urged to separate germplasm conservation and genetic research from plantation establishment and management. The case was strongly argued, as well, for forest policy research.
• The delegate from India pressed his country’s case for selection as the headquarters location for CIFOR, because it met all the requisite criteria for selection. (Six countries are being considered — India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand.)

Responding to the various comments, Mr. Bevege indicated that they would be taken into account. ACIAR is acting as an agent on behalf of the CGIAR system and would do its best to reflect consensus views in its continuing work. As a response to the strong representation that the current proposals for composition of the board may not be strong enough in the area of research management, and financial expertise, and recognizing that the major concerns on this issue were mainly from European members, the Chairman suggested that ACIAR should seek additional expertise in this area and consider adding an additional board member to deal with those topics, possibly recruiting such a person from within the European community.

EXTERNAL REVIEWS

ISNAR

The Group discussed an external review of ISNAR conducted by a panel chaired by Mr. John Lewis. The panel’s report emphasized the need to strengthen national agricultural research systems in developing countries and the importance of ISNAR’s role in this context. The report suggested, however, that the range of ISNAR’s tasks exceeds the size of the institution.

Accordingly, the report advised ISNAR to be selective about initiating new activities, as well as about the nature and intensity of its relations with different national systems. The report urged that in order to achieve maximum impact ISNAR should pursue activities with potential multiplier effects.

The report said as well that ISNAR should increase its efforts to integrate its institution building and training programs with the research collaboration programs of other CGIAR centers.

The report recommended that ISNAR’s core funding should be increased by not less than $2 million in 1993 with some continuing growth thereafter.

Mr. Lewis, who introduced the work of the panel and its report, told the Group that although the panel had some criticisms to make of ISNAR, its overwhelming finding was a very positive overall assessment.

The panel began its work with some skepticism and with critical expectations of ISNAR. As it went deeper into its task, the panel reached the conclusion that ISNAR was a very effective institution for this stage in its development.

Mr. McCalla, commending the review panel’s report, agreed with the panel’s view that the nature and intensity of ISNAR’s relations with national systems involved complex and difficult decisionmaking issues.

For this reason, he pointed out, ISNAR’s role as a research based service, as opposed to purely a service organization, needs to be continuously reviewed and clarified. The nature of ISNAR’s linkages with other CGIAR centers such as, for instance, IFPRI and IIMI, also needed elaboration.

Referring to the recommendation that ISNAR’s core budget should be increased by $2 million, he said that the appropriate time for ISNAR to make that request would be during the five-year program and budget process. TAC, meanwhile, was not passing judgement on the recommendation.

ISNAR’s Board Chairman Mr. John Dillon said that the center had already endorsed 16 out of 17 recommendations in the review panel’s report. It had after very careful consideration rejected the recommendation that the center’s Program Committee should not be a “committee of the whole” (of the Board).

The Group was informed, meanwhile, that the ISNAR Board had increased its size from 12 to 14 members.

Responding to the panel’s view that ISNAR should weigh the pros and cons of relocating the center’s headquarters, Mr. Dillon reported that center management studied this issue quite exhaustively. It found, on balance, that there would be no net benefit in relocating ISNAR.

ISNAR’s Director General Mr. Christian Bonte-Friedheim thanked Mr. Lewis and panel members for a helpful report which contained both commendations and criticism.

He further thanked his colleagues at ISNAR for their contribution to the work of the review panel by way of background material and information.

For an institution as small as ISNAR, the tremendous amount of work required for the review process usually involved some interruption of day-to-day operations. ISNAR staff put in an extra effort, however, and did not disappoint any...
of its developing country partners while preparing for and participating in the review exercise.

ISNAR appreciated the comments made by developing country researchers to members of the review panel. Their praise demonstrated the impact of ISNAR’s work.

Mr. Bonte-Friedheim, while responding in detail to the various comments made by the review panel, provided the Group with an encapsulation of the center’s planned thrusts and programs in coming years. ISNAR will target its services on the needs of national systems at varying stages of development, will cover a wide range of research policies, will forge strategic alliances with other organizations and will seek multipliers to increase the impact of its work, he said.

Pointing out the essential role played by ISNAR, Mr. Bonte-Friedheim argued the case — also made by the review panel — for a greater allocation of resources.

