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Section I
Introduction
President Suharto of Indonesia formally opened the first post-renewal meeting of the CGIAR (MTM96, Jakarta, May 20-24), the first head of state to inaugurate a CGIAR event. Mr. Suharto's personal involvement was in keeping with his emphasis on agriculture as an engine of sustainable growth, and provided reconfirmation of the South's continuing interest in the work of the renewed CGIAR. The strong working relationship between CGIAR Centers and their Indonesian colleagues, as well as the institutional link between the CGIAR and Indonesia, which hosts CIFOR, the youngest CGIAR Center, were manifested throughout MTM96. The formal inauguration of the new CIFOR headquarters symbolized the commitment of the CGIAR, working in creative collaboration with NARS, to protect and restore tropical forestry, including the biodiversity of forestland. Indonesia Day (May 20) provided Indonesian scientists with an opportunity to share their experiences and successes with an international audience.

In his opening address, CGIAR Chairman Ismail Serageldin reminded delegates that the responsibilities of renewal are ceaseless, requiring continued action to ensure that gains, once made, are not lost, and positive trends, once set in motion, are not derailed. These words of encouragement had a strong impact on MTM96, which upheld the "spirit of renewal." The course and conclusion of the meeting led Mr. Serageldin to say that it demonstrated the strong commitment of the System to transparency, partnerships, efficiency, a sense of system, and, above all, concern for the world's weak and vulnerable.

The main highlights of MTM96 included the following:

- increased Southern membership with the inclusion of Pakistan and Syria;
- continued emphasis on research that is "pro-poor and pro-environment";
- restrengthening of System finances through support for the agreed Research Agenda, and the adoption of innovative resource mobilization mechanisms;
- reaffirmation of TAC's strategic responsibilities and guardianship of the System's scientific values;
- endorsement of the work program of the Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group to ensure the effectiveness and relevance of research;
- continued efforts to streamline the way in which the Group conducts its business and reaches decisions;
- agreement to hold the third review of the System; and
- actions to strengthen the relationship of the CGIAR with its partners.

In keeping with the emphasis of the renewed CGIAR on striving for greater openness in its work, partners of the CGIAR—NARS, NGOs, and the private sector—were active in all aspects of MTM96. The Group's business meeting was preceded by a NARS-led forum, which served as a Preparatory Meeting for a Global Forum on agricultural research to be held in conjunction with ICW96 in October. [A seven-member panel, led by Mr. Klaus Winkel of Denmark, which examined governance overhaul as part of the CGIAR renewal program, recommended that periodic fora—regional and global—with wider than CGIAR participation, should help to set the agenda for international agricultural research.] The Jakarta Preparatory Meeting was preceded by several regional fora, whose results were distilled into an agenda of priorities which will be the subject of discussion at the Global Forum.

The Jakarta consultation and events leading up to it were NARS-driven, and there was a common understanding that NARS are the foundation of the global agricultural research system. Equally, however, the im-
portance of all other components of the global system—such as NGOs, the private sector, universities, advanced research institutes, and International Centers—was defined and acknowledged. Throughout MTM96, the relationship between the CGIAR and the rest of the global agricultural research system was emphasized as a factor that both shaped the Research Agenda of the CGIAR and was affected by it.

The Group's new rhythm of decisionmaking provides for the Research Agenda and funding needs of the following year to be outlined annually at the MTM of the current year, e.g., at MTM96 for 1997. Additionally, at MTM96, the Group reviewed TAC's five-yearly review of priorities and strategies. Research was, therefore, paramount at the meeting, with interest centered on medium- and long-term prospects. Two fundamental principles characterized the approach to formulation of the System's Research Agenda: an emphasis on poverty alleviation; and, a balance between productivity enhancement and natural resources management. The main elements or components of the CGIAR Research Agenda and the corresponding budgetary distribution for 1997 are expected to breakdown as follows: increasing productivity, 48 percent; protecting the environment/saving biodiversity, 22 percent; improving policy, 11 percent; and, strengthening NARS, 19 percent. This would require contributions of some $300 million. The details of the priorities and strategies adopted at MTM96 are comprehensively summarized on pages 39 to 54. TAC Chair Donald Winkelmann stressed the need for these programs to be carried out in collaboration and consultation with the rest of the global agricultural research system.

At the outset of MTM96, financial prospects were somewhat clouded because it appeared that funding for the Agenda approved at MTM95 would be short of the targeted $300 million by 6 percent, or some $20 million, while approximately $47 million was available for activities outside of the approved agenda. As the World Bank's contribution had already been disbursed on the basis of earlier indications of contributions made by Members, such a shortfall could have required that part of the Bank's contribution would have had to be returned. The situation was further aggravated by the fact that the shortfall fell unevenly, and was likely to cause more hardship to some Centers than to others. Exceptional additional efforts, particularly by Denmark, but also by Japan, Australia, and France, partial use of the System's reserve, and a strenuous effort to bring funding back within the Agreed Agenda, resulted in the gap being closed.

Funding for 1996 will be about $300 million, although some Centers will continue to feel the pinch. Nevertheless, the System's budget has continued to rise over the renewal period, as the following record of contributions to the agreed Research Agenda indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$235 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$268 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$270 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$300 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These increases have been achieved during a period of disenchantment with ODA spending in some industrial countries. To ensure that the trend remains positive, and the CGIAR System can continue to realize its full potential, new arrangements were set in place at MTM96. They provide entrepreneurial opportunities to the Centers, while seeking to ensure that funding decisions do not conflict with System priorities. Thus, TAC certification will continue to be required for all Center projects underpinning Center financing plans. TAC's central role as the source of guidance on strategic directions and advice on resource allocation was, thereby, reconfirmed. TAC was urged, however, to concentrate on the strategic aspects of its responsibilities and to parcel out some of its "nuts and bolts" tasks to other suitable mechanisms working under its direction.

The Group said farewell to Mr. Tim Rothermel, who was the UNDP representative at CGIAR meetings for ten years. Throughout that time, Mr. Serageldin said, Mr. Rothermel had brought judgment and balance to the CGIAR System. He was perceptive and his counsel was always wise. Mr. Rothermel made a moving response, commenting on the nature and importance of the CGIAR to the goals of human development.

The Group adopted a resolution which was printed on a scroll and presented to Mr. Rothermel. The text of the resolution follows:

*In recognition of his strong interest in tropical agriculture, his wealth of knowledge in agricultural research, and his dedicated commitment to the mission of the CGIAR,*
the Members of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research wish to record their gratitude to Timothy S. Rothermel for his distinguished service as a Cosponsor of the CGIAR (1985-1996), representing the United Nations Development Programme, and to offer him warm felicitations for the future.

Looking to ICW96, the Group approved in principle a program that will commemorate and celebrate the 25th anniversary of the CGIAR.
Decisions by the Cosponsors

CGIAR Cosponsors customarily meet before each of the two yearly meetings of the Group. Cosponsors held their pre-MTM meeting in Jakarta on May 19, 1996. CGIAR Chairman Ismail Serageldin presided. Cosponsors were represented by Mr. Henri Carsalade and Mr. Stein Bie (FAO), Mr. Timothy Rothermel (UNDP), Mr. Carlos Zulberti (UNEP), and Mr. Michel Petit (World Bank).

Following were the main decisions reached:

TAC Matters

- TAC's preeminent role as the custodian of scientific excellence in the CGIAR System was reconfirmed.
- TAC was advised to place a stronger emphasis on its strategic responsibilities, while sourcing out non-strategic tasks to suitable groups—for example, external review panels—who would work under TAC's direction.
- TAC membership would need to be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure that scientists of the correct strategic orientation and caliber are nominated.

Research Agenda

- TAC's analysis and approach in its paper on Priorities and Strategies, as well as on the 1997 Research Agenda and funding were broadly endorsed.
- The twin emphasis on productivity enhancement and natural resources management in CGIAR research was reaffirmed as indispensable.
- The need for all parties concerned to exercise discipline in ensuring that adequate funding would be available to support the full Research Agenda as discussed and approved by the Group was reaffirmed.

NARS Linkages

- Steps taken by TAC, the Centers, and other components of the CGIAR System to work more closely with NARS and integrate a NARS perspective into System planning were commended.
- The need to strengthen NARS-CGIAR linkages and to develop innovative collaborative mechanisms was emphasized.
- The need to bring all elements of the global research system into the Global Forum planned for October 1996 was stressed.

25th Anniversary

- Plans to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the CGIAR in conjunction with ICW96 were approved in principle for submission to the Group.
Decisions by a CGIAR Stakeholders Group

A CGIAR Stakeholders Group met on May 17, 1996 in Jakarta. CGIAR Chairman Ismail Serageldin presided. The following attended: CGIAR Cosponsors (Mr. Henri Carsalade, FAO; Mr. Timothy Rothermel, UNDP; Mr. Carlos Zulberti, UNEP; and Mr. Michel Petit, World Bank); Chair, CBC (Ms. Wanda Collins); Chair, CDC (Mr. Lukas Brader); Chair, Finance Committee (Mr. Michel Petit); Representative of Chair, Genetic Resources Policy Committee (Mr. Geoffrey Hawtin); Co-Chair, NGO Committee (Mr. Robert Blake); Chair, Oversight Committee (Mr. Paul Egger); Representative of Co-Chairs, Private Sector Committee (Mr. Sam Dryden); and Chair, TAC (Mr. Donald Winkelmann). The IAEG Chair (Mr. James Peacock) sent his regrets.

The meeting primarily discussed funding issues, TAC’s role and responsibilities, and the next System Review of the CGIAR. The main decisions reached by the stakeholders are recorded below.

Funding Issues

- CGIAR Members and Centers needed to recommit themselves to giving first priority to funding for the agreed Research Agenda.
- A special effort was required at MTM96 to attract additional funding so that an impending shortfall could be eliminated or reduced.
- Members who had already increased their contributions were to be commended for their efforts.
- The problem would have to be given precedence at MTM96 so that the funding process could revert to transparency and predictability.

TAC’s Role and Responsibilities

- TAC occupies a preeminent position as the System’s source of independent, strategic judgment.
- TAC is urged to emphasize its strategic responsibilities.
- Some of TAC’s less strategic duties could be passed on to alternate sources functioning under TAC’s guidance.
- The profile of TAC membership will need to be adjusted to accommodate its renewed emphasis on strategic responsibilities.

Third System Review

- It would be appropriate for the third System Review to take place after the renewed CGIAR has been operational for a year.
- The Chairman could consult stakeholders before ICW96 on the composition of the review panel and its terms of reference.
Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum

Participants of national agricultural research institutes, ministries, regional organizations, NGOs, universities, and the private sector met in Jakarta on May 17-18, 1996 at a Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum that will take place in the context of ICW96. Observers included representatives of the facilitating agencies, as well as CGIAR Members and Centers.

Participants at the Preparatory Meeting:

- reported the outcomes of a series of NARS-led regional fora;
- reviewed opportunities for inter-regional cooperation;
- examined both the substance and process of collaboration between NARS and the CGIAR; and
- outlined the agenda and priorities for discussion at the Global Forum.

CGIAR Chairman Ismail Serageldin, in his remarks to the Preparatory Meeting, outlined the structure of the emerging global research system, and emphasized the contribution each component of the system was called upon to make in establishing global food security.

The Declaration and Action Program of the Lucerne Ministerial-Level Meeting, held in February 1995, encouraged the CGIAR to develop a more open and participatory System with full South-North ownership, and made specific recommendations to the CGIAR on broadening its membership from the South, expanding its partnerships with NGOs and the private sector, and accelerating the participation of NARS in CGIAR decisionmaking and priority setting.

The CGIAR has implemented a range of initiatives to achieve these objectives, including the convening of NARS consultations, through a group of facilitating agencies led by IFAD, beginning in December 1995. These NARS consultations led to the convening by NARS of regional fora, and the subsequent organization of the Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum.

A summary of the report of the Preparatory Meeting to MTM96 appears on pages 33 to 34. As well, the agenda of the Preparatory Meeting is provided in Annex IV on page 89.
Section II
The Main Decisions
The Main Decisions

The main decisions taken at the Jakarta Mid-Term Meeting are encapsulated below.

**BROADER PARTNERSHIPS**

1. New CGIAR Members

Pakistan and Syria were admitted to CGIAR membership by acclaimation, bringing the total number of developing country Members to sixteen. This expansion carries forward the progress achieved during the program of renewal to open the CGIAR System to full South-North ownership.

2. Partnerships with NARS, NGOs, and the Private Sector

The Group endorsed proposals from a Preparatory Meeting held in Jakarta for the Global Forum on the NARS- CGIAR Partnership Initiative, that included NARS, universities, NGOs, and private sector institutions, and from the NGO and Private Sector Committees. The reports were discussed in the context of the momentum toward the development of a strong global research system, and of preparations for a Global Forum as a major component of ICW'96.

3. Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union

The Group requested the CGIAR Task Force on Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union to continue to engage in a dialogue with states in the region, with a view toward developing a win-win strategy for cooperation, and to present its final report at ICW'96.

**RESEARCH AGENDA**

4. Priorities and Strategies

TAC's recommendations on the CGIAR's long-term research priorities and strategies were discussed and broadly endorsed by the Group, with modifications to give greater attention to networking and training. The Group reaffirmed the desired emphasis on the environment, the rural poor, and on women, and the need to find ways to ensure this is carried out. As well, the Group endorsed initiation of 1998-2000 business planning by the Centers. It was recognized that the document prepared by TAC was a milestone in the effort to move toward a more consultative and transparent process, and which should be built upon as the process moves forward through the preparation of Center medium-term plans.

5. 1997 Research Agenda

The Group endorsed the substance of the 1997 Research Agenda, as recommended by TAC. Increased transparency, resulting from the establishment of a System project portfolio, as well as the availability of each Center's project matrix, was welcomed. The proposed funding requirements for 1997 will be scaled down proportionately to a figure of some $300 million—a notional target, not an envelope. The financing identified in the TAC-certified financing plan approved at ICW'96 will determine the actual funding envelope.

6. Genetic Resources

The Group reaffirmed the importance of the CGIAR's continuing participation in the international dialogue on genetic resources, and of the definition of a clear role and strategy for its participation in relevant international fora. As well, the Group urged that steps be taken to establish a genetic resources policy unit at IPGRI as soon as possible.

7. TAC

The Group endorsed the conclusions of a stakeholders meeting, in which TAC's preeminent position as the System's source of independent, strategic guidance was reaffirmed. TAC was urged to emphasize its strategic responsibilities, and to pass on its less strategic duties to alternate sources functioning under TAC's guidance. The Group recognized that the profile of TAC membership would need to be adjusted to accommodate its renewed emphasis on strategic responsibilities.
FINANCE

1996 Funding Issues

Two steps were taken by the Group at MTM96 to close the funding gap in 1996: redefinition and/or reclassification of funding, totaling approximately $15 million, from complementary activities to the Research Agenda; and the provision of additional resources by Members, at a level of about $5 million, for Centers facing the most severe funding shortfalls. These measures ensured funding of about $300 million for the 1996 Research Agenda and full access to the World Bank’s matching contribution in 1996. The exceptional efforts of Denmark in particular, as well as those by Japan, Australia, and France, to provide additional resources for 1996 were commended by the Group.

Modifications in CGIAR Financing Arrangements

Modified financing arrangements were adopted by the Group, to remove the remaining impediments and disincentives hampering the full effectiveness of the existing financing arrangements, thereby increasing predictability, introducing flexibility, and preserving transparency and accountability in the funding of the CGIAR research agenda. Center entrepreneurship was galvanized through the decentralization of responsibility for financing decisions to Centers and Members, and World Bank support was shifted from partial gap filling to reinforcing membership support. A competitive grants program to foster innovation and a systems-wide reserve were established. [A summary of the modified decisionmaking process and schedule appears on pages 61 to 62.]

1997 Financing Arrangements

1997 will be a transitional year toward the full implementation of the modified financing arrangements in 1998. At ICW96, 1997 financing plans, based on Center proposals which have been certified by TAC, will be approved by the Group, following their review by the Finance Committee.

GOVERNANCE

11 ICLARM

The Group endorsed the decision by the ICLARM board to accept the Egyptian Government’s offer of its facility at Abassa. ICLARM was advised to take note of the reservations, in terms of programs and modes of financing, expressed during the discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance.

System Review

The Group approved a System Review, to be commissioned and monitored by a committee of stakeholders, and conducted in 1997 by an independent team. It was agreed that the Oversight Committee would assist in the detailed arrangements, and that the Review would be forward looking.

Center Boards

The Group adopted, with minor amendments, a paper on the role, responsibilities, and accountability of Center boards.

Oversight Committee

The Group approved the appointments of Messrs. Andrew Bennett and Fernando Chaparro and Ms. Teresa Fogelberg to the Oversight Committee. They succeeded Messrs. Robert Herdt and Johan Holmberg, founding members who completed their terms, and Mr. Manuel Lantin, who assumed the post of Science Adviser at the CGIAR Secretariat.

FUTURE CGIAR MEETINGS

25th Anniversary

The proposed program for the commemoration of the CGIAR’s 25th anniversary at ICW96 was approved by the Group, with the understanding that Members could submit additional comments and suggestions to the CGIAR Secretariat. The Secretariat was requested to prepare a revised proposal for the commemoration, taking into consideration the comments and suggestions received from within the CGIAR System.

Dates of Future Meetings

The Group confirmed the following dates of future CGIAR meetings:

ICW96, October 28-November 2, Washington, DC, USA
OTHER BUSINESS

18 PARC

The Group took note of the PARC report, and a proposal for a public awareness campaign. There was general consensus among the Group that the CGIAR should be moving in the directions recommended by PARC. The broad CGIAR community was encouraged to submit suggestions of possible brand names for the CGIAR.
Section III
Welcoming Address by President Subarto of Indonesia
and Response by the CGIAR Chairman
Welcoming Address by
President Subarto of Indonesia,
at the Opening of the 1996 CGIAR Mid-Term Meeting,
May 21, 1996, State Palace, Jakarta

Ladies and Gentlemen:

First of all, I would like to extend my warmest welcome to Indonesia to all of you, participants in the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research Mid-Term Meeting who are coming from overseas. It is indeed a distinct pleasure for me to be in your midst. It is also an honor for Indonesia to be selected as the host of this important meeting.

I sincerely hope the meeting will proceed smoothly and produce the expected results. I also hope that by visiting our country, you will all be able to see the development endeavors we are carrying out at present and our efforts to preserve natural resources.

We are fully conscious that in exploiting natural resources we pay attention to the harmony between development and preservation of the environment. We have long been profoundly aware of this and, in fact, it has become part of our living values.

Our nation's deep understanding about this matter is reflected in the Pancasila, which is the outlook of life and philosophical foundation of our country. Pancasila contains the conviction that there will be a happy life if we can maintain the harmony and congruency in the relationship between man and his fellow beings, between man and his society, between man and God the Creator, and between man and his environment.

Our Constitution also mandated that we should exploit the soil, water, and natural resources contained therein for the greatest possible prosperity of the people. This means we must exploit and manage natural resources as well as possible by preserving their continued existence. Thus, our natural resources will become sustainable and also enjoyed by future generations, by our grandchildren until eternity. We are carrying out the mandate of our founding fathers and of the Constitution in the most responsible manner.

We are managing these natural resources in such a way that their economic, ecological, and social functions remain harmonious and sustainable. In forest management, we are involving the active participation of the community, especially those living near the forest. We cooperate with other nations in seeking the best method for the people's involvement in forest management. We are conducting various research and development to produce the appropriate technology for the management of our forests. We are fully aware that forests are extremely important natural resources for us and for the whole of mankind.

With the continuing increase of the number of population and of income, it is expected that the demand for agricultural and forest products will continue to become even greater. In order to meet this increasing demand, it is indispensable that production be raised. For this purpose, supporting technology must be developed and simultaneously introduced in the field. However, the discovery of a new technology needs long research, an adequate number of experts, and costly investment. It is, therefore, necessary that, to make it more effective and efficient, there must be cooperation between research centers, both at the national and international levels.

As one of the agrarian developing countries, it is to the great interest of Indonesia to have research centers which are under this Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research. Our experience to date shows the great importance of these research centers. At a time when Indonesia was suffering from severe...
food shortages in the seventies because our paddy fields were devastated by brown plant hoppers, for example, Indonesia was spared from disaster due to the availability of pest-resistance varieties supplied by the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in the Philippines.

IRRI has provided immeasurable assistance with the production of high-yielding varieties, cultivation technology, integrated pest control, post-harvest technology, and agricultural tools and implements. The availability of rice varieties and the application of technology enabled Indonesia to become self-sufficient in rice in 1984. This rice self-sufficiency has such a great significance for our development, because it has not only raised the income of farmers, but also accelerated our economic growth.