Members of the Group complimented the panel on its work, and commended ISNAR for continuing to help developing countries to build up their national research capacity.

Several participants referred to the complexities of the tasks faced by ISNAR, given the fact that national systems were at different stages of development and that there were many actors involved.

They agreed that ISNAR should strengthen and diversify its linkages. The fact that ISNAR was collaborating with FAO, a CGIAR cosponsor, was commended. Urging the development of other linkages, it was suggested that ISNAR might undertake special projects to draw farmers into the process of setting priorities for agricultural research.

The point was also made that in addition to working with universities and other institutes of tertiary education, ISNAR should work more closely with the private sector, with professional organizations and with nongovernmental organizations.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Chairman noted agreement on the following points:

- The Group endorsed the main thrust of the review panel’s report;
- The Group appreciated the thoroughness with which the review was conducted and thanked Mr. Lewis for his leadership;
- The Group noted that ISNAR’s response to the report is positive and that it had made good progress with the implementation of most of the panel’s recommendations;
- The Group endorsed a decision by ISNAR to increase the size of its Board from 12 to 14 and, by implication, endorsed the corresponding amendment to ISNAR’s constitution.

The Chairman said he was confident that ISNAR, a vibrant organization, would incorporate the comments and suggestions made at MTM92 as it continued its follow-up activities based on the external review.

ICLARM

The Group decided that ICLARM should be admitted into the CGIAR system.

At ICW90, the Group expanded its research agenda to include, among other activities, international fisheries research. ICLARM has been the only candidate to take on this responsibility, and the Group required that the center should be subjected to an external review before a final decision was taken concerning its admission.

Hence, the unusual procedure of the CGIAR organizing an external review of an institution that was not part of the system was followed.

The review panel recommended that ICLARM should be admitted to the CGIAR at MTM92, subject to the following two conditions:

- An interim review should be held in three years to determine how far ICLARM had progressed in its implementation of the panel’s recommendations; and
- A “sunset clause” should be set down under which ICLARM’s membership in the CGIAR would lapse in six years if it failed to meet CGIAR performance standards.

TAC supported ICLARM’s admission into the CGIAR and endorsed the proposal for an interim review but did not support the imposition of a “sunset clause.”

Mr. Larry Stifel, Chairman of the External Review Panel, summarized their main findings which were embodied in the report that was circulated to members in advance of the Mid-Term Meeting.

Broadly, the recommendations were directed at helping ICLARM to strengthen its management structure to conform with the programmatic responsibilities of an international center.

The panel felt, too, that ICLARM should define more clearly its proposed programs in coral reef resource systems, coastal resources systems and national research support.

Mr. Peter Larkin, Chairman of the Board of ICLARM, and Mr. Ken MacKay, Director General, explained how the center would respond to the external review, and outlined the main thrusts of ICLARM’s strategic program.

The Group decided to drop the suggested “sunset clause” but agreed that an interim review of ICLARM should be held in about three years.

The Chairman made a strong plea that ICLARM should be provided with additional funding so that fisheries research could be carried out effectively without the diversion of resources from existing centers.

REGIONAL REPRESENTATION

The Group endorsed a review of regional representation in the CGIAR prepared by a working group of the CGIAR Secretariat.

The working group was set up in response to a request at the Berlin Mid-Term Meeting (May 1988) that the question of regional representation should be re-examined in four years.
Recommendations adopted by the Group at MTM92 will be implemented by the CGIAR Secretariat in cooperation with FAO.

The working group said that it considered the review of regional representation as being particularly timely because five parallel trends reinforced the need for more effective representation by national systems in the CGIAR:

• The increased regional emphasis in the way the CGIAR sets its priorities.
• The need to mobilize the ecoregional concept approved by the CGIAR for effective research on natural resource management. Both these will benefit from a permanent channel from the Group to regional constituencies.
• The growing recognition among developing countries and donors alike, that regionally organized research is a cost effective way to use the limited financial and human resources of the developing countries.
• An important number of donors believe the CGIAR should be more demand driven in formulating its policies and priorities.
• Perhaps most importantly both now and in the future, CGIAR members seek strong and continuing reassurance from the developing countries that they benefit from, appreciate and support international agricultural research in the CGIAR centers.

CGIAR Science Advisor Michael Collinson, Chairman of the working group, pointed out that the focus of their report was the linkage between regional representatives (chosen through FAO regional conferences) and national programs in the regions they represent.

The orientation of the report was that global and regional perspectives are changing, and that the institution of regional representation at the CGIAR could be organized to help manage those emerging trends.

He emphasized that defining the role of regional representatives was not the issue, because that was settled in 1988. The question was how to enable regional representatives to play that role with maximum benefit to the constituencies they represent as well as to the CGIAR system.

In approaching this question, the working group was guided to a considerable extent by responses to a donor survey. A high proportion of donors was convinced that a stronger effort should be made to engage national programs in consultations, and to bring specific views emerging from these consultations to CGIAR meetings. Unfortunately, that process was hampered by a lack of funds.

The working group made the following recommendations for strengthening linkages with national systems:

• The CGIAR will not seek the appointment of any more regional representatives from the FAO European region.
• A total of eight regional representatives should sit at CGIAR meetings in future, each representing a subregion.
• Attendance of the regional representatives at yearly meetings of national agricultural research system (NARS) directors should be the link between NARS constituencies and the decisionmaking process of the CGIAR.
• A CGIAR Task Force will pursue the operational details of the changes by discussion with NARS in each region.

The review was commended for its thoroughness and clarity. The working group had produced an excellent report, delegates said, providing for enhanced linkages with national systems. These linkages were uniformly seen as vital to the relevance of the CGIAR.

With some variation, there was general agreement that regional representatives should continue to be selected through the FAO. The suggestion was made, too, that arrangements should be made for regional representatives to present the CGIAR perspective at FAO fora.

The European regional representative agreed with the proposal that representation from his region should be dropped. Another regional representative opposed this recommendation. A CGIAR member suggested that given the global nature of the CGIAR some mechanism was required for interaction between the Group and scientists and policymakers from Eastern Europe. Circumstances favored the establishment of an international research effort in Eastern Europe.

The proposal for direct contacts between regional representatives and national programs was welcomed and strongly endorsed. This mechanism was seen as vital and overdue. Different views were expressed about the regional institutions through which effective interaction could be arranged.

The possibility of engaging regional representatives in a public awareness role was also supported.

Overall, the Group felt that adequate funds and careful planning were both required for the working group’s suggestions to be implemented. The Group gave the CGIAR Secretariat authority, in consultation with FAO, to interact with national systems on strengthening their role in the identification of regional representatives.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS, BIOSAFETY AND BIODIVERSITY

The Group unanimously adopted a working document on genetic resources and intellectual property. This document is not a definitive policy statement but reflects current practices and represents broadly held views within the CGIAR system.

Adoption of the working document is the most recent in a series of steps taken by the CGIAR to deal with the issues involved. At International Centers Week in 1991, for instance, a statement of principles on intellectual property rights, biosafety and plant genetic resources was introduced for the Group’s consideration by Mr. Lukas Brader, co-chair of the joint TAC-Center Directors Committee on Intellectual Property Rights and Plant Genetic Resources. The Group took note of the statement and decided that further consultations should take place and that the issue would be revisited at the 1992 Mid-Term Meeting.

At MTM92 the Group had before it a discussion paper prepared by the TAC-Center Directors Committee, together
with the draft statement of principles considered by the Group at ICW91.

Introducing these documents, Mr. Brader briefed the Group on how the TAC-Center Directors Committee had engaged itself in further examination of the issues after ICW91. He summarized the substance of the examination and outlined the consultations which had been undertaken. These included a BIOTASK-ISNAR workshop held at ISNAR; a World Bank-ODI conference in the United Kingdom; a meeting between NGOs and the CGIAR centers based in Latin America held at CIAT; an ISNAR workshop for small countries held in Mauritius; and meetings of the TAC-Center Directors Committee.

Mr. Hans Wessels (Chair of the CGIAR Task Force on Biotechnology known as BIOTASK) reported that the subject was discussed extensively at a BIOTASK meeting on May 17, 1992. The BIOTASK meeting felt that a CGIAR statement should be formulated prior to UNCED. Consequently, BIOTASK members had circulated a draft statement for the Group’s consideration. This could supersede the draft prepared by the TAC-Center Directors Committee.

Three Questions
Against this background of continuous and wide-ranging consultation, discussion at MTM92 focused primarily on three questions posed by the CGIAR Chairman:

(1) Should the CGIAR make a statement?
(2) If so, what elements should the statement contain?
(3) What is the most appropriate timing of such a statement?