Today, our development has just entered the early years of the Second 25-Year Long-Term Development Programme. During this period, we shall continue to speed up our industrial development. We hope that, in the near future, Indonesia will start to move from an agrarian to an industrial country. However, the agricultural sector will still occupy an important place in our development, because the provision of food for close to 200 million Indonesians precisely depends on this sector and it produces basic materials for our growing industry.

Indonesia is one of the countries that has a very extensive tropical forest. Our forest covers around 140 million hectares or 73 percent of our land mass. Indonesia's tropical forest is the third largest in the world after Brazil and Zaire.

We are managing our extensive forest by taking into consideration its primary function as a production forest, protection forest, and conservation forest. For this reason, Indonesia takes pride being chosen as the site of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).

It is in the vital interest of Indonesia to pay continued attention to forests. Our well preserved forests hold natural sources that make concrete products in the form of timber and other non-timber products. Our forests serve as genetic sources, watershed management, and the lungs of the world. They have very strategic and irreplaceable functions.

It is due to the importance of forests that I would like to make an appeal, once again, to donor countries which are Members of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research to give a greater attention to forests and support the effort to enhance the role and function of forests.

As a developing country, Indonesia has limited capabilities and can only offer a contribution in the form of a headquarters and its facilities for the Center for International Forestry Research and approximately 300,000 hectares of forest for research purposes in East Kalimantan. The presence of a center for international forestry research in Indonesia shall definitely stimulate Indonesia's researchers from various disciplines to gain international experience and present the results of their research for the preservation of forests in the world in general and developing countries in particular. I am sure the close cooperation between foreign researchers and our own can solve and address the various forestry issues that confront the developing countries.

The theme adopted at the present meeting is "Facing the Poverty Challenge." It is, indeed, in congruence with our current development stage, which is intensively concentrated on a poverty alleviation program.

During the past twenty-five years, Indonesia has made encouraging progress in reducing the number of poor people, namely from 60 percent in 1970 to 14 percent of the total population in 1993. Since we have a big population, those who are still living below the poverty line also remain numerous, that is, around 26 million.

The people's prosperity level has improved. In the 1970s, the average life expectancy of Indonesians was 46 years, in 1995 it has risen to 63 years. The number of illiterates has declined from 39 percent in 1970 to 16 percent in 1990. Since 1984, we have been self-sufficient in our rice production. The production of food and clothing from 1968 to 1991 also continued to increase. Fish production has increased from 10 kilograms to 18 kilograms per person. Meat production more than doubled from 2.7 kilograms to 6.4 kilograms per person. Egg production increased by almost six times, from 0.5 kilogram to 2.9 kilograms per person. Textile production rose ten times, from 2.0 meters to 20 meters per person.
In the poverty alleviation program through the Least-Developed Village INPRES, with its cross-sectoral approach, a number of efforts have been made in the past two years to enhance the skills of the villagers so that they can improve their economy on their own.

The theme adopted at your present meeting is in line with the concern of the world today.

As we all know, FAO reported that—apart from rapid technological advancement—there are still at the global level about 800 million people who are suffering from chronic food shortages, and it is even predicted that by the year 2010 most probably 730 million people will still be suffering from hunger. We cannot talk about poverty alleviation if there is still a very large number of hungry people. For this reason, therefore, Indonesia fully supports the initiative of the Director General of FAO to hold the first World Food Summit in 1996 this year.

Thus, in concluding, I hereby declare the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research Mid-Term Meeting 1996 officially opened.

May God Almighty constantly bestow His divine blessings on all of us.

Thank you.

Response by the CGIAR Chairman

Your Excellency, President Suharto, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, Friends and Colleagues:

Mr. President, you have honored the CGIAR by inviting us to your Presidential Palace, by taking the time to welcome us personally and formally inaugurate our meeting. Your appreciation of the work done by the CGIAR demonstrates how strongly you support our mission. We are convinced, as you are, that science and technology, buttressed by research of the highest quality, are essential instruments in the fight against poverty. We are fully in agreement, as well, on the need to manage natural resources wisely, and that empowering the people is vital if this goal is to be reached. The fact that our approach to development is fully compatible with yours is cause for mutual satisfaction.

The CGIAR accepted with pleasure the offer of the Government of Indonesia to host the Group’s 1996 Mid-Term Meeting. We are delighted to be here, in a country with a great history, a rich cultural heritage, an impressive record of development, an enlightened perspective on agriculture within the development framework, and an enduring relationship with the CGIAR.

We were effectively assisted in making arrangements for this Mid-Term Meeting by the Indonesian Organizing Committee, whose members are drawn from the Ministries of Agriculture and of Forestry. We thank all those who assisted us, at all levels of both Ministries. We have encountered friendship and goodwill in full measure from the time of our arrival. This spirit of cooperation is consistent with the quality of Indonesia’s linkages with the CGIAR.

The CGIAR was pleased to welcome Indonesia as a Member in 1992. By joining the ranks of the Group’s membership, Indonesia gave a strong impetus to the subsequent transformation of the CGIAR into a fully South-North enterprise, as part of the CGIAR’s renewal process. In hosting CIFOR, Indonesia, already a partner in productivity-oriented research, identified itself with the national resources management emphasis of the CGIAR.

The Jakarta Mid-Term Meeting is the first to be held following the completion of an eighteen-month program of CGIAR renewal. In Jakarta, therefore, we are challenged to ensure our continued relevance and effectiveness.

You will recall, Mr. President, that at the commencement of an Asean [Association of South East Asian Nations] conference in Indonesia a few years ago, a neigh-
boring dignitary said that on arriving in your country he felt as if he was entering paradise. And, he added, "in paradise, I hear, they never fail." With your kindness and generosity supporting us, and your example inspiring us, we too, "cannot fail." I am confident that the CGIAR will have a fully successful Mid-Term Meeting in Indonesia. We will leave this country replenished and reinvigorated.

Ladies and Gentlemen, in the opening chapter of President Suharto’s autobiography, published in 1989, he refers to the "Ceres" award he received four years earlier from a CGIAR Cosponsor, FAO. He was honored for his leadership which had enabled Indonesian agriculture to scale great heights of productivity in its staple food crop, rice. Reminiscing on that agricultural achievement, President Suharto described it as "the most important issue for 160 million mouths." We fully agree. A hungry people are a neglected people, who frequently become a desperate people. A society which feeds its hungry, and which views agriculture as a vital step toward enriching and empowering the people, is a society reaching out toward the all-too-often elusive goal of national resilience.

President Suharto was schooled in this ideology of development from an early age. He was born in the village of Kemusuk, in a rural area dominated by farm families, whose main occupation was rice cultivation. His father was a village official in charge of the irrigation works that sustained rice production. As a child, President Suharto reveled in that atmosphere. From his farm-based childhood through his early experience in commerce to his career as a soldier and his transference to national leadership, he acquired the kind of wisdom that comes from real life experience, rarely from textbooks alone.

For keeping national and international policies focused on people-centered development, President Suharto was called “The Provider” by the news magazine Asiaweek. From the people of Indonesia, he has earned the informal title, Bapak Pembangunan, the “Father of Development.” We applaud the sentiments inherent in that popular estimation.

Your Excellency, President Suharto, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, the work of development is never done. The complexities and self-doubt that afflict society in high-income countries suggest that at each level of development new challenges abound. Indonesia, thus, today confronts problems and difficulties, despite the success of its development efforts.

I have no doubt that Indonesia will wrestle with these problems as assiduously as it has done with others. The CGIAR Centers will collaborate fully with their Indonesian counterparts in their specific fields of competence. And Indonesia, as a Member of the CGIAR, can exert its influence to ensure that CGIAR policies are relevant to the needs of Indonesia, the region, and other comparable countries elsewhere. Through these processes of cooperation, we can together reach out toward the goal of people-centered development.

Mr. President, I thank you, once again, for your support and encouragement.
Section IV
Chairman's Opening Statement
and Announcements
I. INTRODUCTION

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Welcome to the 1996 Mid-Term Meeting. May the Spirit of Lucerne continue to inspire us, leading us forward to new frontiers of effort and achievement. Reality reminds us that the tasks of renewal are never done. Battles won have to be fought and fought again.

We must keep our vision clear, our goals well defined, and our operations effective. Moving our vision forward from the principles adopted in Lucerne into tangible reality requires redoubling of our efforts on behalf of the weak and the vulnerable. It requires discipline in our internal arrangements and intensive collaboration in our external relationships, for we are part of an evolving global research system in which every component must work well on its own and fit well with the others.

Our first obligation, therefore, is to ensure that the CGIAR System is healthy, vigorous, and working at optimum capacity. Keeping that in mind, I had expected our discussions to be focused primarily on the priorities leading directly to adoption of the 1997 Research Agenda and agreement on the budget for its implementation. That was the original purpose of this Mid-Term Meeting. However, several critical issues, including funding concerns, relevant to the quality of work and the morale of staff at CGIAR Centers need to be addressed as well. We shall be doing so.

I am convinced that our momentum will not be stopped. The responses I have received at discussions with various concerned groups during the past few days encourage me to believe that we are all equally anxious to overcome the obstacles in our way. We confront new challenges, but we celebrate our strengths as well, drawing sustenance from well springs deep within our Group.

Almost to the very day, twenty-five years ago, a small group of visionaries met at the World Bank under the chairmanship of Dick Demuth for the first formal meeting of the CGIAR. They were men of vision, committed to using science and technology to benefit the poor. Their vision has been fulfilled many times over. They continue to be a source of inspiration. We salute their foresight. We accept the solemn responsibility of continuing to build on the foundation they laid twenty-five years ago. They are not here with us physically, but they are with us in spirit. I invite you to join me in honoring them with a round of applause.

II. CONTINUING CHALLENGES

Ideally, twenty-five years on, we should be able to declare total victory, fold up our tents, and move on; but development is about life, and life is not like that. You are all familiar with the record of the past, the complexities of the present, and the problems as well as the promise of the future. I will not repeat data and analyses which are only too well known to you. Let me only restate our common belief that, as Jawaharlal Nehru put it, in development "everything else can wait; but not agriculture."

If we do not transform agriculture to be more productive, we will curtail food abundance, which is the basis of food security. Low-output agriculture cannot feed growing populations. If we do not transform agriculture to be sustainable, we will destroy natural resources, the foundation of productivity and human sustenance. If we do not transform it to benefit the poorest and focus especially on women, we will help to perpetuate the very inequities we want to dismantle.

Agricultural transformation in the world’s developing regions will require a thrice green revolution: green for productivity; green for environmental sustainability; and green for increased income as the entry point to improved living conditions, dealing with the access side of food security.
I am aware that modern agricultural technologies have their detractors. We would be doing ourselves a disservice if we did not respect their genuine concerns. These are many faceted, ranging from fears that new technologies harm the environment and erode biodiversity to claims that only large-scale, rich farmers benefit from modern, science-based agriculture.

When new agricultural technologies were introduced in Asia, the preeminent need was to produce more food, thereby saving millions from starvation or death. This was done. With the cushion of productivity in place, CGIAR policies and programs have evolved into a twinning of productivity-oriented research and natural resource management as the basis of sustainable agriculture. This is fundamental to all our work.

So I would say to our friends whose concerns are with the poor and with the environment: we share identical goals. Our hopes for the future are in complete harmony. We are committed to the new paradigm of development in which cutting-edge science can be combined with traditional knowledge, in which community-based action is recognized as essential for effectiveness; and in which empowerment of farm families, and primarily of women, is paramount. So I say to all of you who share these objectives: whatever your present misgivings, come, join us, let us work together for these better tomorrows.

III. A GLOBAL RESPONSE

Dag Hammarskjold remarked at a meeting of the United Nations Security Council that "the UN was not created to take mankind to heaven, but to save it from hell." The late Secretary General's comment offers us all a warning against false expectations or over-expectations. We should always remember that the CGIAR was never meant to be, and is not, an all-purpose development tool. Our strength and our focus is research. Research is the basis of agricultural transformation. Ours, too, has to be a people-centered agenda in which the results of research sustain the poor and the hungry. Within that focus, we can dare to dream, and dream again, of what is yet to come; but dreams must be tempered with realism. And realism tells us that we cannot act alone. We must combine forces with, and combine the forces of, a variety of partners in a global research system dedicated to food security, poverty alleviation, and agricultural sustainability.

New and deeper partnerships must be forged in a strong, global research system if all the building blocks are to fit together in a durable construct. Farmers and other resource users must have a much stronger voice in setting research priorities, the conduct of research programs, and the evaluation of research results. Research teams in universities and other advanced research organizations must be better mobilized by traditional agricultural research institutions. New arrangements for collaboration with the private sector must be developed. Opportunities must also be created for collaboration and synergies among all actors, including—especially including—NGOs. The CGIAR, while functioning within the global research system, can serve, as well, as a catalyst to bring together all components in a common endeavor.

Economists tell us that we should get the prices right. I would emphasize that, equally, we must get the roles right. Toward that end, we have broadened our partnerships and deepened our collaboration with many. You have already had ample evidence in Jakarta, and you will have much more as MTM96 proceeds, that our linkages with NARS, NGOs, and the private sector are strong and growing stronger day by day. We are moving ever closer to convergence of thought and action.

The NARS CGIAR consultation in Jakarta was a harbinger of even greater transformations to come. You will receive more evidence of these continuing changes in the reports on NARS-CGIAR relations, and on the work of our partnership committees—NGOs and the private sector.

Our strongest contribution to a global research system will, of course, be our research. At MTM96 we will discuss the proposed 1997 Research Agenda as well as TAC's recommendations on priorities and strategies for the foreseeable future. Let me, however, make a few introductory comments for your consideration.

At the launching of our renewal program in New Delhi, I said that we must deal adequately with the issue of water scarcity. I pointed out that current work on water—globally, and not only by the CGIAR—was inadequate to solve a problem that is likely to affect large parts of humanity in the first decade of the next century. It was my view then, as it is now, that for the
CGIAR, water-related research is a central part of natural resources management, should figure more prominently in the work programs of ecoregional Centers, and should be better linked to IIMI’s agenda. Much has happened in the intervening months to highlight this issue on the global agenda.

The World Water Council has provided a forum for promoting the awareness of critical water issues, and to promote the sustainable management of water. In a related development, extensive efforts by the Swedish International Development Agency, UNDP, and the World Bank have resulted in the establishment of the Global Water Partnership. Its purpose is to serve as a coherent, integrated, and collaborative framework for assisting local, national, and regional authorities to implement internationally endorsed water management principles. The causes for this upsurge of interest are presented with insight and brevity in David Seckler’s essay, “The New Era of Water Resources Management,” published by the CGIAR Secretariat. Widespread interest in water management, and the need to conduct research that supports it, is not some passing fad. It is a compelling global need. We dare not neglect it.

Also in New Delhi, I reviewed with you the phenomenon of humans being hunters and gatherers only in the case of the sea. Declining fish stocks have since caused many alarm bells to ring, and the need to be farmers as well as hunters and gatherers is becoming more clear. More than a billion people in developing countries depend on fish as their primary source of animal protein. An additional 16 million tons would be needed annually to maintain consumption at current levels in the year 2010, assuming current rates of population growth, according to UN estimates; but overall production has stagnated. Nine of the world’s seventeen major fishing areas are in serious decline. Existing resources need to be better managed, and sustainable fish farming developed, if fish is to continue to serve as an important item on the human diet. Both areas—water management and aquatic resources research—deserve thoughtful attention, and effective action, prepared in consultation with our partners.

This Group discussed systemwide programs at length and in depth during ICW95. We decided to support a set of systemwide programs on the understanding that we are in a transitional phase and will return to the subject when it can be discussed in terms of practice, not only in theory. In the spirit of that decision, we cannot allow approved systemwide programs to become the victims of lip service. I expect that before this meeting has ended, any issues that impinge on support for these programs will have been fully clarified.

Let me cite a few examples of a mismatch between promise and performance. First, the Alternatives to Slash and Burn Program—well known to all of you—has been and is still facing difficulties. I am hopeful that they will be resolved in the next few days; but why was it at such risk despite the broad-based support we collectively gave it? Second, the Global Livestock Program, an initiative undertaken after the restructuring of livestock research, which seeks to improve understanding of feed production for ruminant livestock and its use in rainfed, mixed farming systems. This program combines strategic and applied research on livestock feed development with policy studies and natural resources management. Likewise the Soil, Water, and Nutrient Management Program, which is also well known to you. Both are approved and are crucial programs affected by financial uncertainty. I urge, therefore, that conceptual commitment be matched by consistent support. Research, once started, cannot be switched off and on again like the flow of water from a faucet.

On another topic involving potential new partnerships, the task force we established last year will be reporting at MTM96 on the opportunities for collaborative research in Central Asia and Eastern Europe. We will hear, as well, about a regional consultation that reviewed this possibility. We need to respond to those reports, creatively and realistically.

IV. MANAGING AND SUPPORTING RESEARCH

Research is the defining core of the CGIAR vision. Every contribution we make to making this world a better place to live in is based on research: its relevance, its quality, its continuity, and its impact. Our vision could disintegrate into a nightmare if we do not support our Research Agenda fully and manage our affairs well. We cannot and, let me emphasize, will not substitute process for vision, unreliability for consistent support, bureaucracy for transparency, and administration for management. Coherence and cohesion shall be maintained, and enhanced. The System shall be more than the sum of its parts.
To help us further strengthen our mechanisms of governance and our systems of financial support, I am going to set out five guidelines for all components of the CGIAR System.

1. Instill a greater sense of discipline—indeed, self-discipline—across the CGIAR, so that commitments made will be upheld. This applies both to amounts pledged and the timeliness of disbursements.

2. Reduce the System’s paperwork. The insistence on transparency that is part of our renewal must not weaken. Facts must be honestly shared; but drowning people in a sea of excessively detailed information is only another form of opacity. A combination of clarity and brevity will enable Members to define their options and make appropriate judgments.

3. Spare Centers the burden of searching for and amassing incredible details in the preparation of budgets, plans, and other proposals. Scientists should not be diverted from research to fulfill bureaucratic compulsions. The Centers, for their part, have an obligation to be open, focused, concise, and strategic in their management and in their presentations.

4. Experiment with the matrix approach as it develops, but not distort it. The Agreed Agenda, which the matrix reflects, is an expression of agreements based on substantive discussion. We must respect the Agenda as a distillation of our vision, and work with it as a tool that enhances transparency and brings clarity to the System’s programs. It must not be a bureaucratic straightjacket.

5. Protect TAC’s capacity to fulfill its strategic responsibility of positioning the CGIAR within the global system, so that the entire global system can be strengthened.

The CGIAR needs, as well, to take a new approach to financing so that some of the frustrations that burden the Centers can be eliminated. I have, therefore, discussed with Center Directors and Finance Committee members proposals for decentralizing financing arrangements and setting up new incentives. In outline, my proposals are designed to meet the following objectives:

- replace perverse incentives with positive incentives;
- increase predictability and reduce uncertainty;
- introduce flexibility;
- encourage entrepreneurship;
- reduce bureaucracy;
- avoid micro-management; and
- enhance transparency and accountability.

In order to reach these objectives, I have suggested to the Center Directors and members of the Finance Committee that we make some changes in our current procedures. The changes in the process are small, but significant. We would be pursuing the following steps:

1. The Agenda will be proposed by TAC after consultations with Centers, NARS, and others.

2. The Agenda will be fully debated and adopted at each MTM.

3. The notional “figures” or “targets” for the various cells of the matrix will be aggregated into five columns for monitoring purposes. We will continue to have more detailed information available but not for monitoring progress.

4. The Centers will negotiate with Members to fund the Agenda to reach or exceed targets in the various cells in the matrix.

5. Prior to ICW, the Center proposals will be reviewed by TAC and “certified.”

6. The aggregation of TAC-certified Center proposals becomes the Agenda submitted for endorsement at ICW.

7. The Finance Committee will study this proposed matrix, review it, and if satisfied, present it to the Group at ICW for discussion and approval.

8. The Center-generated, TAC-certified, and CGIAR-approved matrix becomes the basis for seeking the World Bank’s contribution and for allocating it.
The Bank funds would be allocated to each cell of a “coarse” matrix of five columns, with special attention being given to systemwide programs. The sum of the amounts across a row will be given to the Center concerned. That money will have to be accounted for: if the estimated work in any of the five cells is not achieved, the Bank will have to be reimbursed proportionately by the Center concerned. A small part of the Bank funds will be held in reserve and will be available for competitive grants allocated by TAC for innovative ideas during the course of the year. Special attention will have to be paid to systemwide programs and their funding.

These ideas will clearly need to be elaborated on and discussed in the days ahead, but they hold promise and I commend them to your attention. These guidelines are meant to sharpen decisionmaking, reemphasize accountability, and enhance flexibility. They will encourage entrepreneurship and innovation—the keystones of scientific achievement. Furthermore, we now have in place an Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group, whose groundbreaking work will help us to assess past investments as a basis for planning future activities.

Within this framework, TAC’s role is more important than ever. Its importance was acknowledged twenty-five years ago, and has been repeatedly reaffirmed. It is particularly important in enabling the CGIAR to function effectively in a global setting. Because of its importance, there have been some concerns that “nuts and bolts” tasks may have crowded out its strategic functions. I have reviewed its role and functions. I met for a whole day with TAC members in Rome. Cosponsors examined the issues in Washington, DC, as did a group of stakeholders under my chairmanship in Jakarta last week. The purpose of these discussions was to explore how TAC’s composition and operations could be strengthened so that the best talent could provide us with guidance on strategic matters.

Stakeholders confirmed TAC’s central role in guiding the evolution of the CGIAR in the context of a changing global system, the independence of TAC as an advisory body, and the need for a strong TAC consisting of internationally recognized scientists. They agreed that TAC’s key functions in the coming years would be: to position the CGIAR within the evolving global research system—the 96 percent of research efforts—based on an assessment of comparative advantage for producing international public goods research; to determine CGIAR priorities and strategies; to recommend the CGIAR’s response to global research needs and opportunities; to review the fit of the CGIAR Research Agenda with the programs of other actors in the global system; and to ensure the scientific quality and relevance of Center programs.

Stakeholders suggested, as well, that TAC might consider delegating the management of micro issues of resource allocation and budget analysis to others, who would carry out these tasks and report back to TAC. I expect that by MTM97, the TAC Chair will be able to present the Group with a progress report.

The TAC-proposed Research Agenda for 1997 is notionally presented at $311 million, a proposal whose composition and size I expect us to debate and endorse in the next few days. Before we get to 1997, however, we need to confront problems affecting funding in 1996.

At MTM95 in Nairobi, the Group approved a Research Agenda for 1996, and agreed on a funding requirement of close to $300 million. Was this a manifestation of post-Lucerne euphoria? If it was, the feeling was strong, because by October, at ICW95, some two-thirds of this much higher level of funding had already been pledged, double the previous percentage achieved at a comparable point in the budget cycle. The positive trend seemed firm and the Bank provided the CGIAR with a 15 percent contribution based on total support of $300 million. The Bank’s contribution was disbursed, still on the basis that full funding would be achieved in 1996.

Several troubling events have taken place that shake our confidence in full funding for 1996. Let me list the most significant of them.

First, implementation of the financing matrix adopted as part of the renewal program has caused some confusion about whether indicated support is directed to items inside or outside of the Agreed Agenda. Several discussions have been held on this issue and, consequently, I expect much greater clarity to emerge during the course of this week.

Second, some Members have continued to provide support for activities that are not part of the Agreed Agenda, while elements of the Agenda remain unfunded or underfunded.

Third, due to domestic pressures, some Members have cut their contributions. Additionally, there has
been slippage in project financing from our institutional contributors.

The current projection is for a shortfall of some 6 percent in 1996. If this materializes, I will be compelled to return to the Bank the amount that is in excess of its 15 percent ceiling. Moreover, the change from the commitments of full funding in 1995 to a threatened shortfall threatens the integrity, predictability, and transparency of the funding process. We cannot revert to a situation of uncertainty which makes the budget drive the Research Agenda. Members and Centers must work together to ensure that funding falls squarely within the Agreed Agenda. Based on consultations now taking place, I am confident that we will have more funds within the matrix than we had at the beginning of the week.

Having said that, however, let me point out that even with a 6 percent shortfall, if we do face one, we will be better off than we were last year and immensely better off than we were in 1993. Then, as a $220 million organization, the CGIAR contemplated “restructuring”—an euphemism for taking the ax to the Centers. We have triumphed over that malaise.

I commend Japan for the expansion of its support and for its steadfastness at a time of great need. Since ICW'95, several Members—notably Belgium, Italy, Spain, and the United Kingdom—have made special efforts to expand or maintain their commitments. I urge all of you to use your powers of persuasion to convince your financial colleagues that contributions to the CGIAR are not a luxury, but a solid investment in the human family. I invite you all to draw inspiration from the example of Denmark, which has announced a 50 percent increase in its 1997 CGIAR contribution, and of Switzerland and the Netherlands, which made three-year commitments last year. Consider also the actions of the Group’s Southern Members: Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Korea, and The Philippines. They muster the resources to support the CGIAR. In the face of their example, how can any Northerners justify backsliding?

Let us take all the time we need to make this range of issues the focus of our discussions. That is the way forward.

V. FACING THE FUTURE

I grant that there is reason for pause and doubt in much of what is happening around us. We live in a confused world, desperately seeking a sense of redefinition. The uncertainties of the Cold War have receded and in their place we have new uncertainties. A “beggar-my-neighbor” mood stalks the corridors of power. There is an onslaught on public funds. Generosity and compassion are rare. These are formidable obstacles to progress. Can we overcome them? Yes, if the CGIAR System remains committed to its mission and works in full partnership with those who share the same concerns and strive for the same goals. International commitment to agricultural research remains in place. There has been a renewed interest in agriculture and rural development since the Lucerne Ministerial-Level Meeting.

I attended the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, at its meeting here in Jakarta last November. In my statement, I highlighted the key role of the CGIAR within the global system for the conservation and use of genetic resources for the improvement of food and agriculture. The Conference of the Parties recognized the importance of the renegotiation of the International Undertaking, currently taking place within the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources, and endorsed the preparation by FAO of a State of the World Report and Global Plan of Action, which will be tabled at the FAO International Technical Conference next month in Leipzig. I am pleased that we will be sending a very strong delegation to the Leipzig Conference. This will again provide an opportunity for us to show our strong commitment and engagement with the world community on these critical issues.

In another important development, many of the governments represented here have joined to form the new Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest, which I have the honor to chair. The CGAP will seek to ensure that the very poor, especially women, have access to timely small loans and interest-bearing savings. The BRI Unit Desa in this country, like the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh and the Bank for Agriculture and Agricultural Cooperatives in Thailand, has proved how strongly the availability of rural finance empowers, inspires, and galvanizes the weakest segments among the rural poor.
The Fourth Annual Conference on Environmentally Sustainable Development will be held at the World Bank this fall. The theme of this year’s conference will be “Rural Well-being—From Vision to Action.” We chose this theme because a thriving rural economy or a state of rural well-being will result in a great reduction of worldwide poverty, which is overwhelmingly concentrated in rural areas.

International Centers Week, the first Global Forum on agricultural research, and our 25th anniversary celebration will follow. The United Nations World Food Summit, organized by FAO, will bring these events to culmination, with heads of state and government expected to pledge support for food security programs. This initiative merits the fullest support of the CGIAR. I have asked IFPRI to represent the CGIAR in the preparations for the Summit. A paper from the CGIAR will be among the Summit documents. As your ambassador, I will, of course, attend.

I mention these events because they show that we are not alone. Many others share both our compassion and our optimism. Let us reach out to them. We have begun to do so in several ways. Our membership drive is rapidly turning the CGIAR into a fully South-North enterprise. After MTM96, sixteen of our 52 Members will be from the South, up from zero in 1971. That characteristic must permeate every component of the CGIAR, demonstrating our sense of inclusion. In this connection, I am delighted to report that information on the CGIAR is now available in six languages, including Bahasa Indonesia. The CGIAR is no longer one of the world’s best kept secrets, but that is not enough. The CGIAR must become one of the world’s best known examples of human achievement. This requires a well-planned public information strategy. Your contribution to the development of such a strategy is a precondition for its success.

The past twenty-five years were a period of strenuous endeavor and also of great accomplishment. The years ahead will be no less arduous, no less significant, no less satisfying. So let us recommit ourselves to the ideals that have sustained us, and to the scientific efforts that have sustained others. In our commitment lie the seeds of hope for the disadvantaged and deprived of today and tomorrow.

Inspired by the record of the past twenty-five years and strengthened by renewal, we must face the future with hope, determination, and confidence in ourselves and our partners, however formidable the challenges of today and tomorrow might be. We can either be forward looking, adopt the 1997 Research Agenda, and prepare to work collaboratively with our partners, or we can retrogress into another crisis. The latter course must not prevail.

The magnitude of the tasks ahead seem awesome; but heights can be conquered, problems surmounted, if as a young American poet urged in another context, our spirits are ever-soaring, chasing heights swept by the winds of passion and promise, until we can one day say to those who will not dream and dare, that we have:

Soared where neither lark nor eagle flew...
Done a hundred things you have not dreamed of...

Thank you.

Chairman’s Announcements

IN MEMORIAM

It is my sad duty to record the tragic death in a drowning accident of William Colby, the husband of Sally Shelton-Colby, USAID’s Assistant Administrator for Global Programs, Field Support, and Research. We all know Sally well as the head of the United States delegation who has been unwavering in her commitment to the CGIAR and undeterred in her optimism that international trends of reaction will recede, enabling sense and goodwill to maintain their place in the international development community. She was in Lucerne with us, offering wise and timely counsel. Our thoughts go out to Sally at this time of shock and sorrow.

We note, as well, the passing, also in a drowning accident, of Wolfgang Siebeck, a former staff member of the World Bank who was a CGIAR Secretariat consultant, specializing in genetic resources and intellectual property rights issues. Wolfgang was a published author on these issues, but carried out most of his work behind the scenes, advising CGIAR colleagues at the Centers, on
our Genetic Resources Policy Committee, and elsewhere. His work was deeply appreciated by his peers. He was a respected and well liked colleague.

I have already conveyed our condolences to Sally Shelton Colby and to Maika Siebeck. With your permission, I will suggest to the Executive Secretary that he inform them of this formal expression of sympathy by the Group.

NEW MEMBERS

I referred in my opening statement to our continuing membership drive in the context of our transformation into a truly South-North enterprise. I have received strong support in this effort from many of you, and wish to place on record my appreciation of that help. The Executive Secretary's efforts have been indefatigable. I invite others who wish to help in this exercise to discuss joint strategies with him.

I am pleased to welcome Sujayet Chowdhury, the delegate from Bangladesh, the first home-based representative to join us. At International Centers Week, you will recall, Bangladesh was represented by a member of that country's embassy in Washington, DC.

Since we last met, Syria and Pakistan have formally conveyed to me their desire to join the CGIAR. If there is no objection, I will inform them that their request for admission has been granted. May I have the customary indication of acceptance? Thank you.

I understand that more requests for membership are possible in the near future. In this connection, I am delighted to welcome observers from Morocco, New Zealand, South Africa, and Sri Lanka. I hope that when we next meet we can welcome their countries as Members of the CGIAR.

The old mix with the new, and I am pleased to inform you that a Memorandum of Understanding, confirming continued support, has been signed between Spain and the CGIAR; and that Brazil has officially announced its commitment to reactivating CGIAR membership. Both developments are highly desirable and greatly appreciated.

COMINGS AND GOINGS

I extend a most cordial welcome to all delegates of established CGIAR Members representing their institutions for the first time. For Tim Rothermel, the UNDP Cosponsor representative, this is expected to be his last CGIAR meeting in his present capacity. He has been a pillar of the CGIAR for many years, and we will have occasion to pay him appropriate tribute during the course of our meeting.

Two new regional representatives are with us in Jakarta: Chandra Gautam of Nepal and Gonzalo Jordan of Chile. Welcome to the world of the CGIAR. Please convey our felicitations and thanks to your colleagues from your countries whom you have succeeded.

Changes have taken place in the chairmanship of two Center Boards, since we last met. At IRRI, Rudy Rabbinge has succeeded Emil Javier, and at CIMMYT, Wally Falcon has succeeded Louisa van Vloten-Doting. I welcome the two new Chairs into the most intimate circle of CGIAR leadership, and note with pleasure that their wealth of experience continues to be available to us. I thank the outgoing Chairs who served with great accomplishment.

If any you are wondering about the identity of the newcomer in the TAC corner, please welcome Shellemiah Keya, the new Executive Secretary of TAC. Shellemiah is a soil scientist who comes to us direct from his position as Professor of Soil Science at the University of Kenya. He represents within himself much of the extended CGIAR community—Kenya, a CGIAR Member; the Southern university community; the NARS; and that ubiquitous body, the Cornell mafia. With those credentials, he surely is going to be a strong force within the CGIAR System. On behalf of all of us, and personally as well, I welcome him and wish him many years of effort and achievement. Our thanks go out in full measure to Guido Gryseels, who held the fort at TAC during the search for John Monyo's successor. Guido is a loyal and highly respected member of the CGIAR family. His work at the TAC Secretariat has been invaluable and no doubt will continue to be so. Thanks, Guido.

A very warm welcome, as well, to Jim Peacock, Eugenia Muchnik, and Tim Healy of the Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group—they will in the future be the keepers of our conscience!—and to the members of the NGO and Private Sector Committees, and the NARS leaders who participated in the Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum. We look forward to your participation here at MTM96.
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I. BROADER PARTNERSHIPS

The program of renewal, launched by the CGIAR in May 1994, had as one of its primary objectives a more open and participatory System with full South-North ownership. The Declaration and Action Program of the Lucerne Ministerial-Level Meeting, held in February 1995, directed the CGIAR: to enrich its dialogue with members of civil society interested in the same issues as the CGIAR, by convening a committee of NGOs and a committee of the private sector; and, to accelerate the process of systematizing the participation of NARS of developing countries in setting and implementing the Group’s agenda. As well, the Lucerne Meeting encouraged the CGIAR to undertake research in Eastern Europe and in the countries of the former Soviet Union, and recommended that the CGIAR carry out an analysis to determine its options.

As part of the efforts to implement the Lucerne recommendations, the CGIAR Chairman carried out a broad range of consultations with the NGO community and the private sector, which led to the establishment of a NGO Committee and a Private Sector Committee. As well, dialogue with developing country NARS was strengthened, sharply focused, and expanded. Additionally, the CGIAR created a Task Force to study the potential for a CGIAR effort in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

The Group received reports on progress made in broadening the CGIAR’s partnerships through these activities at MTM96. Reports from the NGO and Private Sector Committees, and a report on the Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum on the NARS-CGIAR Partnership Initiative, were discussed together in the context of the momentum toward development of a strong global research system and, consequently, of preparations for a Global Forum to take place during the CGIAR’s 25th anniversary commemoration and ICW96. The report of the Task Force on Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union was considered and discussed by the Group separately.

Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum on the NARS-CGIAR Partnership Initiative

A Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum on the NARS-CGIAR Partnership Initiative was held on May 17-18, immediately prior to MTM96 in Jakarta, Indonesia. On behalf of the facilitating agencies—IFAD, the World Bank, FAO, EC, SDC, and ISNAR—Mr. Abdelmajid Slama (IFAD) reported that the Preparatory Meeting had been a success. He emphasized that the meeting was NARS-driven, and that follow-up of its recommendations would be NARS-led.

Preparatory Meeting Chair William Dar (The Philippines) reviewed the events leading up to the Preparatory Meeting. As part of the program of renewal, IFAD convened, in December 1994, a consultation on the NARS vision of international agricultural research, which produced a declaration and recommendations on strengthening NARS-CGIAR partnerships.

A second consultation was held in conjunction with MTM95 to implement the Lucerne recommendations, and resulted in the development of an outline action plan. This plan, which called for the establishment of regional fora of NARS leaders, was subsequently presented and adopted at ICW95. Thereafter, regional fora were convened to ensure that the broader NARS community had an opportunity to discuss issues of importance in developing stronger NARS-CGIAR partnerships.

The Preparatory Meeting enabled NARS leaders from four regions to share ideas on strengthening the CGIAR’s partnerships with NARS, to build on the outcomes of the various regional fora, and to reach a common understanding on relevant issues, in preparation for the Global Forum at ICW96.

Mr. Dar reported on the key issues emerging from the Preparatory Meeting and the consensus reached by participants. The issues included: a global agricultural research system; regional fora; broadening NARS; regional representation in the CGIAR; priority setting; train-
ing; improved communication; research and development; and funding of regional fora.

The Preparatory Meeting recognized the need for a more efficient global agricultural research system, with NARS as the cornerstone, to meet present and future challenges. Strong regional organizations and consultative mechanisms at the regional level were regarded as important components of such a global system.

It was noted that the LAC and Africa regions had strong subregional organizations in place, and were now setting up consultative mechanisms at the regional level; WANA and the Asia and Pacific regions, which already had regional organizations in place, were enlarging their memberships and strengthening their mandates.

The Preparatory Meeting concluded that regional and subregional organizations could provide mechanisms for better regional representation in the CGIAR, particularly of non-CGIAR Members.

There was a general endorsement of the goals of the CGIAR, and a recognition that emphasis on increased productivity and production remains a high priority of NARS. The greater transparency in priority setting by TAC was welcomed, as was further interaction with TAC to resolve remaining differences.

The need to increase training as part of the capacity building efforts of NARS was emphasized, and the CGIAR was urged to provide more training, particularly on advanced technologies, together with assistance offered by universities, the private sector, and stronger NARS.

The growing gap in electronic communications technology between NARS and the Centers was raised as an issue of concern. The need to accelerate consultation, and for NARS to gain wider access to new research technologies and databanks, was supported. The assistance offered by some donors was welcomed.

The importance of participatory collaboration with farmers and extension services to carry forward technology generation through to dissemination and adoption was emphasized. It was also felt that this was an area where partnership with NGOs at the national level could have particular benefit.

There was general agreement that a mechanism for sustained financial support of the regional fora needed to be consolidated and implemented.

Mr. Dar reported that the Preparatory Meeting produced a suggested agenda for the Global Forum at ICW96. Specifically, it would have the theme, “NARS-CGIAR Partnership from Consultation to Action,” and would include discussion of a proposed operational framework for NARS-CGIAR partnerships, to be adopted at ICW96, and other high priority issues raised at the Preparatory Meeting. He said that, following MTM96, the regional fora would convene again to prepare their contributions to the operational framework. A consolidated draft would then be prepared by a steering committee, comprising one or two representatives of each region and representatives of the facilitating agencies and the Centers. The committee would be convened by IFAD in August. The draft operational framework would be reviewed by the regional fora and the CGIAR prior to ICW96, and would be presented at the Global Forum.

As an integral part of the operational framework, a first set of specific research activities for implementation in partnership at regional and subregional levels during 1998-2000—coinciding with the medium-term planning of the Centers—would be prepared for endorsement at ICW96. As well, case studies of best practices of NARS-CGIAR partnerships would be conducted, as part of partnership activities during implementation of the operational framework.

**NGO Committee**

NGO Committee Co-Chair Robert Blake presented to the Group a report on the Committee’s activities since ICW95. He said the NGO movement was emerging as a positive force in agricultural development and a political force in rural empowerment. As well, it was part of a worldwide movement toward privatization, decentralization, local control, and a greater role for civil society.
Mr. Blake indicated that Committee members shared a common vision of a world in which the interests of the poor of the South received no less attention and respect than those of the prosperous North. The Committee is especially concerned with the problems of rural people, and believes their empowerment has never been more urgent. Rural people must have a voice in determining their futures, and in developing new agroecological technologies that can raise their productivity, protect the environment, and improve their lifestyles.

The Committee was convinced, Mr. Blake said, that NGOs had an important role to play as a link between farmers and scientists. NGOs can help to provide farmer input into CGIAR research, while also helping farmers to use Center research products. NGOs have a particularly important role to play where NARS are weak or not ready to address the problems of poor farmers.

The Committee, he said, recognized that not all NGOs were strong or technologically capable enough to act as partners in the farmer-back-to-farmer cycle; however, given the importance of farmer participation, it believed the CGIAR had a real stake in helping to increase NGO effectiveness to assume this role.

The present state of cooperation among NGOs and national and international systems is not adequate in the Committee's opinion. NGOs and Centers, as well as NARS, must become part of a broad partnership, if the vision of equitable, more productive rural societies is to be achieved. NGOs of particular relevance for the CGIAR are grassroots, farmer-oriented groups, that reflect the views of rural people.

Mr. Blake reported that members of the Committee had visited six Centers—CIFOR, CIMMYT, ICARDA, ICLARM, IIMI, and IRRI—where they were briefed on Center research and collaboration with NGOs, interacted with local NGOs, and brought to the Centers a perspective of what NGOs would like to see accomplished through research. The Committee plans to organize several types of visits in the coming months.

The Committee has identified a number of high priority goals for implementation, including:

- promotion of agricultural systems that are environmentally, socially, and economically sustainable;
- promotion of sustainable natural resources management;
- ensuring the conservation of ecological integrity;
- advocacy of equitable opportunity for the urban and rural poor;
- promotion of sustainable livelihoods and food security; and
- empowerment of communities and, particularly, of women's groups.