Need. The participants agreed that it would be appropriate for the CGIAR to make a statement. The issues are important to most members of the CGIAR, and to the system’s developing country partners. A CGIAR statement would reaffirm the Group’s sensitivity to these issues, demonstrate the system’s continuing commitment to dealing with the issues and establish the positive approach of the CGIAR system to all aspects of the topic. In the short term a CGIAR statement could offer guidance to delegations from CGIAR member countries at UNCED and serve as the basis for continued discussion there between CGIAR representatives and NGOs as well as other concerned groups.

Substance. It was broadly agreed that a CGIAR statement should address the issues relating to both plant genetic resources and intellectual property rights. The statement could indicate how CGIAR centers were responding to the need to conserve biological diversity and to the changing role of intellectual property in the management of biological research programs worldwide. These positions would demonstrate the contribution that CGIAR centers can make to post-UNCED programs. The statement should reflect the diversity of views among CGIAR members and among CGIAR centers.

Timing. Some delegates expressed caution about the timing of a statement, because the CGIAR should assess developments in other fora where the issues were being discussed (e.g. at GATT, at the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources and during the negotiations on the Convention on Biodiversity) before reaching its own conclusions. The point was made that the issue should be viewed in a long-term perspective as one that would merit attention for quite some time to come.

Concern was also expressed that the CGIAR system should not give the impression of bypassing consultations which had been instituted with various collaborators in national agricultural research systems, nongovernmental organizations, advanced laboratories and private companies. Conversely, several others emphasized the view that it was necessary for the CGIAR to inform national delegations as well as CGIAR representatives at UNCED as to the current status on these issues within the international centers. This would prevent misunderstanding and misperception. Such an exercise should not pre-empt continuing consultation with partners and collaborators.

Agreement. The consensus view was that it would be desirable for the CGIAR to agree on a statement at this meeting addressing both plant genetic resources and intellectual property rights. The Chairman nominated a 14-person drafting committee, chaired by the delegate from Sweden, and representative of the variety of views expressed in the discussion, to draft a working document for consideration by the Group.

Further Elaboration
The following points emerged during discussion of the text produced by the drafting group:

- The document is a working document which describes the present situation on plant genetic resources and intellectual property rights at CGIAR centers.
- The centers and their Boards of Trustees bear the responsibility for developing particular policies and procedures relating to the major issues dealt with in the working document.
- Consultations will continue with all collaborators including NARS, NGOs, advanced laboratories and private companies.
- The implementation of center activities in these areas will continue to be reviewed by TAC as part of the program and management reviews of the centers, and will be reported to the CGIAR in this context.
- The various documents prepared by the TAC-Center Directors Committee may be shared with interested stakeholders and other interested parties.
- The working document adopted will be used as necessary by CGIAR members to brief their delegations and by members of the CGIAR delegation at UNCED. It will not be presented to UNCED as a formal statement.
As the issues are the subject of consultations in various fora it is premature for the CGIAR to move toward a formal system-wide policy at the present time. The CGIAR system will keep the issues under active review.

The text adopted by the Group is reproduced in Annex 3 of this report.

FUTURE MEETINGS

Reorganization of Centers Week

The Chairman appointed a working group consisting of Robert A. Herdt (Chairman), Manoel Malheiro-Tourinho, Wilhelm Suden, Eugene Terry and Klaus Winkel with the following terms of reference:

- To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the CGIAR’s current deliberation and decisionmaking processes, taking into account the views expressed most recently at the Mid-Term Meeting in Istanbul and the consultation in London.
- To develop options for improving these processes, and, in consultation with the members of the CGIAR, the centers and other actors make recommendations to the CGIAR Chairman for the organization and conduct of ICW92.
- To submit recommendations to the Chairman by September 15, 1992.

The working group was appointed in the context of a proposal from the Rockefeller Foundation representative (Mr. Herdt) to restructure ICW92 so that at least one day would be set aside for four parallel meetings on the need for international agricultural research in Latin America, Africa, Asia, the Near East and North Africa.

Mr. Herdt further proposed that at all parallel sessions there could be a focus on a single topic, for example, the food consumption pattern of the poorest 50 percent in a selected country or countries, likely changes in that pattern and how international agricultural research could help the countries concerned to cope with the changes.