Mr. Blake highlighted some of the Committee's observations from its Center visits and dialogue with NGOs. First, there were in place more productive, continuing relationships between Centers and NGOs than the Committee had expected, and few cases of failed relationships, although generally both Centers and NGOs recognized that their relationships could be improved and expanded. Second, Centers have not yet mainstreamed the promotion of work with NGOs, despite the fact that existing Center-NGO relationships were not yet as productive as both Centers and NGOs considered desirable.

Mr. Blake said the lack of Center knowledge about potential NGO partnerships was a constraint, but understandable given the number of NGOs and the changing NGO scene. Surprising to the Committee, however, was the lack of information on the part of some leading NGOs about the CGIAR System and how the Centers work together for the advantage of the poor. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends greater efforts to keep NGOs informed about the work of the CGIAR. Other measures recommended by the Committee include the participation of NGOs in the medium-term planning process, the appointment of NGOs to Center boards, and the inclusion of NGO representatives on external review panels.

Turning to the forthcoming System review, Mr. Blake emphasized the need to ensure substantial NGO input. As well, to gain the confidence of the global NGO community, the nominations of NGOs for participation in the review should arise from a broad consultative process with NGOs, and those selected must be seen as representing all major segments of the NGO community.
Mr. Blake said the Committee currently comprised eight members. The Committee, he said, urged the CGIAR Chairman to appoint additional members from the South, and especially women, to the Committee, following broad consultations with the NGO community. Specifically, the Committee recommends that one NGO from each of the following areas be invited to join the Committee: Africa, East Asia, and WANA.

Touching on the Committee's plans to broaden its approach by meeting regularly with the Private Sector Committee, Mr. Blake said there was much the two Committees could contribute to each other's work.

Private Sector Committee

Mr. Sam Dryden presented the report of the Private Sector Committee to the Group, on behalf of Co-Chair Alejandro Rodriguez, who could not attend MTM96. The Private Sector Committee was created to provide private sector perspectives on international agricultural research, and to foster new partnerships between the private sector and the CGIAR.

The Committee's membership, Mr. Dryden said, was representative of the broad diversity of the for-profit sector, as reflected in its equal North-South balance, its inclusion of large multi-national corporations to small venture enterprises, and the broad range of commercial sectors in which member companies were engaged, including seed, agricultural chemicals, fisheries, forestry, and animal health and nutrition. The Committee intends to identify two additional members, and will give priority to candidates from Japan and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. Dryden indicated the Committee was still in the formative stages of educating itself and identifying issues of importance. Since ICW95, it has held two meetings, and has established a dialogue with the Chairman, the CGIAR Secretariat, the World Bank, several Centers, and the NGO Committee. It will continue to expand this dialogue, and will meet again in August at CIMMYT and at ICW96.

The Committee has identified three important roles for itself. First, as a focal point and center of expertise on the private sector and its relationships with the CGIAR and with NARS. Second, as a communicator of private sector perspectives. Third, as a catalyst to mobilize the private sector on relevant issues in which the CGIAR engages. Specifically, the Committee has focused its efforts on four areas: biotechnology; intellectual property rights; genetic resources; and biodiversity policy; mechanisms of interaction with Centers and NARS; and research management practices. It has formed two sub-groups: one to address the topics of biotechnology and the related issues of intellectual property rights, genetic resources, and biodiversity; the other to explore mechanisms for interaction between the private sector, the CGIAR, and NARS.

Mr. Dryden commented on the changing role of the private sector in the global agricultural research system. Traditionally, the private sector focused exclusively on providing for profit goods, whereas the CGIAR and NARS focused on providing public goods. In both cases, these products were derived through publicly-funded upstream technologies, and distributed either by the CGIAR and NARS for the public good, or marketed as a private good by the private sector.

During the past decade, with the advent of biotechnology, the global research system has changed dramatically, and the private sector has become a major player in upstream research. This shift has had many positive consequences, including: a significant increase in funding for agricultural research; a substantial increase in the number of research students and researchers; and the generation of new technologies which themselves have enabled the development of entirely novel products. However, as the private sector has moved into upstream research, research results have increasingly become privatized through intellectual property rights and the free flow of information constrained. Concurrently, the global view of genetic resources has shifted, from having a common heritage to a new paradigm based on national sovereignty.

The growing complexity of the global agricultural research system, Mr. Dryden said, has increased the importance of an ongoing dialogue to identify complementarities among various actors. He mentioned that some significant examples of common ground existed for the transfer of valuable proprietary technologies from several large corporations to NARS, and that the Committee was focused on studying these examples for their relevance and applicability to the CGIAR.

Mr. Dryden emphasized the need for better marketing of the CGIAR to the private sector. The private sector...
sector and the CGIAR were “travelers on the same uncharted road,” he said, with much to gain by a coordinated approach. Yet, many industry leaders are unaware that the CGIAR exists. Given the common factors that the two share—both are engaged in international agricultural research over a long-term time horizon, both are developing products targeted to developing countries, and both have similar investment strategies—a coordinated approach would make sense, particularly to optimize the use of increasingly constrained resources.

Discussion of Reports from the Preparatory Meeting and the NGO and Private Sector Committees

Appreciation was expressed by the Group to all three Chairs for their presentations. Participants in the Preparatory Meeting and the various regional fora, and members of the NGO and Private Sector Committees, were thanked for engaging in an open dialogue with the CGIAR. As well, the Centers were commended for the spirit of cooperation which marked their interactions with the Committees and the NARS fora.

Many Members expressed their pleasure at the considerable progress achieved in broadening the CGIAR’s partnerships, and reaffirmed their continuing support of the efforts underway. The importance of continuing an open and constructive dialogue to improve cooperation further was emphasized, and the positive effects of cooperation on the quality of CGIAR research were underscored.

The CGIAR’s partnerships with NARS, NGOs, and the private sector were recognized as being part of a larger multiplicity of interactions among actors in the global agricultural research system, in which a participatory approach at national, regional, and international levels was considered crucial. Strong partnerships at national and regional levels were seen as a necessary foundation for fully effective partnerships at the global level.

There was broad agreement that the CGIAR should actively continue its efforts to achieve an open and participatory system in which NARS, NGOs, and the private sector are fully engaged. The CGIAR was particularly requested to ensure broad participation in the organization of the Global Forum.

Similar efforts were urged at the regional and national levels. Specifically, the importance of widening participation in the regional fora to include a full range of potential collaborators in the NGO community, the private sector, as well as from the forestry and aquaculture sectors, was emphasized, in order to provide a better understanding of regional needs and how they relate to the CGIAR. NARS were encouraged to establish participatory mechanisms at the national level, to enhance their input into subregional and regional fora.

The regional fora and the Global Forum were seen as important mechanisms to promote NARS-NARS collaboration, as well as NARS-CGIAR partnerships and the involvement of NARS in CGIAR priority setting. Centers were urged to continue to build on the progress made, and, specifically, to seek and incorporate the input of NARS and the regional fora into their medium-term planning.

The need to ensure that the regional fora complement and build on—rather than duplicate, replace, or compete with—existing mechanisms at the subregional and regional levels was emphasized. The regional fora were encouraged to incorporate, whenever possible, other existing mechanisms, particularly subregional fora.

The LAC regional forum was mentioned as an example of the tremendous interest and expectations the regional fora had generated among NARS. The LAC regional forum was characterized by wide participation of national research institutes, NGOs, universities, and the private sector. Participants expressed a clear interest in continuing the forum, and in sharing the costs of future meetings. The LAC region is in the process of establishing a regional fund to support NARS-CGIAR and NARS-NARS interaction generated by this consultative process.

A recommendation was made that, given the comparative advantages of the various partners, the priorities for collaboration and the sharing of responsibilities between Centers, NARS, the regional fora, and NGOs, be elaborated more clearly, particularly in regards to the implementation of programs.

The shifting boundary between public goods and private for-profit goods was recognized. The importance of increasing awareness of where the boundary
lies, through dialogue among NARS, NGOs, the private sector, and the CGIAR, to better understand what public goods are needed that are not being offered through the market economy, was emphasized.

A recommendation was made that Centers be more active in inviting representatives of NARS and NGOs to participate in Center training programs. This was seen as one means of strengthening the CGIAR’s partnerships with NARS and NGOs by creating a common bond from which a relationship could be forged.

Ecoregional programs were mentioned as generating significant opportunities for CGIAR collaboration with NARS, NGOs, and universities. It was pointed out that, in the Africa region, CGIAR ecoregional initiatives had been placed under the auspices of the new regional bodies.

Closer partnerships with farmers as breeders and researchers in their own right were encouraged, to enhance CGIAR breeding activities. It was noted that CIMMYT, IRRI, and CIAT have launched a systemwide initiative on participatory research to help link farmers and researchers more effectively.

The FAO representative indicated that FAO would consult closely with its members states and the CGIAR to ensure that the existing mechanism for the selection of CGIAR regional representatives is further improved, to achieve a fuller role for regional organizations in the process.

The need for a greater representation of members from developing countries, NGOs, and the private sector on Center boards was recognized. The CBC Chair indicated that Center boards were well aware of the importance of having a proper balance of membership from the South and the North, and of having the perspectives of NGOs and the private sector reflected in board membership. Center boards, the CBC Chair said, were striving to achieve the desired balance, and welcomed the input of the NGO and Private Sector Committees, and the NARS fora, in identifying qualified candidates.

**CGIAR Task Force on Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union**

On behalf of Task Force Chair Rudy Rabbinge, Mr. Klaus Lampe presented the interim report of the Task Force to the Group. The Task Force was guided by the Lucerne requirements that research in Eastern Europe and Central Asia should be initiated only when a clear program of work, where the CGIAR has a distinctive comparative advantage, had been identified, and a minimum level of separate and additional funding had been secured.

Pointing to the social and political transformation occurring in Eastern Europe and the states that were formerly part of the Soviet Union, Mr. Lampe described the multiple constraints to agricultural research in economies in transition. He said the CGIAR should reinforce and encourage positive changes underway by helping to strengthen technical research, and that such an effort would be mutually beneficial.

The Task Force studied three aspects: the needs of the region and the demand for CGIAR collaboration; the options for CGIAR involvement (the potential “supply”); and the rationale for the CGIAR to work in the region. In its analysis, the Task Force considered the input received from Centers, particularly those that have started cooperation or have established linkages in the region, and the results of a regional consultation held in the Czech Republic in May 1995, in which the Task Force participated. As well, the Task Force recognized that bilateral linkages already exist between many CGIAR Members and countries in the region. Accordingly, the Task Force anticipated that its final recommendations to the Group at ICW95 would represent a realistic Center System perspective as well as the interests of the region.

Preliminary findings suggest that there is: a high research potential in the region, but a relatively weak strategy for agricultural research; a high production potential which is not used or is underutilized; a need to greatly improve research management; significant demand for CGIAR collaboration and a desire on the part of some Centers and Members to engage in various forms of collaboration; and significant isolation of agricultural scientists and research managers, which has resulted in duplication of efforts.

As compared to developing countries, the Task Force found the needs of Eastern and Central Europe to be more organizational and financial, than technical and scientific. These needs also differ significantly from those of the Central Asian Republics, which will be assessed by the Task Force at a meeting to be held in Uzbekistan in September.
Mr. Lampe elaborated on three potential areas of collaboration between the CGIAR and the region, based on cost: low-cost options; medium-cost options; and higher-cost options. Low-cost options focused on increasing knowledge about the CGIAR, which is at a very low level, and reducing the isolation of agricultural research professionals in the region. These included information exchange, particularly the distribution of CGIAR publications, participation in seminars, workshops, and conferences, and the establishment of a visiting scientist program. Medium-cost options included CD-ROM documentation of major publications, Internet and electronic mail linkages on special projects, annual regional conferences, specific training programs, and the exchange of genetic material. Higher-cost options included CGIAR input in genetic improvement, development of research networks, genebank development, and joint research programs.

Based on its preliminary findings, the Task Force concluded that, with a modest financial investment, the CGIAR could do much to: provide information and publications that are currently available in the CGIAR, but not in the region; ensure that scientists and research leaders are more integrated into the international agricultural research community; and provide a focus and direction for research activity, thereby creating synergies with new partners. In particular, the CGIAR should explore the establishment of collaboration with the more advanced institutes in the region. As well, an Eastern and Central Europe regional association of agricultural research leaders should be created.

The potential benefits to the CGIAR of an effort in the region, include: greater information and knowledge about the region; cost-effective contract research; knowledge of low-input research systems, which may be applicable to CGIAR work in developing countries; an intensified exchange of genetic material; and linkages with bilateral technical and financial assistance programs.

Discussion of Task Force Report

The Group welcomed the interim report of the Task Force, particularly its assessment of the potential approaches to a CGIAR effort in the region. The need for collaboration in the region, and the interest of some Members and Centers to do so, was recognized.

The Lucerne requirements, particularly the need to secure additional funds for activities in the region, were emphasized as important elements associated with the Group's consideration of engaging in a new relationship in the region.

TAC involvement in the proposal of any potential program was recommended.

The Chairman noted ICARDA's successful consultation with Central Asian Republics in Tashkent in 1995, and said that any future consultations in the region would build on ICARDA's efforts.

Conclusion

The clear positioning of the CGIAR within the global agricultural research system and the obvious signs of mutual trust between the CGIAR and its partners were commended by the Group.

The need for the CGIAR and its partners to collectively define new roles and terms of reference, and to establish a new balance in response to shifting boundaries, as progress is made toward a global system was recognized. There was agreement on the importance of working together to find the common ground and build on it, while recognizing and respecting the differences and diversity of views that enrich the dialogue.

There was general agreement that the CGIAR should continue to engage in a dialogue with Eastern Europe and the now independent states of the former Soviet Union, leading to the development of a win-win strategy for cooperation.

The Group noted the follow-up activities to take place in preparation for the Global Forum that will be convened in conjunction with ICW96. As well, the Group noted the regional consultation to be held with the Central Asian Republics, and that the Task Force would present its final report to the Group at ICW96.

II. RESEARCH AGENDA

Research Priorities and Strategies

Introduction

At MTM87 held in Montpellier, France, the Group decided that TAC should periodically review the long-term priorities and strategies of the CGIAR and make
recommendations to the Group on a framework that defines longer-term directions for CGIAR research and its implementation through CGIAR programs. Typically, this review takes place about every five years to ensure that the CGIAR is responsive to changes in the external environment, and extends over several meetings to allow interaction among TAC, the Centers, and the Group prior to decisionmaking. The last review of priorities and strategies by TAC was initiated in 1991.

The current review was initiated in 1995, to ensure that the CGIAR’s long-term priorities and strategies reflect the broad directions provided by the eighteen-month program of renewal begun at MTM94 and, particularly, by the CGIAR Ministerial-Level Meeting, held in Lucerne, Switzerland in February 1995. TAC’s initial presentation to the Group under the current review took place at ICW95. At MTM96, the Group considered TAC’s specific recommendations on priorities and strategies for activities, and its preliminary comments pertaining to commodities and sectors. To facilitate in-depth discussion of TAC’s proposals, the main TAC report on priorities and strategies as well as connected studies were discussed both in plenary and in parallel sessions.

The long-term priorities and strategies endorsed by the Group at MTM96 will guide Center research and determine resource allocations through the 1998-2000 medium-term planning period. Centers will prepare their medium-term plans, based on guidelines to be developed by TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat following MTM96. TAC will interact with the Centers on a continuing basis as the plans are developed, and will make further recommendations on commodities and sectors to the Group at MTM97. The Group will consider TAC’s recommendations and take decisions on allocations for 1998-2000 planning period at MTM97.

**TAC Analysis and Recommendations: Major Themes**

TAC Chair Donald Winkelmann referred the Group to the document prepared by TAC to serve as background to the Group’s discussions on priorities and strategies. He elaborated on the consultative and analytical process through which the paper was developed. TAC was guided by the considerations that emerged from the Lucerne Ministerial-Level Meeting and the Group’s deliberations on priorities and strategies at ICW95, particularly the Group’s dominant concern for a people-centered approach to sustainable food security through poverty alleviation and protection of the environment, and its emphasis on balance in the pursuit of the CGIAR’s overarching goals. Additionally, TAC integrated into its analysis the results of its interactions with the Centers, as well as the outcomes of the various regional fora.

Specifically, TAC’s work in shaping long-term priorities and strategies reflected the high priority given by the Group to:

- A forward looking approach to decisionmaking, in which present and future poverty are pivotal criteria;
- Strategies that reduce the tradeoffs between increasing productivity and conserving natural resources;
- Emphasis on the rural poor and on women, as well as concern for marginal environments;
- Research on international public goods;
- Increased collaboration both within and outside of the CGIAR;
- The pivotal role of regional fora as a mechanism to expand the role of NARS in CGIAR decisionmaking; and
- A high degree of transparency in terms of how the deciding criteria were defined and applied by TAC.

Contrasting the current framework to the previous priorities and strategies effort, Mr. Winkelmann indicated that the new framework differed in several important ways: it was less complex, in part because the System’s goals were more explicitly defined; it was more forward looking, based on projections to 2010; it did not assign *a priori* values to regions; and it gave more emphasis to qualitative considerations. Factors affecting TAC’s qualitative judgments in the current priority setting exercise included: changes in the locus and level of present and future poverty; changes in perceptions about the health of natural resources; new advances in science,
and their implications for probable impact on productivity and conservation; changes in the circumstances of NARS and of other potential alternative sources of supply for the international public goods on which the CGIAR conducts research; and changes in the global community's interest in areas that overlap those of direct concern to the CGIAR.

Mr. Winkelmann noted that, in general, between 1994 and 1996, the CGIAR had proceeded in the directions recommended by TAC in the previous priority setting exercise. TAC used the current resource allocations as the basis for the present priority setting exercise.

Mr. Winkelmann highlighted the major themes elaborated in the priorities and strategies background document.

Based on its analysis of the broad external environment and the implications for the CGIAR, TAC concluded that a heightened concern for poverty by the CGIAR was warranted. As well, research combining productivity increasing and resource conserving possibilities should be favored over research focused exclusively on either one or the other objective. TAC expects changes in science in virtually all areas of concern to the CGIAR, and advocates the CGIAR should find ways to capitalize quickly on those areas growing most rapidly. Consequently, for example, TAC gave special consideration to the implications of new science for germplasm enhancement, and the opportunities for investments in this area.

Mr. Winkelmann explained TAC's emphasis on a pro-poor, pro-conservation strategy. Based on its analysis of the links connecting sustainable food security through the reduction of poverty and protection of natural resources, TAC concluded that, for large numbers of people, access to food, health, longevity, and self-esteem rests ultimately on increased productivity. Moreover, TAC's analysis suggests that efforts aimed at poverty alleviation should be via productivity growth in agriculture, focusing on those countries where a high proportion of the workforce is engaged in agriculture and a high proportion of household budgets are committed to foodstuffs—the world's poorer countries. These perceptions guided the subsequent determination of the poverty indicator.

At the same time, in reviewing natural resources management, Mr. Winkelmann said TAC concluded that much of the CGIAR's efforts contribute directly or indirectly to conservation. Accordingly, TAC is focusing on ways to better combine productivity increasing and resource conserving efforts, and to develop technologies and policies that reduce the tradeoffs between the two objectives. TAC also recognizes the need for more solid empirical analysis on the extent, causes, and impact of degradation, and for strategies that are at once pro-poor and pro-conservation.

TAC employed a poverty-weighted congruence analysis to give more emphasis to the products and activities of special importance to poor consumers and producers, Mr. Winkelmann said. TAC studied how to incorporate a poverty indicator into its analysis on priorities and strategies. He said the measure that TAC proposed permits comparisons among countries over time, is sensitive to the inequality of incomes within countries, gives increased weight to the poorest within a country, facilitates comparison of different ethical views, is consistent with good professional practice, and accommodates the limitations imposed by the data available.

TAC also studied how to achieve a greater emphasis on the rural poor and on women in priority setting. TAC concluded from its analysis that the most effective means of incorporating these important considerations into priority setting were at the level of Center decisionmaking rather than at the System level. Mr. Winkelmann elaborated the results of TAC's poverty-weighted congruence analysis, when additional weight, on the order of 25 percent, was added in favor of the rural poor over the urban poor and in favor of female producers over urban producers. The results showed that, at the aggregate level at which TAC decisionmaking is focused, adding such preferential weights gave TAC little added evidence for choosing one set of commodities or one sector over another. At the Center level, however, TAC concluded programs could be targeted more adeptly toward the rural poor and toward women. Accordingly, TAC has incorporated an emphasis on the rural poor and on women in the external review process, to ensure that Centers systematically examine opportunities aimed at these two groups as they shape their medium-term plans.

In recommending priorities for activities, TAC also took into account alternative suppliers for the goods which the CGIAR produces; the probability of impact on the goals of importance to the CGIAR; the length of time between implementation and impact of CGIAR
activities; and the balance between favored and marginal environments—noting that over one-third of the CGIAR's resources now go to research focused on marginal environments.

TAC believes the CGIAR is well placed to catalyze the development of mechanisms to foster cooperation among the various entities in the global agricultural research system with regards to international public goods, and that there are high potential payoffs of such cooperation. As well, TAC believes it has a pivotal role to play in this area, and will reinforce efforts by Centers to expand cooperation with other members of the global system, by ensuring that such cooperation is incorporated into external reviews.

Mr. Winkelmann emphasized the importance of the regional fora to the CGIAR, to NARS, and to the global system. He noted the complementarity in TAC's recommendations to the combined views of the regional fora, with two exceptions—training and networking. TAC noted that all regional fora endorsed the CGIAR's mission and focus, emphasized capacity building and the primary importance of production as compared with resource conservation, and expressed the desire for greater transparency in the process of CGIAR priority setting, and that many also stressed the importance of export and cash crops. He said TAC looks forward to continued interaction with the regional fora in areas of common interest.

TAC reviewed the nineteen CGIAR activities, and recommended increases for twelve and decreases for six, and left one unchanged, as detailed in Table 1. He highlighted several points related to TAC's recommendations for the Group's attention, showing how the several decision criteria entered into TAC's judgments. TAC advocated an increase in germplasm improvement. For crops, this meant an increase in support for prebreeding. For other types of breeding, TAC recommended a rebalancing to increase research on those crops for which NARS capacities are less well developed and to decrease effort on those for which NARS capacities have improved. TAC recommended an increase for livestock breeding to apply molecular techniques to disease resistance; for germplasm enhancement in trees, largely to identify and test elite materials; and for fish breeding. In biodiversity, TAC advocated more work on stored materials in seed pathology and physiology; more effort on core collections; the use of molecular characterization in characterizing germplasm; and increased work on in situ conservation for forestry. As well, an increase in the allocation to generic work on water management was recommended, which TAC believes must be given higher priority than in the past.

In its review of commodities, TAC studied the implications of poverty-weighted congruence analysis on the twenty-seven commodities of direct concern to the CGIAR. TAC's review began with an assessment of the value of the commodities on which the CGIAR conducts research to poor producers and consumers in developing countries. TAC reaffirmed that all of the commodities on which the CGIAR works are of importance to the poor, with some being more so than others.

TAC based its analysis on projections of future, rather than on present, production and income levels, on the grounds that the fruits of CGIAR research are not realized until several years after investment decisions are made, so the latter should accord well with expectations about future, rather than current, circumstance. These projections had a considerable impact on TAC's analysis of commodities, with implications for the relative weight a commodity is likely to receive in terms of CGIAR priority setting. Although the commodities on which the CGIAR focuses are widely distributed across the developing world; they are not evenly distributed. Consequently, the relative share allocated to commodities of importance in those developing countries in which incomes are expected to grow rapidly by 2010 declined, on the basis that these countries would likely be able to deal directly with their remaining poverty problems. Likewise, the relative share rose for the commodities produced in those poorer countries in which incomes are not expected to have rapid growth.

As well, new advances in science, for example, in molecular biology, that promise more rapidly attainable progress and more widespread impact will also be important considerations as TAC continues its review of individual commodities. TAC will finalize priorities for commodities, Mr. Winkelmann said, after discussions with Centers and NARS in the course of the development of Center medium-term plans.

TAC considered a possible expansion of CGIAR commodities to include export and cash crops, fruits and vegetables, and medicinal plants. TAC did not,
Table 1. TAC Recommendations on CGIAR Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Category</th>
<th>1992 Recommendation (%)</th>
<th>Current Share (%)</th>
<th>TAC 1996 Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increasing Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Germplasm Enhancement and Breeding</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prebreeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Crops</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Production Systems Development and</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cropping Systems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Livestock Systems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tree Systems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fish Systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Protecting the Environment¹</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Saving Biodiversity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improving Policies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Economic and Social Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Policy Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Governance and Management of Public Systems²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Organization and Management of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strengthening National Programs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Documentation, Publication, and</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Institution Building²/Advice to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Institution Building Networks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 5.1, Priorities by Activity Category, in “CGIAR Priorities and Strategies” (SDR/TAC:IAFQ/96/6.1), p. 54.

¹ To be merged as new category 2, “Sustainable Production Systems.”
² To be integrated into new category 4.3, “Governance, Organization, and Management of Public Institutions.”
however, recommend an expansion in the CGIAR commodity improvement programs at this time, for a variety of factors, including that none of the commodities proposed met all the necessary criteria for inclusion as a CGIAR commodity. Mr. Winkelmann said TAC sees an expansion of work in such commodities as an outgrowth of the broader sphere of activities under the ecoregional approach, which would, as a matter of course, include the management of such crops, but probably not varietal improvement.

TAC took an integrated approach in its analysis of the CGIAR's four production sectors—crops, livestock, forestry, and fisheries—and considered those portions of the four sectors in which the CGIAR has a direct interest. TAC recognized that the research of the CGIAR is focused primarily on commodities and production environments, with resulting implications for production sectors and regions. TAC recommended increased investment in livestock, forestry, and fisheries.

In its review of systemwide programs and initiatives, TAC identified two categories of effort, as shown in Table 2: those undertaken to implement the ecoregional approach; and those undertaken to strengthen specific areas of CGIAR research. Mr. Winkelmann said TAC recognized the opportunities for efficiencies to be gained through inter-center collaboration, and that systemwide programs were one mechanism to achieve such efficiencies. However, TAC also noted that the systemwide mechanism can impose higher transaction costs. Accordingly, TAC recommended that systemwide activities be reviewed to better learn from experience before more efforts are launched, unless there is compelling evidence to expand the list.

Important questions remain about financing and managing systemwide work, Mr. Winkelmann said. For example, to the extent that systemwide work is more efficient in the pursuit of the CGIAR’s goals and of individual Center goals and is of high priority, than Centers should be inclined to finance such work from Center funds. As well, to the extent that systemwide approaches aimed at strengthening work in specific areas achieve their objectives and put in place demonstrably effective new linkages, special mechanisms will no longer be necessary and changes in the modus operandi can become part of the mainstream operation of the CGIAR.

As regards the forthcoming allocation process for the 1998-2000 medium-term planning period, Mr. Winkelmann indicated that TAC had been engaged with the CGIAR Secretariat in developing a format for Centers to present their work in terms of projects in order to make the linkages between the System’s priorities and strategies and the activities of individual Centers more transparent and clear. A first portfolio of projects was provided as a background document to MTM96.

As well, he said TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat had deliberately not fixed a funding envelope for each Center for the preparation of Center medium-term plans, in order to encourage Centers to develop stronger proposals for support. The imposition of an upper bound on potential funding, it was felt, had the effect of limiting the creativity and imagination of the Centers.

Discussion

TAC’s endeavor to prepare a document that reflects a transparent priority setting process was applauded by many Members. It was felt that the transparency of the criteria used and judgments made by TAC enabled a full and open discussion by the Group of the merits of TAC’s recommendations.

It was observed that clear priorities based on a transparent framework and criteria, as well as consultation with stakeholders, were important factors in sustaining the CGIAR’s ability to attract unrestricted support for its Research Agenda.

TAC was praised by many Members for its efforts to introduce a poverty indicator as an integral component of the analytical framework it used in priority setting. There was universal agreement within the Group on the importance of a poverty orientation in CGIAR priority setting, particularly focused on the rural poor and on women. Discussion by the Group centered on TAC’s application and interpretation of the poverty indicator.

Several Members were troubled by TAC’s conclusion that, at the System level, priority could not effectively be given to the rural poor or to women, and that this would be pursued instead at the Center level. It was felt that there was a need both for TAC to explicitly state that the CGIAR will give priority to the rural poor.

2 “1997 CGIAR Research—Project Details” (MTM/96/10A).
Table 2. Systemwide Initiatives and Programs Undertaken by the CGIAR

TO IMPLEMENT THE ECOREGионаL APPROACH

Regional Initiatives for:

- Sustainable natural resources management options to arrest land degradation in the desert margins of Sub-Saharan Africa
- The warm humid and sub-humid tropics of Sub-Saharan Africa
- The humid and sub-humid tropics of Asia
- On-farm water husbandry in West Africa and North Asia
- Coastal environments

Regional Programs for:

- Sustainable rice-wheat based cropping systems in the Indo-Gangetic Plain
- Enhancing agricultural research effectiveness in Tropical America

Cross-Regional Programs for:

- Alternatives to slash-and-burn agriculture
- Sustainable mountain agricultural development

TO STRENGTHEN SPECIFIC AREAS OF CGIAR RESEARCH

Initiatives in:

- Water management
- Agricultural research indicators
- Property rights and collective management
- Integrated pest management

Programs in:

- Genetic resources
- Livestock research

Source: Table 7.1, A List of Systemwide Initiatives and Programs Undertaken by the CGIAR to Implement the Ecoregional Approach, and Table 7.2, A List of Systemwide Initiatives and Programs Undertaken by the CGIAR to Strengthen Specific Areas of CGIAR Research, in "CGIAR Priorities and Strategies" (SDR/TAC/CIAR/96/6.1), pp. 71-72.
and to women, and for TAC to develop criteria on how it will monitor implementation by the Centers of the Group’s desire to give greater priority to the rural poor and to women.

Mr. Winkelmann reiterated that TAC had studied this question in-depth and had concluded from its analysis that the most effective means of increasing emphasis on the rural poor and on women in priority setting were at the level of Center decisionmaking rather than at the System level, where fine grain decisions were not possible. He gave examples of how Centers had such opportunities, while TAC did not. This being the case, TAC’s responsibility would be to ensure, in the development of Center medium-term plans and in the external review process, that Centers take advantage of the opportunities that exist to enhance priority on rural poor and on women.

The poverty indicator used by TAC was seen by several Members as likely being the best currently available, and that the results, if surprising, could be due to the limitations of this, albeit best, quantitative indicator, which focuses on a level that perhaps is too aggregate. As well, caution was expressed that measurement of poverty does not provide answers on how to eliminate that poverty, nor does it provide clear direction on the impacts of diverse approaches. The difficulty in showing direct and precise links between the work of the CGIAR and income levels was mentioned.

A question was raised regarding whether TAC’s projection of demand, production, and poverty in 2010 was the best basis for the CGIAR to better target its investments in research aimed at poverty reduction. It was suggested that the data used by TAC represented information on a highly aggregated level, with equal weight being given to commodities, and that, instead, a more useful approach might be to give more weight to productions systems and crops of primary importance to the rural poor and to women, and to link the poverty indicator to malnutrition and food consumption patterns, to give the poverty dimension much higher priority. Mr. Winkelmann pointed out that, through the poverty indicator used by TAC, greater weight would indeed be given to those commodities of greatest importance to the poorest.

A comment was made that it might have been more valuable had TAC focused its congruence analysis on demand, rather than on production, in order to better target women and the rural poor. Mr. Winkelmann indicated his willingness for TAC to test both approaches to determine which analysis was more satisfying conceptually and which conforms most closely with the CGIAR’s objectives. He pointed out that those who advocate investing in proportion to production rather than utilization do so because of the perception that this is the best way to accelerate economic growth.

A number of Members felt it would have been helpful had TAC carried its analysis a step further by setting more explicit priorities. It was remarked that, in the absence of sufficient guidance from TAC, particularly on commodities and regions, it was difficult to draw conclusions about priorities and determine recommendations for the 1998-2000 medium-term planning period. Of particular concern to several Members were the implications of TAC’s recommendations for marginal areas, which were considered by many to warrant greater attention. It was felt to be imperative that the Group know what the major balances will be among the CGIAR’s priorities and have the opportunity to discuss them.

TAC was requested to ensure adequate attention to subregional differences as it translates shifts in commodity allocations into relative shifts in emphasis for various regions. For example, the potential developments in China were mentioned as an area meriting greater attention than had been given in the TAC document.

The increased allocation given to work on water management by TAC was welcomed by several Members, who emphasized the importance of efficient use and conservation of water resources.

Several Members noted that the TAC document gives more emphasis to productivity and poverty alleviation over environmental goals. More attention to the environment was recommended, particularly to give greater emphasis to concerns relating to coastal areas, wetlands, water supply and quality, biodiversity conservation, and natural forests.

Some Members pointed to the CGIAR’s role as a key factor in the global environmental equation, directly as well as indirectly, as well as the environmental community’s emergence as a major constituency for the CGIAR System. Consequently, it was recommended that the CGIAR maintain a highly visible focus on
environmental issues, and not diminish its perceived role with respect to the environment.

A number of interventions were made to recommend that more emphasis be given by TAC to highly-stressed ecological areas, particularly in Africa, as was discussed at both the Lucerne and Nairobi meetings of the CGIAR. As well, it was recommended that TAC aggressively address the problem of soil fertility in Africa, which was seen as a paramount problem with widespread implications, and one of great concern to many NGOs. Mr. Winkelmann indicated that TAC planned to address the issue of ecological zones under stress more fully at its TAC meeting in July.

Concern was expressed that there was no specific indicator in TAC's framework for soil and water degradation. Mr. Winkelmann said there was not yet an indicator available that could effectively measure degradation and its consequences. Reliable data on a broad scale is expected to become available in three to five years. In the absence of an indicator for degradation, it was suggested that, in the preparation of their medium-term plans, Centers include the impact on food security, protection of the environment, and poverty alleviation in the description of every project, to help in the setting of priorities and in the assessment of impact. Mr. Winkelmann had noted that the CGIAR Secretariat and TAC plans pertaining to project descriptions included these considerations.

A number of interventions were made regarding TAC’s approach to biodiversity. The view was expressed that TAC’s approach was quite conservative, as compared with the importance placed on biodiversity both by Members of the CGIAR and the world community at large. Two elements were raised as missing from TAC’s priorities and strategies document. Sufficient emphasis on in situ conservation of agrobiodiversity, including crops and livestock, in addition to forestry; and attention to issues of access to genetic resources, in particular the legal requirements of intellectual property rights, and how these issues can be addressed between public goods research and private sector research. As well, how the emergence of new and qualitatively different access regimes to genetic resources will affect overall CGIAR operations to 2000 and beyond was raised as a critical issue for TAC’s consideration.

Mr. Winkelmann indicated that there was an immense investment annually in in situ conservation on a global basis, and that TAC was focusing on determining what specific role the CGIAR should play in this context. TAC member Sir Ralph Riley clarified that TAC was concerned about the use of molecular markers to understand intra-species diversity, which was crucial for biodiversity conservation. As well, it was recognized that the use of molecular markers was necessary in order to understand the populations being conserved.

TAC was perceived as operating under a restrictive definition of biodiversity that included only genetic diversity, while the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Global Biodiversity Assessment identifies biodiversity as including genes, species, and ecosystems. It was recommended that the CGIAR embrace the definition that has been negotiated and agreed on by the international community. Mr. Winkelmann said that, indeed, TAC subscribed to this view.

TAC was requested to develop strategies and guidelines for how the CGIAR can better link with alternative sources of supply in the global agricultural research system, and to more clearly define how advanced research institutions, as alternative sources of supply, influence CGIAR priority setting. Mr. Winkelmann indicated that TAC will encourage Centers to reach out to alternative sources of supply through medium-term planning and the external review process, and had noted that the development of mechanisms for fostering collaboration was a major challenge for the CGIAR.

An observation was made that much of what TAC considers as alternative sources of supply, in terms of commodity research and private sector initiatives, is in fact complementary to CGIAR research, rather than a substitute for it.

Questions were raised about the implications for the CGIAR of potentials for scientific breakthroughs, how the CGIAR can best take advantage of such potentials as they emerge, and whether they justify additional resources.

A more effective participation of the rural poor, and particularly of women, in research planning and the

---

3 CGIAR Ministerial-Level Meeting, held February 9-10, 1995 in Lucerne, Switzerland, and the 1995 CGIAR Mid-Term Meeting, held May 22-26, 1995 in Nairobi, Kenya.
targeting of research activity toward beneficiaries was raised as an area requiring greater attention by the CGIAR. An observation was made that linking target oriented planning with impact assessment required even closer interaction between the beneficiaries and TAC.

TAC was requested to clarify how the results from the regional fora enter into its recommendations on priorities and strategies, and how TAC helps to define the CGIAR’s partnerships.

The CGIAR was requested to focus more on linking with NARS to develop technology that can be appropriately tailored to the needs of small farmers, particularly the rural poor, and that a systems approach would be helpful to achieve this. As well, it was observed that NGOs are a major vehicle to target the poor, given their grassroots basis, emphasis on local action, and experience tackling the integrated issues of rural poverty, women, genetic resources, and environmental conservation. A recommendation was made that the CGIAR draw on NGO experience as it clarifies a holistic strategy to address the needs of the poor. Mr. Winkelmann noted the major opportunities for collaboration with NGOs and the considerable effort underway.

Several interventions were made to recommend that the CGIAR maintain the level of its investment in networks. Networks were considered by Members to be important mechanisms for the generation and promotion of technologies, as well as being an avenue to strengthen partnerships with NARS, NGOs, and the private sector. Mr. Winkelmann had distinguished between research networks, where TAC strongly endorsed support, and training and communications networks, where TAC favored reduced investment.

The need to develop clearer criteria and guidelines for systemwide activities, to avoid proliferation, and to monitor them to ensure their continued relevance was supported. A caution was expressed that TAC should not view all systemwide activities as necessarily being of limited duration and as eventually reverting back into individual Center programs. On the contrary, it was felt that some activities, such as ecoregional programs, integrated pest management, genetic resources, and natural resources management, were well placed in a systemwide context. Mr. Winkelmann clarified that TAC believes systemwide activities should be continually reviewed, with the expectation that some, but not all, of them would be phased out in time.

A different balance in TAC’s recommendations on activities was advocated to give greater weight to postharvest elements of the production-consumption continuum. Specifically, TAC was requested to give more consideration to utilizable production, delivery mechanisms, and assessing impact. The need for greater emphasis on the value added aspects of products processed by rural people for their own marketing was mentioned. Mr. Winkelmann indicated that, as TAC pursues medium-term planning with the Centers and in external reviews, it will look for the role of postharvest technology in Center activities. He also indicated that TAC’s focus on productivity embraced the entire continuum from production through to ultimate consumption.

An observation was made that the exportation of nontraditional crops, including vegetables, fruit crops, and root and tuber crops was increasing in importance in most countries in Africa. It was suggested that the CGIAR focus greater attention on crops of export importance to developing countries, both in terms of increasing production as well as addressing postharvest needs.

Several Members commented on the apparent discrepancy between the 1996 allocations and the 1997 allocations, and questioned whether the 1996 allocations were an appropriate basis for medium-term planning, in light of some significant shifts in allocation percentages from 1996 to 1997. Mr. Winkelmann acknowledged that TAC found that, as the CGIAR moved toward a description of Center activities in terms of projects, the allocation profile had changed. Until the project definitions were completed, he said, it could be expected that there would continue to be shifts in the CGIAR profile.

TAC was urged to specify the process for translating its general principles on priorities and strategies into specific allocations, through active interaction with the Centers, and to forward the agenda for these interactions as soon as possible. The Centers, it was mentioned, needed further clarification on how to translate the general results of TAC’s priorities and strategies effort into Center specific priorities and allocations. Mr. Winkelmann had noted that guidelines from the CGIAR Secretariat and TAC would be available to Centers and Members in July.
The need to identify the relative priorities of various programs at the System level in order to protect the essential elements of the CGIAR—the so-called "heartland"—was noted, particularly in light of funding shortfalls, which affected various Centers and programs in an ad hoc manner. It was recommended that every effort should be made to protect the System's essence, and to ensure that a suitable balance in the allocation of resources was maintained.

TAC was requested to clarify how the IFPRI Vision 2020 Initiative and other studies link into the priorities and strategies recommended for the CGIAR.

It was suggested that greater emphasis be placed on livestock improvement, particularly on the evaluation of indigenous characteristics, and on food legumes, which are important sources of protein for human nutrition and for soil fertility.

Mr. Winkelmann elaborated TAC's work schedule for the next several months, in particular, TAC's planned interactions with Centers and others on medium-term plans and to develop specific recommendations on commodities and sectors. He said this interaction would ensure the delivery of an appropriate set of recommendations to the Group at MTM97, and that TAC welcomed additional guidance from Members as it proceeded in its interactions with the Centers.

Parallel Sessions

The mechanism of parallel sessions was used at MTM96 to facilitate in-depth consideration by the Group of a number of specific priority and strategy issues. Members selected the parallel session in which they wished to participate for detailed discussion. Subsequently, reports on the outcomes of the parallel sessions were made and discussed in plenary.