Explaining the reason for his proposal, Mr. Herdt said it was a response to a widespread feeling within the system that there was a need for more productive use of time at ICW.

As the CGIAR agenda expanded there was less time for full participation by members in decisionmaking. Suggestions had been made from time to time for mechanisms that would improve the process. Parallel sessions was one of them, and he felt that they could be effective.

Parallel sessions organized by region would enable members to focus more clearly on the needs for agricultural research in a homogenous context. Officials with regional responsibilities in donor agencies could bring their expertise and funding support to these sessions. Discussion would be more concentrated than at present and, therefore, would provide clarity on the whole gamut of system activities. Regional orientation would not detract from the international responsibilities of the CGIAR system.

Broad support was expressed for the view that the Group should scrutinize its conduct of business so as to make it more effective. All stakeholders needed to have an involvement in decisionmaking, and a mechanism was required by which such variety could be ensured without further burdening the agenda of meetings.

Several suggestions were made about the timing of such sessions, how they should be planned, their agenda and who should attend. The consensus from these discussions was that the Chairman should have the authority to reorganize CGIAR meetings and that he could be assisted to do so by a small working group serviced by the CGIAR Secretariat.

Confirmation of Dates

The following dates and locations of future meetings were reconfirmed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTM93</td>
<td>May 24-28</td>
<td>San Juan, Puerto Rico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICW93</td>
<td>Oct. 25-29</td>
<td>Washington D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTM94</td>
<td>May 23-27</td>
<td>New Delhi, India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICW94</td>
<td>Oct. 24-28</td>
<td>Washington D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTM93 will be co-hosted by the United States, the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. Preliminary plans for the meeting in Puerto Rico, including a workshop on agroforestry and forestry and a visit to a wet tropical forest, were outlined by a U.S. representative.

The Indian representative confirmed an earlier indication that the Government of India wished to host MTM94 in New Delhi. India’s invitation was accepted.

OTHER BUSINESS

BIOTASK - Progress Report

Mr. Hans Wessels reported on BIOTASK activities other than its involvement with intellectual property rights (IPR) issues which were taken up as a separate agenda item.

He informed the Group of progress made on an Intermediate Biotechnology Service (IBS) whose objectives are to provide developing countries with access to informed advice on the policy and management aspects of biotechnology, biosafety and IPR. With support from a group of donors, IBS has developed into a well-constructed project which will be implemented by ISNAR. The service will, however, have its own steering committee consisting of three representatives each from donor and developing countries.

CIAT, meanwhile, he said was the anchor of another project initiated by BIOTASK, a Cassava Biotechnology Network (CBN) whose aim is to direct cassava research to the needs of small-scale producers. This will be done through networks consisting of researchers, representatives of national systems and end-users.

BIOTASK is committed to the diffusion of information, he added, and in this connection is attempting to identify suitable
libraries in developing countries as recipients for a biotechnology journal.

Other topics covered by BIOTASK included biotechnology cooperation among developed countries, and the progress of the UNCED process.

BIOTASK will next meet in Washington at the time of ICW92.

Crawford Fund

Derek E. Tribe, Executive Director of Australia’s Crawford Fund for International Agricultural Research, reported to the Group on the Fund’s activities in its three years of existence.

The Fund was set up as a national support organization for international agricultural research, in response to an initiative by the CGIAR Secretariat.

For the past one-and-a-half years, the Crawford Fund had carried out a public awareness campaign aimed at politicians and bureaucrats; farmers, environmentalists and NGOs; scientists and academics; the media, and through the media, the community at large.

One important outcome of their efforts was that a Joint Parliamentary Committee recommended that Australia contribute 1.5 percent of ODA to CGIAR centers; up from less than half of one percent at present.

On average, Mr. Tribe said, all bilateral donors to the CGIAR contribute only 0.4 percent of their total aid budgets and the most enlightened donor only gives 1.2 percent.

The Crawford Fund therefore argues that if the donor average increased to 1.2 percent, the CGIAR budget would increase threefold and, almost certainly, money would no longer limit the success of the system.