The topics discussed in parallel sessions were:

- Soil and Water Aspects of Natural Resource Management Research;
- Inter-Center Review of Root and Tuber Crops;
- Strategic Study on Institution Strengthening Research and Service;
- Complementarities between CGIAR and NARS Priorities;
- Allocations to CGIAR Activities and Systemwide Programs; and
- Allocations to Commodities and Production Sectors.

The parallel sessions dealt with studies commissioned by TAC. Each study was introduced to provide a brief overview of the considerations that motivated the study, the findings of the study and TAC's response, and the likely operational consequences for the CGIAR.


In Parallel Session I, chaired by Mr. Anton Reithinger (European Community), Members of the Group considered and discussed TAC's conclusions and recommendations on three studies. Each study was considered separately, and briefly introduced through a presentation, followed by comments from participants. Dr. Lucia Vaccaro (TAC) introduced the first paper; Dr. David MacKenzie (Review Panel Chair), the second, via video; and Sir Ralph Riley (TAC), the third.

The three reports were broadly endorsed by the Group. Their timeliness, importance, and quality were repeatedly noted in the interventions made. As well, the importance of collaboration with partners both within and outside of the CGIAR System was a recurring theme.

There was consensus among participating Members that insufficient time had been allocated to the discussion of these studies, in particular the first study, given their importance to the CGIAR's Research Agenda. It was recommended that, in future meetings, adequate time be allocated to allow for a thorough discussion by the Group. The comments of the Group related to each study follow.

Soil and Water Aspects of Natural Resources Management Research. Participating Members felt that, given
the fundamental importance of research on soil and water, a much greater sense of urgency was needed and warranted than was presented in the TAC study. It was also felt that this area of research should be given greater visibility in TAC’s priorities and strategies document than at present. The impact on the environment was considered a central issue, which should be taken into greater consideration.

The move toward an integrated natural resources management framework for research was endorsed and the linkages involved were recognized. It was felt that the linkages between research and diffusion or adoption of results should receive greater attention. Participants agreed on the need for more research on the constraints and incentives which affect adoption of sustainable development technologies by farmers. The study noted that, where there has been evidence of success, effective local organizations have participated. The location specificity issue was raised, and it was agreed that, as the study recommended, forthcoming research should be more universal and generally applicable.

**Inter-Center Review of Root and Tuber Crops.** The similarities and dissimilarities among root and tuber crops were noted by participants, and the lack of available production and consumption data was recognized as a constraint. The long-term potential of root and tuber crops, including sweet potato, was affirmed, as was their importance as staple crops in developing countries. TAC’s recommendation to continue current investments on root and tuber crops was endorsed. It was agreed that an inter-center consultative committee, already formed by the Centers concerned, could be a useful mechanism to facilitate cooperation, and that such a consultation process should involve NARS.

It was felt that there were opportunities for collaboration both among Centers and with other institutions outside of the CGIAR—for example, with AVRDC on sweet potato—which should be explored further to build on the complementarities which exist among the crops. However, the cost of collaboration should be kept in mind, and every effort made to collaborate through efficient and cost-effective means.

**Strategic Study of Postharvest Technology.** Members applauded the interactive, participatory approach taken by the study panel, and endorsed TAC’s recommendation that the CGIAR should take a more comprehensive research approach to include postharvest technology development. As well, the benefit of postharvest research to widening the efficiency of research and the adoption of technologies, particularly by small-scale producers and women, was affirmed.

It was also felt that a better integration of postharvest technology in priority setting on commodities was warranted; that more attention was needed on marketing economics, as an important dimension of postharvest technology development and utilization; and that networking, including with the private sector, would be a very important component to complement rather than duplicate efforts of others already working in this field. It was noted that there were opportunities for collaboration in the forestry sector as well.

IDRC expressed its willingness to provide support for a small working group to explore two areas where there is potential for increased collaboration and to develop broad principles with wide applicability: methodologies for production-to-consumption research; and small-scale agroenterprise development.

**Report on Parallel Session II:**

Perspectives on Policy and Management Research in the CGIAR; Strategic Study of Institutional Strengthening Research and Service; and Priorities and Strategies for Policy, Public Management, and Institution Strengthening Research and Service in the CGIAR

In Parallel Session II, chaired by Mr. Faisal Kasynro (Indonesia), Members of the Group considered three studies. The first two were commissioned by TAC and conducted by two external panels, chaired by Dr. Alain de Janvry and Dr. John Nickel, respectively. The two panels interacted with each other during the period of study, to capture the commonalities between policy and management research and institutional strengthening research and service. The third study reflects TAC’s synthesis of the first two studies for the purpose of drawing lessons for the CGIAR’s future work in these areas.

The reports were presented by Mr. Guido Gryseels (TAC), who served as Secretary of both external panels. The presentation focused mainly on TAC’s synthesis report, which concluded that:
• Strategic directions of CGIAR activities in both policy research and institutional strengthening research and service are appropriate, and these activities are, in general, of high quality.

• The Centers should assign high priority to a number of topics which have high potential payoff. In the policy research area, these include: the public-private interface; common property resources; generic, as compared with country-specific, policy studies; and political economy of policy and management decisions. In the institutional strengthening area, the most urgent need is to conduct more research on institutional development, particularly related to agricultural research in developing countries. Also important is improving understanding of the role and management problems of NGOs and other non-profit organizations of civil society.

• Inter-center coordination and collaboration in policy and public management research should be enhanced through decentralized and informal mechanisms.

• Regarding institutional strengthening research and service, Centers should take full advantage of opportunities to work with more than one NARS in any given activity, particularly through regional groupings initiated by the NARS themselves.

The discussion highlighted the complexity of conceptually integrating work on public policy, public management, and institutional strengthening. It was noted that there are differences in the scientific bases of these areas. Whereas the key scientific discipline on which policy research is based is economics, management research relies on a more heterogeneous set of fields and disciplines. It was pointed out that the difficulties caused by this phenomenon are not addressed in the studies. As well, surprise was expressed that the work on management made little reference to the body of literature on management.

Several Members stressed the importance of interdisciplinary work, enabling economists and other social scientists to work together with biological scientists. Another theme emphasized was the significance of participatory research, particularly in studying such subjects as management of common property resources.

It was observed that there was considerable scope for carrying out policy and management research in close collaboration with NARS.

The need for strengthening the empirical base of policy and management research was highlighted. One Member recommended developing a systemwide GIS database to improve the empirical foundations of policy and management research.

Another Member observed that the documents gave little guidance to the Centers—with the exception of IFPRI and ISNAR—on future research on policy and management for use in the preparation of Center medium-term plans. Another noted that Centers have expressed a strong desire to collaborate with IFPRI on policy research. Although this speaks well for IFPRI’s competence in policy research, it was felt that collaboration with other competent institutes within the global research system would help broaden the CGIAR’s partnerships with these institutions.

Regarding next steps, Mr. Gryseels noted that these strategic studies had served as background to the priorities and strategies document being considered by the Group. They will also be used in the external reviews of IFPRI and ISNAR, which will examine in greater detail the operational implications of the strategic suggestions made in the studies.

Report on Parallel Session III:
Allocations to CGIAR Activities and Systemwide Programs

In Parallel Session III, chaired by Mr. Iain MacGillivray (Canada), Members of the Group considered and discussed TAC’s recommendations on CGIAR activities and systemwide programs in the 1998-2000 priorities and strategies document. Sir Ralph Riley (TAC) introduced the process followed by TAC in arriving at the recommendations in the relevant chapters of the report.

Overall, there was broad agreement with: TAC’s recommendations for the balance among and directional changes in CGIAR activities proposed for the 1998-2000 period; the recommendations relating to review and assessment of systemwide initiatives and programs, as well as their critical importance in the research agenda; and, the recommendation to modify slightly the CGIAR activity structure in the future.
There was clarification sought on a number of specific issues, and some suggestions offered for TAC consideration as well.

**Improving Policies.** It was suggested that there should not be a too sharply delineated boundary between socioeconomic studies and policy analysis for the purposes of resource allocation in the CGIAR, as these are part of a continuum. One suggestion made was that this issue, as well as that of the public goods research value of market reform and trade policy studies, should be assessed in an upcoming external review.

**Strengthening NARS.** There was a sentiment expressed by several Members that there should be no further reduction in the allocation to institution building and networks. It was also noted, however, that in zero sum situations, such as resource allocation, not all worthy elements can be increased or even maintained at the current level.

**Production Systems Development and Management.** The proposal to modify the activity structure—merge production systems development and management and protecting the environment into a single “sustainable production systems” category—was considered to be attractive generally, although it was noted by several participants that there should remain explicit reference to the environment in the activity set. Several Members felt that the environment could be considered a goal or objective rather than an activity and, therefore, enter into much of the work in other activities. There was considerable discussion of the overall activity structure, and further review was urged.

**Soil and Water Research.** It was suggested that this topic and that of degraded lands in general should receive greater prominence and priority in the CGIAR Agenda.

**Systemwide Programs.** There was strong support for systemwide activities as an effective and efficient vehicle for a number of priority CGIAR themes. It was felt that the tone of the TAC document may imply a loss of conviction which is not warranted. The desire to review the experiences with systemwide activities was accepted, and it was noted that Center Directors have also commissioned a review. Some Members felt that there should be a possibility to continue to add new systemwide activities, even while the overall program is under review.

---

**Report on Parallel Session IV: Allocations to Commodities and Production Sectors**

In Parallel Session IV, chaired by Mr. Klaus Winkel (Denmark), Members of the Group considered and discussed TAC’s views on priorities for commodities and production sectors. The focus of the discussion was the role of the poverty indicator in the congruence analysis and the weights to be assigned to other factors, such as environmental sustainability, alternative sources of supply, contribution to economic growth, and probabilities of success.

The Group also discussed the operational use of these indicators in defining research priorities among commodities, production sectors, and regions. TAC Chair Donald Winkelmann introduced the poverty indicator and elaborated the analytical framework used in developing it.

**Analytical Framework.** The concepts and methodology used in developing the poverty indicator were discussed in depth, leading to a consensus that TAC’s approach was transparent and, after considering the elaboration suggested below, provided a reasonable basis for developing commodity and sectoral priorities.

**Poverty and Environment.** Due to data limitations, TAC’s analysis does not fully capture the impact of the interaction between poverty and the environment. Thus, some Members felt that it does not sufficiently distinguish between the differential impacts of levels of poverty or the absolute number of poor. The TAC Chair identified the current lack of poverty and environmental data at a level of detail necessary to conduct such analysis; for example, poverty data is not yet available to permit comparisons between the various ecoregions. Interactions planned between TAC and Centers over the next twelve months may resolve some of these data issues.

**Approach to Modeling.** TAC is operating at a high level of aggregation in developing its analytical framework. It was suggested that TAC consider an alternate or supplementary bottom-up approach by scaling up farm-level data, including relevant details regarding environmental degradation and poverty. The TAC Chair noted that this information is now widely available through experimental data collected by CGIAR Centers as well as other researchers and should be assessed.
**TAC Recommendations.** The Group explored with
the TAC Chair TAC's plans to develop specific
recommendations by MTM97, by further pursuing this
analysis in collaboration with the Centers. Participants
suggested that TAC's analysis and data be shared with
CGIAR partners to benefit from their insights.

**Report on Parallel Session V: Complementarities between CGIAR and NARS Priorities**

In Parallel Session V, chaired by Dr. Abd-El-Salam Gomaa (Egypt), Members of the Group considered and
discussed the complementarities between CGIAR and
NARS priorities. The subject was introduced by Dr. Lucia Vaccaro (TAC), whose presentation posed a basic question
which set the tone for the ensuing discussions, should
high priority for NARS imply high priority for the CGIAR?

As indicated by the regional fora and reaffirmed in
the Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum on the
NARS-CGIAR Partnership Initiative, the goals of the
CGIAR are generally shared by the NARS. However,
the priorities of the CGIAR differ from those of the NARS
in some activities. Priorities also differ among regions
and among NARS within regions.

In terms of activities, TAC's analysis shows a high
level of congruence in priorities between CGIAR and
most NARS. It is largely in the area of NARS
strengthening that some differences exist; for example,
all of the NARS leaders indicated that training should
remain a high priority in the CGIAR Agenda. TAC, on
the other hand, recommended a reduction in Center
investment in this activity. Although it is still recognized
as an important component of institutional strengthening,
TAC recommended that this be supported through
bilateral programs or internal sources of funding.

Networking for institution building or strengthening
is also given low priority by TAC in the allocation of
CGIAR resources. However, Dr. Vaccaro clarified that
networking for research remains high in priority ranking.

Bringing the prioritizations process down to the level
of sectors and commodities within sectors results in
reduced congruence between NARS priorities and those
of the CGIAR. Participants coming from various NARS
identified a number of cases where differences exist;
for example, export or cash crops, indigenous fruit trees,
and vegetables. TAC's prioritization at the commodity
level, however, is still in process and will be finalized
only after consultation with the Centers.

It is clear that NARS priorities and CGIAR priorities do
have a certain degree of congruence or overlap. Translated
into activities, non-overlapping areas represent those for
which each component of the global agricultural research
system is responsible. The congruent areas are those that
the CGIAR is expected to cover, solely or jointly with
NARS. These are areas of complementarity and partnership
for which the CGIAR and NARS are enjoined to strive.

**Conclusion**

TAC's recommendations on the CGIAR's long-term
priorities and strategies were discussed by the Group
and broadly endorsed, with modifications to give
greater attention to networking and training, as a
framework for medium-term planning. As well, the
Group endorsed initiation of 1998-2000 business
planning by the Centers.

The TAC Chair and his colleagues were commended
for the transparency which characterized both the criteria
used by TAC in determining priorities and strategies
and the process by which TAC arrived at its conclusions
and recommendations. As well, TAC was commended
for its serious effort to integrate poverty considerations
in its analysis.

It was recognized that the product prepared by TAC
was a milestone in the effort to move toward a more
consultative and transparent process and which should
be built upon as the process moves forward through
the preparation of Center medium term plans.

The broad points emphasized during the discussion,
as highlighted by the Chairman, were:

- reaffirmation of the desired emphasis on the
  environment, the rural poor, and on women, and
  the need to find ways to ensure this is carried out;

- the need for greater urgency and visibility for
  research on the soil and water aspects of natural
  resources management, given the fundamental
  importance of soil and water to sustainable
  production systems;
• the need to increase both collaboration among Centers as well as linkages with other actors in the global agricultural research system, including NARS, NGOs, the private sector, ARIs, and non-CGIAR Centers;

• the need to find ways to collaborate with NARS as equal partners, through research networks, training, and outsourcing of Center work to strong NARS;

• the need for greater attention to postharvest technology development, particularly given its relevance for women;

• recognition of the limitations of currently available data on poverty and the environment, which makes aggregate modeling difficult, and the need for a simultaneous bottom-up approach;

• recognition of the importance of an integrated approach to agricultural production and environmental conservation;

• the need for a review of systemwide programs, although this should not limit the consideration of new initiatives; and

• the importance of obtaining an overall balance in the way resources are deployed in order to protect the key elements of the Research Agenda.

1997 Research Agenda and Funding Requirements

Presentation by the TAC Chair

TAC Chair Donald Winkelmann presented TAC’s recommendations on the 1997 Research Agenda to the Group at MTM96. He said the timetable for the preparation of the 1997 proposals had been extremely tight, due to the current scheduling of some Center board meetings, which may have to be reevaluated in order to provide adequate time for the preparation of TAC’s recommendations on the Research Agenda in the future.

All sixteen Centers presented a program and budget for 1997. Additionally, eleven proposals were received for the implementation of systemwide programs and six for the design phase of systemwide initiatives. Total funding requested was for $338 million. Almost all Centers requested increases in their funding levels for 1997 as compared to 1996, either for new programs or for the transfer of activities from complementary programs to the Research Agenda. TAC evaluated Center requests on the basis of three criteria: new scientific breakthroughs which influence Center activity; changes in the priorities of NARS and the development assistance community; and the introduction of new systemwide activities.

TAC recommended a funding level of $312 million to implement the 1997 Research Agenda, resulting in the following profile for CGIAR activities in 1997: increasing productivity, 48 percent; protecting the environment, 13 percent; saving biodiversity, 9 percent; improving policy, 11 percent; and strengthening NARS, 19 percent.

Mr. Winkelmann highlighted several aspects of TAC’s recommendations, including support for new activities and for systemwide programs and initiatives, as well as the additional reclassification of some funding currently outside of the Research Agenda. Specifically, TAC recommended an increase in the allocations to five Centers—CIFOR, IIMI, ILRI, ISNAR, and WARDA—for new activities. Support was recommended for systemwide programs on: soil, water, and nutrient management research; humid tropics and inland valleys; rice; wheat; alternatives to slash and burn; sustainable mountain agriculture; on-farm water husbandry in the WANA region; tropical Latin America; and genetic resources. Additionally, funding was recommended for systemwide initiatives on: water; desert margins in Africa; integrated pest management; and participatory research and gender analysis. As well, an additional reclassification of complementary support to the Research Agenda totaling $5.4 million was recommended for three Centers—CIFOR, IRRI, and WARDA.

Discussion

Finance Committee Chair Michel Petit reported that a preliminary estimate of the resources available to fund the 1997 Research Agenda was $287 million. Consequently, the Finance Committee could not recommend endorsement of the proposed financial requirements of $312 million in 1997. He emphasized that this was not a criticism of TAC, and reminded the Group that it had agreed at ICW95 that a budget ceiling should not be imposed by TAC a priori. The critical issue for the Finance Committee was not to pass judgment on TAC’s recommendations, which the Finance Committee
agreed were legitimate in broad terms, but rather how to reconcile the needs of the TAC-recommended Agenda with the reality of available funding.

Many Members expressed appreciation to the Centers and the CGIAR and TAC Secretariats for the tremendous effort that was put into presenting, describing, and clarifying Center activities in terms of projects. The project documentation prepared was praised as substantially increasing the transparency of the agenda setting process and the linkages between the matrix and projects being carried out by the Centers, thereby greatly facilitating decisionmaking by the Group. At the same time, several Members felt that care must be taken to ensure that efforts to increase transparency do not overburden the Centers in terms of the preparation of documentation.

A number of interventions were made to support the Finance Committee's recommendation that the Group be realistic and responsible in terms of approving the 1997 Research Agenda within the parameters of available funding.

Conclusion

The Group endorsed the substance of the 1997 Research Agenda, as recommended by TAC. Increased transparency, resulting from the establishment of a System project portfolio, as well as the availability of each Center's project matrix, was welcomed.

In his summation, the Chairman indicated that the proposed funding requirements for 1997 would be scaled down proportionately to a figure of some $300 million. He emphasized that this was a notional target, not an envelope, as the financing identified in the TAC-certified financing plan approved at ICW96 would determine the actual funding envelope.

Committee Reports

Technical Advisory Committee

TAC Chair Donald Winkelmann reported to the Group on aspects of TAC's work not covered under other MTM96 agenda items. He focused, in particular, on the outcomes of TAC 68, held at ICRAF in December 1995, and TAC 69, held at IRRI in March 1996.

At TAC 68, TAC reaffirmed its support of a proposal to improve the quality and consistency of external reviews of Centers, by moving toward a single, integrated system for evaluating Centers, comprising Center commissioned reviews, CGIAR external reviews, and a mechanism linking the two. TAC also discussed the resource allocation process for the next medium-term planning period, based on a three-year cycle beginning in 1998. TAC was favorably disposed toward a proposal under which Centers would not have ex ante funding envelopes. TAC noted, however, that planning for scientific research generally required a longer time horizon than three years, but that, in order to respond to budgetary considerations, financial planning could be based on segments of three years within a longer research cycle. TAC's discussions on medium-term resource allocations continued at TAC 69.

Mr. Winkelmann outlined the external program and management reviews of Centers that TAC would carry out during 1996 and 1997 in conjunction with the CGIAR Secretariat, as follows:

- 1996: ICRISAT and ISNAR
- 1996-1997: IFPRI and IPGRI
- 1997: CIFOR, CIMMYT, and IRRI

Other TAC plans include: a study of CGIAR priorities and strategies for research on marginal lands, to be conducted in 1996; a study of CGIAR commitments in Latin America, to begin in 1996 and be completed in 1997; and a desk study, already underway, on current global spending on in situ conservation.

Mr. Winkelmann said that TAC 70 would be held at CIAT in July.

Genetic Resources Policy Committee

IPGRI Director General Geoffrey Hawtin presented the report of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee on behalf of GRPC Chair M. S. Swaminathan, who was unable to attend MTM96.

At its meeting in February 1995, in Rolle, Switzerland, the GRPC discussed a range of issues, including:
- developments related to the Convention on Biological Diversity, particularly those that will affect the future work of the CGIAR;
- the forthcoming negotiations of the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources;
- the FAO International Technical Conference to be held in Leipzig, Germany in June 1996;
- the Systemwide Genetic Resources Program;
- the IPGRI study of alternative systems for exchanging genetic resources; and
- farmers' rights.