UNCED

The Group endorsed the continuing association of the CGIAR with the evolving UNCED process, and agreed that when action programs are undertaken as a follow-up to the Earth Summit, the CGIAR should determine the precise role that it could play in programs that coincide with its scientific expertise. In this connection, particular mention was made of sustainable agriculture, biodiversity and the diversification of production systems.

Introducing the item, Mr. von der Osten drew the Group’s attention to a Secretariat document which reported on the various activities undertaken by the centers and the Secretariat in response to a request by the Group (at MTM91) that the CGIAR system should work closely with the UNCED process.

As a result of these activities, UNCED organizers had recognized the CGIAR as an intergovernmental agency. The CGIAR was granted observer status at the Earth Summit and invited to attend with a single delegation. Representatives from CIAT, IBPGR and the CGIAR Secretariat would form the delegation.

At Rio, he said, members of the delegation would interact with international policymakers on subjects in which the CGIAR has contributions to offer, based on its practical experience. These efforts would be complemented by public awareness activities including the establishment of an information booth and liaison with nongovernmental organizations.

In the process of preparatory work for the Earth Summit, he said, the CGIAR had benefited from the support of its three cosponsors. Planning for UNCED had reaffirmed the value of collaboration among different components of the system. And it had integrated the system’s scientific focus with its public awareness work.

Vavilov Institute

The Group appealed to the international community to help preserve the priceless collection of plant genetic material at the Vavilov Institute in Russia. In response to requests from several members they will receive from the World Bank an estimate of the Institute’s needs.

CLOSING REMARKS

In his closing remarks, the Chairman said that he shared the Group’s sense of accomplishment at what they had done in four days of intense and collegial discussion.

All proposals before the Group were examined thoroughly, even exhaustively, and important trends were set in motion. This is what he had hoped for in his opening remarks when he called for productive use of the time that CGIAR members generously allocate to the enterprise.

He was impressed by the high level of debate and by the unusual blend of knowledge and dedication which characterized their discussions, the Chairman said.

Many people had contributed to the success of the meeting. Before reviewing the substance of the Group’s discussions he wished to thank them all — the Government of Turkey; the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs; Turkish officials, especially Hasim Ogut, Ali Eryilmaz, Guzbuz Mizrak and S. Nogay; the Turkish support staff; the interpreters; the hotel staff; Alex McCalla, TAC and the TAC Secretariat; Alexander von der Osten and the CGIAR Secretariat and, “above all — all of you (members of the Group).”

To guide the system as it followed up on the Istanbul meeting, the Chairman summarized the main conclusions reached:

- Priorities

The Group concluded its formal discussion of a set of priorities analyzed and grouped by activities, agroecological regions, production sectors and commodities. These priorities will determine the strategies and structure of the CGIAR system over the medium and long term. They will also serve as the basis of resource allocation among CGIAR centers. Obviously, these are areas which will always interest the Group.
Strategies and Structure

The Group endorsed in principle TAC's preliminary attempt to redefine the strategies and structure of the CGIAR system, in keeping with the priorities that were adopted. At the core of TAC's approach is a division between two related sets of activities — global and ecoregional. TAC can now go forward with its plans to discuss its proposals fully with international centers, national research systems and others, before reporting back to the Group at ICW92 and, with finality, at ICW93. The views of the CGIAR centers will be crucial as TAC strives for the clarity requested by members.

Resource Allocation

The Group endorsed as an appropriate starting point for interaction between TAC and CGIAR centers a set of “resource envelopes” based on the assumption of constant funding with some additionality for agroforestry, forestry and fisheries. TAC's calculations are subject to challenge and adjustment during its budget discussions with the centers. Final budget proposals will be presented to the Group at ICW93.

ICLARM

ICLARM was admitted into the CGIAR system. Thus, an earlier decision to support fisheries research has now become reality.

However, the extent to which ICLARM can function effectively without diverting resources from existing centers will depend on how much additional funding is provided for this activity. An interim external review of ICLARM will take place in about three years.

CIFOR

ACIAR, the implementing agency for CGIAR decisions on forestry, presented a progress report. The Group generally endorsed the progress made. Some reservations were expressed, however, particularly about the composition of the board. At the end of a full debate it was agreed that an additional board member should be appointed.

ISNAR

Members reacted quite vigorously to an external review of ISNAR. In the context of the range of linkages between CGIAR centers and national research systems required by CGIAR priorities and strategies, ISNAR has even a greater responsibility now than it did at its creation. The Group wants ISNAR to play its role effectively.

Regional Representation

Regional representatives are a conduit between the CGIAR and national agricultural research systems in developing countries. The significance of their contribution to the CGIAR was recognized during discussion of proposals for strengthening regional representation and making it more effective.

Early in the life of this meeting, Walter Falcon, reporting on the London consultation, reminded us that the CGIAR cannot expect to do “business as usual,” the Chairman said.

This attitude was implicit in Bob Herdt’s proposals to rearrange part of ICW, and in discussions of CGIAR governance at the informal executive session that was held over dinner. And it is an assumption behind the thinking of the TAC papers on priorities, strategies and structure.

Commenting on the view that the CGIAR cannot expect to do "business as usual" the Chairman said he had no concerns about the Group’s ability and willingness to make whatever changes are required — whether in research programs, governance or anything else — to keep the CGIAR relevant and effective. But, he pointed out, change should be made deliberately, collaboratively, transparently and with a clear understanding of the reasons for change or reconstruction.

The Chairman concluded: “The CGIAR has come as far as it has, because it has always been pragmatic, convincing and courageous. We need those same qualities today. With them, we can move forward with confidence, preserving what needs to be preserved, and adding on what must be added on.”

The Chairman concluded the meeting on Friday, May 22.
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The working document adopted by the Group follows:

This document reiterates the commitment of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) to the conservation and use of genetic resources, and to the dissemination of its discoveries and products to the developing world in an expeditious and cost-effective manner.

Established in 1971, the CGIAR is an association of countries, international and regional organizations and private foundations dedicated to supporting international research. It currently sponsors 18 autonomous international research centers involved in research on problems related to production in agriculture, forestry and fisheries. The purpose of the CGIAR-sponsored research is to improve the quantity and quality of production in a sustainable manner. The centers have made substantial contributions toward these goals for the benefit of producers and consumers in developing countries. These contributions have resulted from the work of scientists at the centers, in close collaboration with scientists in the national research systems and in public institutions, universities and private companies throughout the world.

In this connection the value of biological resources is becoming increasingly recognized by the world community. The centers are contributing to the conservation of biological diversity through: (1) the collection, characterization, ex-situ maintenance and worldwide distribution of plant genetic resources; and (2) germplasm enhancement for subsequent breeding and adaptation to local agroecological conditions by national research systems. The CGIAR recognizes both Plant Breeders' Rights and the concept of Farmers' Rights, in accordance with the agreed interpretation of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources. Moreover, conservation of genetic resources by the centers, and research on their use is contributing to the goals of the convention on biological diversity presently in preparation.

A fundamental objective of the CGIAR is to ensure access to knowledge, technology and materials in the interests of the developing countries. The CGIAR reaffirms that the genetic resources maintained in the genebanks of the centers are held in trust for the world community. Material from the genebanks at the centers will continue to be freely available, in accordance with the 1989 CGIAR Policy on Plant Genetic Resources.

Modern biotechnology is becoming an important tool for the work of the centers and their collaborators. Advances in its use offer the potential for the centers and their collaborators to increase productivity in agriculture, forestry and fisheries in developing countries. In a changing research environment, the centers need to collaborate with a wide range of agencies in both the public and private sectors which increasingly protect their inventions through holding intellectual property.

Centers do not seek intellectual property protection unless it is absolutely necessary to ensure access by developing countries to new technologies and products. The centers will not seek intellectual property protection for income-generating purposes and will not view potential returns from intellectual property protection as a source of operating funds. Should exceptional cases arise where a center might receive a financial return, an appropriate means will be used to ensure that such funds are used for the conservation of genetic resources and related research.

On a case-by-case basis, the centers carefully consider the advantages and disadvantages, and the costs and benefits before deeming it necessary to seek and maintain any form of intellectual property protection on their inventions. A center's decision reflects its own priorities and concerns as well as those of its collaborators and the nations with which it works. Such decisions are motivated by the need to: (1) establish collaborative research with advanced laboratories; (2) ensure product development and distribution; or (3) forestall preemptive protection by others of CGIAR-generated technology. Any intellectual property rights acquired by a center are exercised without compromising in any manner whatsoever the fundamental position of the CGIAR regarding the free access by developing countries to knowledge, technology, materials and plant genetic resources.