The meeting also provided a valuable opportunity for the GRPC and IUCN to engage in a dialogue and explore possibilities for expanded collaboration between the two institutions, particularly in the policy area. As well, the GRPC received an update on UPOV, and welcomed the participation of a WTO representative.

Mr. Hawtin reported that the Second Meeting of the Conference of Parties of the CBD was held in Jakarta, Indonesia in November 1995. He highlighted the discussions which took place on: a funding mechanism for the CBD; the development of a protocol on biosafety; coastal marine biodiversity; and agrobiodiversity. He noted that ICLARM had played a prominent role in the preparation of papers and the discussions which took place on coastal marine biodiversity. Agrobiodiversity was discussed in the context of FAO’s work, which was strongly endorsed, on the renegotiation of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources and on the development of a Global Plan of Action. Further discussions on agrobiodiversity were expected to be held at the meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical, and Technological Advice of the CBD in September 1996 and at the Third Conference of the Parties of the CBD in November 1996.

Turning to the International Technical Conference to be held in Leipzig, Mr. Hawtin indicated that two major documents would be tabled at the meeting: a report on the State of the World on Plant Genetic Resources, which provides the status of genetic resources on a country basis, a regional basis, and a crop basis; and a Global Plan of Action, which, at this stage, does not include forestry. Mr. Hawtin said that the CGIAR features quite strongly in the Plan, both implicitly and explicitly, and that many of the topics covered in the Plan are of significant relevance to the CGIAR, including ex situ conservation, in situ conservation and use utilization of plant genetic resources, and institution and capacity building.

In relation to plant variety protection, the GRPC noted that UPOV had increasingly become the intellectual property protection system of choice for plant variety protection by many countries, including developing countries. The GRPC expects that countries, in the fulfillment of their obligations under the GATT TRIPS agreement, would increasingly elect to participate in some form of plant variety protection under UPOV.

The GRPC reviewed several issues pertaining to the Systemwide Genetic Resources Program, including: the guiding principles for the CGIAR on intellectual property rights and genetic resources; the external review of Center genebanks conducted in 1995; progress made on the Systemwide Information Network on Genetic Resources; and collaboration among Centers. Mr. Hawtin indicated the GRPC and the CDC were interacting on an expansion of the guiding principles for genetic resources, and expected to present modified guiding principles to the Group at ICW96 for ratification. The report of the review of Center genebanks will be forthcoming shortly, and identifies areas of strength as well as some areas where additional work is required to bring the CGIAR's custodianship of genetic material in line with international standards.

Mr. Hawtin reported that significant progress has been made during the year on SINGER, to bring a degree of standardization to Center databases on genetic resources collections, and to link them electronically so that a core set of information on the entire collections held by the CGIAR would be available as a unified database. It is expected that, by the end of 1996 or early 1997, the majority of the CGIAR collections will be listed on the Internet. As well, Mr. Hawtin said strategies were being developed for in situ conservation, ex situ conservation, training, and information and documentation, and that Centers were engaged in collaborative projects in all four of these areas.

The GRPC considered the study of alternative systems for exchanging genetic resources, undertaken by
IPGRI at the request of the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources. IPGRI, Mr. Hawtin said, was analyzing the costs and benefits of various options for exchanging genetic resources and for ensuring the sharing of benefits from their use, consistent with the CBD. Three options are analyzed in the report: a strictly bilateral arrangement; an open access system, without any set rules or understanding; and a more formal multilateral system that has a minimum of rules needed to ensure transparency and clear mechanisms for sharing benefits. The report primarily focuses on the third option, and examines a range of issues, as well as options for implementation.

The GRPC also discussed farmers' rights, which it felt was a topic the CGIAR needed to consider further, in terms of how it affects the CGIAR's work and how the CGIAR can contribute to a meaningful implementation of the concept. The GRPC plans to host a workshop in Brazil in April 1997 on ethics and equity, under which a discussion of farmers' rights would be covered.

As regards the policy unit approved by the Group at ICW95, Mr. Hawtin reported that it had not yet been established, and that, given the current funding situation, TAC had not felt it could approve it at this juncture.

Discussion

There was no discussion of the TAC report by the Group.

The GRPC was commended for providing an excellent overview of the issues and events relevant to the CGIAR in the complex area of genetic resources. IPGRI was praised for its support to the GRPC.

The Group took note of the Chairman's participation in COP II, and the importance of his continuing personal involvement at international fora dealing with these issues. The increased voice of the agricultural community at COP II, and the priority given to agrobiodiversity on the COP III agenda, was welcomed by the Group.

The importance of a strong and visible CGIAR presence at relevant international fora, in particular the forthcoming International Technical Conference in Leipzig, in terms of clarifying the role that the CGIAR could play in the implementation of the Global Plan of Action, as well as showing the CGIAR's strong commitment to engaging in a dialogue on these issues with the world community, was emphasized. The CGIAR was urged to define a clear role and strategy for its participation in the Leipzig conference and other international fora, that is based on the technical expertise that it brings to the discussions, in order to help develop appropriate mechanisms that best serve the needs of developing countries and the poor.

It was suggested that the CGIAR could also play a very useful role in helping to bridge divergent viewpoints, particularly between developed and developing countries, given the CGIAR's own successful experience as a global forum in which common ground is mapped out.

A recommendation was made that Members harmonize their positions on plant genetic resources in relation to their participation in the various international fora. It was pointed out that, while this was desirable, it would be very difficult to accomplish, given that some Members themselves may have difficulty in coordinating the activities of various Ministries within their own governments on this issue.

Several Members raised the issue of the national and regional restrictions that are increasingly being placed on the transfer of genetic resources, and expressed concern as to how such restrictions were affecting the flow of germplasm among Centers and among Centers and NARS. It was noted that the flow of new material into Center genebanks had slowed down significantly over the last few years. Given the amounts of material the CGIAR distributes each year, it was felt that the CGIAR should be in a strong position to seek an exchange system that is as open as possible and which results in mutual benefits.

IPGRI's study of a multilateral system as one option to facilitate the global exchange of genetic resources was welcomed, and the advantage of such a system as compared with bilateral agreements was mentioned.

IPGRI was urged to establish the policy unit previously approved by the Group, particularly since the decisions now being made in international fora have a direct impact on the scope and quality of the CGIAR's work, and require the continued active participation of CGIAR and monitoring with regards to their implications for the CGIAR.

The Group welcomed the GRPC's efforts on farmers' rights, and encouraged a further elaboration of operational considerations needed to translate farmers'
rights into meaningful action. The need to consider in
greater detail the ethical issues of utilization of genetic
resources, that the planned workshop in Brazil would
address, was recognized.

The review of Center genebanks was also welcomed
by the Group.

**Conclusion**

The Group took note of reports from TAC and the
GRPC.

The importance of the CGIAR's continuing partici-
pation in the international dialogue on genetic resources
was emphasized. As well, the CGIAR was urged to
define a clear role and strategy for its participation in
relevant international fora, and to take steps to estab-
lish the policy unit at IPGRI.

**III. FINANCE**

**1996 Funding Issues and Their Resolution**

At the commencement of MTM96, there was
widespread concern over three interrelated developments
pertaining to financing of the 1996 CGIAR Research
Agenda. First, the 1996 Agenda, which required support
of $300 million as approved at ICW95, would be
underfunded by some 6 percent, or approximately $20
million, while some $47 million in funding remained
outside of the Agenda in support of complementary
programs. Second, the shortfall of funding for the Research
Agenda was unevenly distributed among Centers, placing
several Centers at serious risk due to insufficient funding
in 1996. Third, the World Bank's matching contribution
was placed in jeopardy as a consequence of the shortfall,
raising the possibility that a refund of part of the Bank's
contribution would be required.

In his opening statement, the Chairman urged the
Group to take action to resolve the funding shortfall
in 1996, and to reverse the perverse incentives
motivating Center financing that were at the root of
its cause. Consequently, discussions by the Group
on the CGIAR's financing arrangements were focused
on proposed measures to close the funding gap in
1996 and to modify financing arrangements to create
positive incentives to avoid a recurrence of the funding
crisis in future years.

Two measures were used to close the funding gap.
First, through redefinition and/or reclassification of
funding currently in support of complementary programs
outside of the Agreed Agenda, monies would be
identified to fund the Agreed Agenda. Through a process
of consultation, involving Center Directors, TAC, the
Finance Committee, and the CGIAR Secretariat,
complementary activities consistent with the Agreed
Agenda were identified during MTM96 and relevant
funding totaling approximately $15 million was
contributed toward closing the funding gap. Secondly,
during the course of MTM96, Members mobilized
additional resources at a level of about $5 million for
Centers facing the most severe funding shortfalls. These
exceptional efforts, in particular of Denmark, and as
well as those of Japan, Australia, and France, and the
partial drawing down of reserves previously set aside,
will contribute substantially toward solving the problem.
Although the concerned Centers must curtail spending,
a crisis has been avoided.

The steps taken at MTM96—redefinition and/or
reclassification of funding and the provision of additional
resources by Members—have closed the funding gap
in 1996 by ensuring funding of about $300 million and
full access to the Bank's matching contribution.

**Modifications in CGIAR Financing Arrange-
ments**

**Renewal Program Reforms**

Financing arrangements were reformed by the
Group in 1994 and 1995 under the renewal program to
introduce transparency, accountability, and predictability
in CGIAR funding. Members responded positively to
the changes implemented, and confirmed their intention
to fully support the Agreed Agenda. As well, some
Members also expressed their intention to take on a
stabilizing role in the System by supporting, through
unrestricted funding, less popular but promising
research.

The financing arrangements in place at the time of
MTM96 were characterized by the following reforms,
developed and implemented during the renewal program:

- a matrix, to better articulate the Research Agenda
  for the purposes of program development and
financing, and to facilitate multiple financing modalities;

- a project based approach for program preparation, targeted to achieve full transparency by 1997;

- a financing plan, to secure full financing for programs under the Agreed Agenda, while retaining the sovereignty of Individual Members to fund the programs of their choice; and

- a new decisionmaking cycle, to ensure adequate time between consideration of the Research Agenda by the Group and decisionmaking regarding its financing by Members, as well as to negotiate full funding of the Agreed Agenda.

Remaining Impediments to Full Efficiency

Despite the advances achieved in 1995, it became evident at MTM96 that further fine tuning of the financing arrangements was required to remove several remaining impediments, which hampered the full effectiveness of the existing arrangements. These impediments included:

- the perceived rigidity of the financing arrangements and the restrictive nature of individual Center budget envelopes, which were seen as stifling the entrepreneurship of Centers to seek financing of sound research proposals within the parameters of the Agreed Agenda;

- the persistence of disincentives for Centers to seek funding for the Research Agenda from Members, due to the perception that it would result in a loss of funding from the World Bank for the Center concerned, once the funding envelopes had been fully subscribed;

- the perceived lack of clarity regarding the criteria for determining the inclusion of Center activities within the Agreed Agenda, and the resulting confusion created among Members and Centers;

- the lack of stability in Center funding;

- the confusion regarding the responsibility for financial planning at the Center level; and

- the concern with the amount of paperwork generated by the existing allocation process, which was perceived as limiting TAC's capacity to fully engage in the strategic issues of concern to the CGIAR.

Toward the Future: Modifications Proposed

Recognition of the obstacles created by these impediments led the Chairman to propose significant modifications in the existing financing arrangements for the Group's consideration. At the heart of the modifications proposed was a shift in emphasis from confining Center initiative through the mechanism of a fixed budget envelope, to promoting Center entrepreneurship by decentralizing responsibility for financing decisions to Centers and Members. World Bank support would shift from partial gap filling to reinforcing membership support. It was felt these measures would remove the remaining impediments and disincentives in the existing financing arrangements, and would increase predictability, introduce flexibility, and preserve transparency and accountability in the funding of the CGIAR Research Agenda.

The proposed modifications were discussed by the Group in plenary, as well as by the Finance Committee, Center Directors, Center Board Chairs, TAC, and the CGIAR Secretariat, meeting in small groupings, jointly, and with the Chairman, throughout and immediately following the conclusion of MTM96, to reach agreement on the proposed modifications and their implementation.

The modified financing arrangements: allow flexible planning by Centers to respond to new opportunities; provide incentives to Centers to expand funding for the Agreed Agenda; bring realism into CGIAR planning; and streamline processes and decisionmaking, thereby reducing unnecessary paperwork by the Centers and by TAC. Centers were given full responsibility for developing their individual financing plans, subject to TAC's certification of their proposed activities, thereby decentralizing CGIAR financial planning and basing it squarely on Center projections. World Bank support was shifted from partial gap filling to reinforcing membership support. A new, albeit small, scheme of competitive grant funding was instituted, to be allocated based on TAC recommendations. The purpose would be to foster innovation, as well as
inter-center collaboration. A provision for a systemwide reserve was established.

At the same time, mechanisms were established to ensure that the process of decentralization does not jeopardize the overall priorities of the CGIAR as approved by the Group. Specifically, TAC's critical role in priority setting and resource allocation was reaffirmed, to ensure the continued integrity of the CGIAR System and the pursuit of high value science opportunities. The content of the Center programs following the development of their financing plans will be subject to TAC's certification of their proposed activities. Members will take on the role, traditionally assumed only by the World Bank, of ensuring that individual funding decisions do not compromise high priority activities of the CGIAR System as a whole.

**Distribution of World Bank Funds**

Under the modified financing arrangements, the World Bank will continue to finance 15 percent of the total Research Agenda; however, the allocation of Bank funds will change. A large part (say 12 to 13 percent) of the World Bank funds will now be allocated to Centers across the five major CGIAR undertakings—as represented on an aggregate matrix of the five undertakings (columns) by sixteen Centers (rows)—on the basis of projections by the Centers of expected support from Members, the remaining 2 to 3 percent would go toward competitive grants and a reserve fund. To avoid unrealistic projections, the Centers will be required to refund proportionately World Bank funding if their projected support from Members for activities under the five undertakings is not forthcoming. As an additional safeguard, the World Bank will disburse its funding to the Centers in two equal tranches, with the second tranche subject to prior review by the Finance Committee at the MTM.

There will be a transition period of one year, in 1997, to facilitate the changes in the World Bank allocation being implemented. In 1997, to facilitate special one-time payments by the World Bank to Centers with high levels of Bank support in 1996, the percentage of World Bank support to Centers on the basis of funding secured by Members will be 9 percent, rising to 12 or 13 percent in 1998.

The modified financing arrangements thus recognize the Centers as being intrinsically entrepreneurial and highly motivated to maintain their status as centers of excellence, where the best science is being done for the purposes of sustainable agriculture for food security in the developing countries. By removing unnecessary barriers, the talents and entrepreneurship of the Centers have been unleashed, with those Centers proactively securing funding for their missions being rewarded with World Bank funds.

Clearly, special efforts must be made by the Centers and Members to ensure the integrity of the Research Agenda and the promotion of inter-center collaboration so that the whole System is more than the sum of the Centers.

**1997 Financing Arrangements**

1997 will be a transitional year toward the full implementation of the modified financing arrangements in 1998. The modifications to be implemented in 1997 are: decentralization of the responsibility for financial planning to Centers, partial implementation of the changes in the distribution of World Bank funding, TAC's role in certifying the program content of the Center financing plans and the increased role of Members in ensuring that high priority activities of the CGIAR System are funded.

At ICW96, 1997 financing plans, based on Center proposals which have been certified by TAC, will be approved by the Group, following their review by the Finance Committee.

In 1997, World Bank will continue the shift, initiated in 1995, from gap filling toward reinforcing membership support. However, those Centers receiving high levels of World Bank funding for gap filling in 1996 will continue to receive Bank support for this purpose, albeit at lower levels, in 1997. Such gap filling support by the World Bank will be completely phased out in 1998. Accordingly, in 1997, of the 15 percent of the Research

---

4 In 1996, the World Bank continued to finance 15 percent of the total Research Agenda, with 14 percent being distributed to the Centers and 1 percent being held as a reserve. The allocation methodology used in 1996 to distribute Bank support was twofold: first, the allocation as "first donor" to the Centers at about equal levels across the board; and, second, gap filling support. Thus, four Centers received 8 to 9 percent of their budgets from the World Bank in 1996, seven Centers received 10 to 15 percent, and five Centers received 16 to 23 percent.
Modified Decisionmaking Process and Schedule

The modified process for decisionmaking on the Research Agenda and the allocation of resources by the Group would be as follows:

Setting the Agenda (MTM—May)

At the Mid-term Meeting of the current year, TAC proposes the Research Agenda for the following year, including competitive grants, based on interaction with the Centers. The Group debates TAC’s recommendations, taking into consideration advice from the Finance Committee on funding prospects. The Group endorses the proposed Research Agenda and notional budget, with or without modification. As well, competitive grants are allocated to the Centers. Following MTM, the CGIAR Secretariat solicits overall financing indications from Members.

Preparation of Financing Plans (June—September)

Centers prepare their individual financing plans for the following year, unconstrained by the notional budget indicated at the time of the approval of the Research Agenda at the MTM. Centers project the level of expected funding they will receive, based on specific financing information solicited through bilateral contacts with Members. World Bank funding is included on a percentage basis of funding secured by Centers—probably around 9 percent in 1997 and 12 to 13 percent in 1998, depending on the final decision of the Finance Committee.

Confirmation of Program Content (mid-end September)

Following the preparation of Center financing plans, Centers indicate to TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat the changes to the notional budget for the following year, as endorsed by the Group at MTM, resulting from subsequent interactions with individual Members on expected funding, and their implications to the program content of the Research Agenda. TAC reviews the program content, certifies or disapproves additional projects proposed for inclusion in the Research Agenda since the MTM, and highlights any significant implications to program content for the Group’s attention at ICW.

Review of Financing Plans (end-September and October)

Following the confirmation of program content by TAC, the Finance Committee reviews Center financing plans for the following year for consistency and feasibility, based on funding information solicited by the CGIAR Secretariat. As well, the Finance Committee confirms the contribution of the World Bank, earmarked to the five major CGIAR undertakings.

Approval of the Research Agenda and Financing Plan (ICW—October)

At ICW of the current year, the Group considers the finalized Research Agenda and financing plan for the following year, leading to the Group’s approval of its financing and implementation.

[continued on next page]
Disbursement and Implementation (January)

Following approval by the Group at ICW (in the previous year) of the Research Agenda and financing plan, Centers commence implementation of the Agenda on January 1 of the current year, and Members disburse funds to the Centers. Of the World Bank funds, half are distributed in January. The remaining half are disbursed in June, upon the authorization of the Group at the MTM of the current year, based on a review by the Finance Committee of updated Center financing plans.

Accountability (December-January)

At the end of the current year, Centers prepare financial statements showing the use of funds received in support of the Research Agenda. As well, Centers confirm the use of funds provided by the World Bank according to the five major CGIAR undertakings, and refund any overcommitted funds to the Bank.

Agenda the Bank finances, 9 percent will be allocated to Centers on the basis of the support Centers expect to receive from Members, 1 percent to competitive grants, and 1 percent to a systemwide reserve. The remaining 4 percent will be allocated as a special one-time payment to those Centers with higher than 9 percent Bank support in 1996. This represents a provision of 80 percent of the total amount provided by the Bank for gap filling in 1996 to individual Centers. The Finance Committee will continue to study the allocation and may amend it somewhat, but will retain the general thrust of the scheme.

Discussion

The extensive discussions of the proposed modifications throughout and immediately following the conclusion of MTM96 enabled all involved parties to discuss the CGIAR's financing arrangements, raise and address issues of concern, provide clarification, and consider alternative schemes, leading to agreement by week's end on the proposed modifications and their implementation.

There was widespread agreement among Members with the objectives motivating the Chairman's proposed modifications to the financing arrangements, namely the need to remove the remaining impediments and disincentives in the existing financing arrangements and to promote Center entrepreneurship by decentralizing responsibility for financing decisions to Centers and Members, in order to increase predictability, introduce flexibility, and preserve transparency and accountability in the funding of the CGIAR Research Agenda.

While removing obstacles in the existing financing arrangements, many Members felt the proposed modifications had hidden risks. By eliminating the current incentives for Centers to keep programs outside of the Research Agenda, the modifications could lead to a gradual, but continual broadening of the Research Agenda, resulting in a dilution of the "heartland" of the CGIAR—long-term research on international public goods.

Members felt that it was vital that the integrity of the CGIAR System, its priority setting process, and its research be preserved. The CGIAR must resist the tendency to become "all things to all people" by explicitly defining what it does do, and what it does not do, what it stands for, and what roles it has. In this way, the very heart of the CGIAR—which must be financed and which cannot be placed at risk—would be identified and protected.

The Group recognized that the modified financing arrangements would require a steadfast commitment by Members and Centers to withstand the short-term fads and fancies of public opinion, to which Members are subject and Centers are pressured, in favor of long-term public goods research. It was agreed that every Member and every Center must do its share to maintain the integrity of the Research Agenda and the cohesion of the CGIAR, and to resist undermining the common effort.

There was general agreement that the role of TAC as an independent guardian of the integrity of the CGIAR must be maintained. TAC's central importance in defining
the CGIAR heartland, and in carefully monitoring its implementation and funding, were emphasized.

A recommendation was made that, as much as possible, Members should provide unrestricted support to the Centers, to enable Centers to take full advantage of their own creativity and entrepreneurship.

Among the questions raised were: whether the proposed modifications would promote competition among the Centers at the expense of cooperation, and how this would affect the CGIAR System; what additional demands direct bilateral negotiations would place on Members; how the modified arrangements would reduce uncertainty, when Members still have to follow their same budget processes at home; how Members could continue to earmark funds to specific Center programs or ecoregional programs, given the new condensed five-column matrix.

The Chairman clarified that the proposed modifications simply recognize the reality of individual Center-Member negotiations which already exist; the new feature is not the direct negotiation process, but where the responsibility for making judgments on the levels of financing expected ultimately rests. This responsibility will now shift from the Finance Committee and the CGIAR Secretariat to the Centers. He also explained that Members can still fund individual projects or programs of their choice, and that the aggregate five-column matrix was not intended to replace a more detailed matrix, but rather to be used only in the allocation of World Bank funds.

Concern was expressed as to how quickly those Centers that have been relying heavily on World Bank funds can switch to the modified arrangements, and how to prevent short-term distress during the transition period.

The importance of the monitoring role performed by the CGIAR Secretariat, particularly for Members to get a sense of what other Members are funding and what parts of the Research Agenda remain unfunded, was emphasized.

Proposal by the German Delegation

Mr. Jurgen Friedrichsen presented to the Group the German Delegation's alternative proposal for the allocation of World Bank support, which combined characteristics of both the existing financing arrangements and the modifications proposed by the Chairman. The alternate scheme was intended to address the concern of how to minimize the adverse affects on program implementation in the event of a funding shortfall under the modified financing arrangements proposed.

Specifically, the German Delegation proposed the World Bank allocation comprise a mix of three components:

- An initial contribution, totaling one-third of the World Bank's support, to be allocated in proportion to the approved budget for the Research Agenda, as agreed by the Group at MTM. The initial contribution would be disbursed in January.

- An incentive contribution totaling one-third of the World Bank's support, to be allocated in proportion to Member support. The incentive contribution would be disbursed in the actual budget year, with an adjustment in January of the following year.

- A balancing or gap filling contribution, totaling one-third of the World Bank's support, with preference given to systemwide programs and initiatives. This contribution would be distributed in June.

Statement by the Representative of Denmark

Mr. Klaus Winkel announced Denmark's intention to provide an extraordinary contribution to the CGIAR in the amount of $4 million to help close the funding gap in 1996. This represents funds additional to Denmark's $11 million contribution to the CGIAR in 1996. As well, he announced Denmark's plans to increase support to the CGIAR in 1997 by almost 50 percent, from $11 million to $17 million.

Mr. Winkel elaborated the three primary reasons for the increase in Danish support to the CGIAR. First, Denmark strongly believes in the CGIAR System, its objectives, its modus operandi, and its results. The renewal program has impressed Danish authorities and strengthened their commitment to the CGIAR.

Second, awareness has been increasing in Denmark of the threatening global crisis with respect to food security and the degradation of natural
resources. The CGIAR has contributed to this increased awareness. Mr. Winkel mentioned, in particular, the visits of the Chairman and his meeting with the Minister, the visits by IFPRI on the 2020 Vision Initiative, the CGIAR’s input to Denmark’s preparations for the World Food Summit, and the participation of the head of DANIDA in the Ministerial-Level Meeting. As well, DANIDA efforts to brief Danish journalists and nurture their interest in the CGIAR have had a valuable impact.

Third, there is an enabling environment around Danish cooperation with the CGIAR. Of Denmark’s $1.6 billion annual aid program, about 50 percent is channeled through DANIDA and via multilateral agencies. Denmark has become much more selective in its support, has become tough and critical, and has increased its expectations. Where these expectations have not been fulfilled, it has reduced its contributions. On the other hand, where important goals are being served in an effective manner, as in the case of the CGIAR, it has increased its contributions.

Mr. Winkel said these three factors accounted for the substantial increase in Denmark’s support to the CGIAR.

The Group welcomed with acclamation the statement by Mr. Winkel and the intentions of the Government of Denmark both to provide an extraordinary contribution in 1996 as well as to substantially increase its contribution to the CGIAR in 1997.

Statement by the Representative of Japan

Mr. Kunio Nakamura expressed the Government of Japan’s satisfaction with the progress made by the CGIAR under the renewal program during the last two years, and the expeditious implementation of its outcomes at MTM96. As well, he expressed Japan’s appreciation to the Chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Nakamura elaborated Japan’s newly established position in relation to international agricultural research and the CGIAR, which included cooperation between Japan and the United States in the promotion of international agricultural research, to address global food supply within a framework of a common global perspective.

Japan’s decisions on its 1997 support to the Centers would, Mr. Nakamura said, be intended to meet the following criteria:

- to continue Japan’s role as one of the leading contributing Members of the CGIAR, and to do so in a stable and predictable manner;
- to place priority on projects within the Research Agenda, while continuing to support ongoing special projects until those activities are completed;
- to increase the number of earmarked projects so that visible project activities clearly show Japan’s contribution to the CGIAR;
- to enable Japan to play the role of financial balancer as one of the largest contributing Members of the CGIAR, in consultation with relevant colleagues, and specifically including systemwide and ecoregional programs;
- to avoid the overlapping of Japan’s contributions with those of international organizations; and
- to enable Japan to establish a monitoring system for projects to which it has contributed.

As regards Japan’s budget for 1997, Mr. Nakamura said it was currently under consideration by the relevant ministries. He said Japan encourages the CGIAR to reach out to new sources of funding in the international donor community to stabilize its budgetary situation, and urges other Members to maintain the levels of their contributions.

The Group welcomed with acclamation Mr. Nakamura’s statement. The Chairman expressed the CGIAR’s deep appreciation to the Government of Japan for its willingness to take on a systemwide perspective in the allocation of its resources in the future and to assist in ensuring that the heartland of the CGIAR Research Agenda is preserved.

Conclusion

Two steps were taken by the Group at MTM96 to close the funding gap in 1996: redefinition and/or reclassification of funding, totaling approximately $15 million, from complementary activities to the Research Agenda; and the provision of additional resources at a
level of about $5 million by Members for Centers facing the most severe funding shortfalls. As a result, funding of about $300 million for the 1996 Research Agenda and full access to the World Bank's matching contribution have been ensured.

Modified financing arrangements were adopted by the Group to remove the remaining impediments and disincentives in the existing financing arrangements, thereby increasing predictability, introducing flexibility, and preserving transparency and accountability in the funding of the CGIAR Research Agenda. Center entrepreneurship was unleashed through the decentralization of responsibility for financing decisions to Centers and Members, and World Bank support was shifted from partial gap filling to reinforcing membership support. A competitive grants program to foster innovation and a systemwide reserve were established. 1997 will be a transitional year toward the full implementation of the modified financing arrangements in 1998.

The statements by the representatives of Denmark and of Japan were acclaimed by the Group.

Finance Committee

Finance Committee Chair Michel Petit reported to the Group on the Committee's deliberations during MTM96, which he said had primarily focused on addressing 1996 and 1997 funding issues.

The Finance Committee's first objective had been to address the 1996 funding shortfall, in terms of how to meet the minimum needs of those Centers most severely affected, while remaining fair to all Centers. The Centers experiencing shortfalls each were requested to provide the Committee with relevant information on the nature of their funding deficits, the impact this had on their financial situation overall, what the Center had done to address the problem, and what urgent support was required. The Finance Committee then assessed the magnitude of the financial problems facing each Center. On the basis of its assessment, the Committee determined that an additional $8 to 9 million in funding was required to meet the minimum needs of these Centers.

Mr. Petit reported that, as a result of actions taken during MTM96, the Committee anticipated that 1996 funding requirements would be successfully met, and those Centers with the largest funding gaps—CIAT and ICRISAT, followed by CIMMYT, IITA, IRRI, and ISNAR—would be aided. He specifically mentioned the funds mobilized by Denmark, Japan, France, and Australia, and the Committee's hope that Spain, Italy, and the European Commission would each also provide additional funds. As well, the reclassification of some $15 million of funding currently outside of the Research Agenda would enable the CGIAR to benefit from the full World Bank support of $45 million in 1996. Therefore, part of the $2.5 million set aside at the start of the year as a reserve could also be used to satisfy the additional 1996 requirement.

The second major item addressed by the Finance Committee was 1997 funding requirements, particularly how to reconcile the $312 million budget recommended by TAC with the preliminary estimate, at $287 million, of resources expected to be available from Members. The Finance Committee concluded that the TAC-recommended budget of $312 million should be considered as a program target, whereas a budget of $300 million—comprised of the $287 million estimate of Member funding and approximately $15 million in reclassified funds—would be a more realistic funding target.

On other topics, Mr. Petit reported that the Finance Committee would consider a note prepared by the CGIAR Secretariat on risk management at its next meeting. As well, he indicated that the composition of the Finance Committee would change, as the representatives of the United Kingdom and The Netherlands had agreed at MTM96 to serve on the Oversight Committee and, therefore, would be departing the Finance Committee. He reminded the Group of the need for the various caucuses to elect two new representatives to the Committee at ICW96. Finally, Mr. Petit reported that the Committee would hold a meeting immediately prior to ICW96, and that it might also convene in September, if necessary.

IV. GOVERNANCE

The Group received progress reports from CGIAR committees pertaining to governance, including the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, the Oversight Committee, and Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group. The Ad Hoc Committee on Governance and the Oversight Committee were convened in parallel session during MTM96.
Ad Hoc Committee on Governance

The Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, chaired by Mr. Fernando Chaparro (Colombia), considered two items: a progress report on ICLARM; and a paper providing guidelines on the role, responsibilities, and accountability of Center boards.

Progress Report on ICLARM

The Committee considered ICLARM's recent decision to accept the offer by the Government of Egypt of the use of a site and facilities for aquatic resources research in Abassa.

During the Committee meeting, ICLARM Board Chair John Dillon noted that the board had reached its decision unanimously, after careful consideration of strategic, programmatic, institutional, and financial aspects. The facility would serve two purposes: as a hub for ICLARM's collaborative research and training activities in Sub-Saharan Africa and WANA; and, as a site for upstream ecoregional and global research on selected topics.

ICLARM Director General Meryl Williams then summarized recent developments. She said the host country agreement was well advanced and would soon be ready for signing. The refurbishment of the facility, for which most of the needed funds were available, could be completed within the next two years. She stressed that use of this facility would dramatically increase ICLARM's capacity to serve the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa—an opportunity for which there were no cost-effective alternatives. Use of the Abassa facility would generate global spillovers and fast-track the CGIAR's and ICLARM's desire to meet fisheries research needs in Sub-Saharan Africa and WANA.

As well, TAC Chair Donald Winkelmann noted that, although it was representative of the conditions in WANA, the Abassa site was less useful for work on Sub-Saharan Africa, and, therefore, TAC had concluded at its March 1996 meeting that the proposal ICLARM had presented to TAC did not make the case for using the Abassa facility as a regional headquarters for an expanded CGIAR effort on fisheries research in Sub-Saharan Africa.

In the ensuing discussion, many Members indicated their support of ICLARM's decision. Among the principal points made were:

- Acceptance of the offer by the Government of Egypt would enable the CGIAR to advance the implementation of the decisions reached in Lucerne to place priority on aquatic resources research.

- ICLARM's use of the Abassa facilities would provide an ideal opportunity for strengthening NARS-CGIAR partnerships—another conclusion reached in Lucerne, as well as at the Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum.

- Acceptance of the offer by the Government of Egypt had important political side benefits, such as contribution to the Middle East peace process.

- The judgment of the ICLARM board should be respected, as its membership had the requisite professional expertise and was in the best position to integrate scientific, financial, and pragmatic considerations.

Some Members expressed concern with fully endorsing the board's decision. They were particularly concerned with funds, and priority setting.

Mr. Chaparro summarized the main points made and concluded that there was wide support for endorsing the decision of the ICLARM board. He added that the CGIAR should advise ICLARM to consider the concerns expressed by Members, in particular regarding non-competitive funding and the efficiency of using the facility as a staging post for a research program targeting Sub-Saharan Africa.

Guidelines on the Role, Responsibilities, and Accountability of Center Boards

Oversight Committee Chair Paul Egger introduced a paper updating the CGIAR's guidelines for the operations of Center boards. The draft was prepared jointly by the National Center for Nonprofit Boards and the CGIAR Secretariat, and had been reviewed by the Committee of Board Chairs at ICW95. CBC Chair Wanda Collins said the CBC was pleased with the guidelines and that its previous comments had been incorporated into the present draft. She noted that additional clarification was necessary regarding how CGIAR nominees were appointed.
Following a brief discussion, Mr. Chaparro concluded that the Committee recommended endorsement of the guidelines by the CGIAR, with the modifications noted to be made by the Secretariat.

Oversight Committee

Oversight Committee Chair Paul Egger reported to the Group on the Committee’s meeting, held immediately prior to MTM96, which focused on the following issues: partnership with NARS; System governance; the future role of TAC; the System Review; Center governance; due diligence matters; the Committee’s work program; and internal matters.

Strengthening partnerships with NARS was at the top of the Oversight Committee’s agenda, Mr. Egger said. The Committee welcomed the shared vision of a global agricultural research system, and the outcome of the Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum and related NARS fora. The role of NARS as the cornerstones of the global agricultural research system was recognized. Future consultations at all levels were urged to include the strong representation of NGOs and the private sector. The need for practical priority setting tools that can be used in assessing collaborative programs was noted. A pragmatic approach for strengthening partnerships, based on positive experience, was supported. TAC was recognized as having an important leadership role in guiding the CGIAR toward stronger global partnerships in research.

Turning to System governance, Mr. Egger noted that a paper on the roles, responsibilities, and procedures of the CGIAR’s committees and units had been circulated to the Group, and requested that any comments be directed to the CGIAR Secretariat. With regards to the IAEG, the Oversight Committee was very pleased with the conceptual orientation of the IAEG and its pragmatic approach. As well, it was felt the IAEG’s affiliation with UNDP should help to support its independence. The Committee urged the IAEG to interact with TAC and the Inter-Center Working Group on Impact Assessment to develop information systems that facilitate the continuous monitoring of progress in achieving the CGIAR’s goals.

On the future role of TAC, the Oversight Committee welcomed a more strategic emphasis, and urged TAC to give greater attention to analysis of the CGIAR’s role in the global system. The Committee emphasized the importance of an independent TAC, as well as TAC’s continued involvement in providing recommendations on programs and resource allocation. TAC’s vital role in defining the “heartland” of CGIAR research, in order that it may be protected as modified financing arrangements are implemented, was stressed.

Mr. Egger reported on the Committee’s preliminary discussion of a System Review. The Committee concluded that there was both the need and opportunity for a System Review, and that it should be broad in scope, covering the following topics: the vision and goals of the CGIAR, and their relationship to global agendas; the CGIAR’s new partnerships; boundaries between NARS-CGIAR research and public and private sector research; CGIAR governance; the structure and mode of financing research within the CGIAR; and the management of the System, including the roles and responsibilities of existing units. Further, the Committee concluded that the Review should be conducted by a small and independent panel, comprising external individuals of strong capability and stature. Mechanisms through which key CGIAR stakeholders could contribute their perspectives to the Review panel, and oversee the process, were needed. The Committee recommended the Review be launched at ICW96.

The Committee also discussed Center governance, in particular new guidelines on the role, responsibilities, and accountability of Center boards. The Committee noted that the guidelines would be supplemented by five additional papers on specific topics, and urged that all of the papers be published. Mr. Egger indicated that the Committee would monitor the composition of Center boards in cooperation with the CBC and with the assistance of the CGIAR Secretariat. The Oversight Committee appreciated the collaboration of the CBC on these concerns, Mr. Egger said.

Regarding due diligence matters, the Oversight Committee discussed the expansion of ICLARM’s activities into Egypt. It discussed the ICLARM expansion both in terms of the interaction between funding and program priorities for the System as a whole, as well as the influence of the expansion on ICLARM’s current program. It raised caution that funding opportunities should not drive the CGIAR Research
Agenda. The Committee also considered the impact of funding shortages on Center programs, particularly in terms of whether some Center programs had the minimum critical mass of scientists necessary to successfully operate.

The Oversight Committee also reviewed the results of the questionnaire survey on its past and future work. Mr. Egger indicated that the responses expressed a vote of confidence in the Committee by key constituents in the CGIAR. As well, the survey identified priority areas for the Committee’s future work program, in rank order as follows:

- monitoring partnership with NARS;
- examining the effectiveness of the CGIAR’s committees and units;
- monitoring System governance;
- monitoring the implementation of the Lucerne decisions;
- examining the CGIAR’s priority setting process;
- examining the CGIAR’s budgeting and finance processes, specifically the interaction between funding and program integrity (in cooperation with the Finance Committee);
- examining the coordination of systemwide programs; and
- recommending procedures and issues for the System Review.

Turning to internal matters, Mr. Egger indicated that three members would be departing the Committee—Mr. Robert Herdt (Rockefeller Foundation); Mr. Johan Holmberg (Sweden), and Mr. Manuel Lantin (CGIAR Secretariat: formerly, The Philippines). He noted, in particular, the significant contributions to the Committee of founding members Herdt and Holmberg. The Committee requested Mr. Egger to continue to serve as Chair until the new, full Committee had assembled and had the opportunity to address the question of the chairmanship.

Messrs. Fernando Chaparro (Colombia) and Andrew Bennett (United Kingdom) and Ms. Teresa Fogelberg (The Netherlands), were nominated by the CGIAR Chairman to serve as members of the Oversight Committee.

**Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group**

IAEG Chair James Peacock reported to the Group on the activities of the IAEG since its establishment at ICW95. The IAEG, which comprises three members, was created to strengthen impact assessment and evaluation across the CGIAR System, in order to improve decisionmaking for research and resource allocation, as well as accountability to Members, increase interaction between the CGIAR and NARS, and build greater awareness outside of the CGIAR of the importance of agricultural research in establishing food security in developing countries.

The primary objective of the IAEG, Mr. Peacock said, was to assist the CGIAR in developing a culture in which evaluation is an integral component of all program activities. He elaborated the IAEG’s modified terms of reference, for approval by the Group, as follows:

- to facilitate the strengthening of the CGIAR’s *ex post* impact assessment capabilities;
- to provide guidance and oversight to impact assessment activities and recommend appropriate actions by the CGIAR and/or the Centers; and
- to ensure the design and conduct of evaluations which document the impact of the CGIAR as a System.

The main components of the IAEG workplan are: to formulate an evaluation strategy for the CGIAR, in association with TAC; to encourage the formation of effective evaluation networks throughout the CGIAR; and to foster and commission studies which assess the CGIAR System from several perspectives. The range of impact studies envisaged include: System level studies covering major programs or activities; country level studies; Center level studies; and science discipline studies.

In the short term, the IAEG plans to focus on three major activities: analyzing and assessing the quality of *ex post* impact assessment and evaluation studies conducted over the past five years in the CGIAR; conducting a training workshop on case study methodologies, as part of a replicated case study analysis.
of the impact of CGIAR programs on selected crop and forage species in a number of selected countries; and studying the impact of CGIAR programs on food production in developing countries in the last twelve to fifteen years.

Mr. Peacock highlighted several important benefits of conducting evaluations and impact assessments. Evaluations provide accountability—of particular value to Members, who need credible data to assess the quality of their investments in the CGIAR. As well, evaluations reveal deficiencies or gaps in the way research is being carried out, thus enabling the CGIAR to target areas requiring improvement and to strengthen its capacity. Additionally, impact studies provide the information needed to better describe what the CGIAR has contributed to developing countries through its research, thereby helping to raise the profile of the CGIAR in the external environment.

The IAEG intends to work with the Centers and TAC, and especially the Inter-Center Working Group for Impact Assessment and Evaluation, to improve the quality of evaluation practice in the CGIAR. Mr. Peacock noted that the Centers already have significant expertise in evaluation.

The IAEG held its first workshop in April 1996 in The Hague, The Netherlands. The workshop enabled the IAEG to establish a rapport with the Centers, as well as with some Members and NARS, and gave participants the opportunity to provide feedback on the IAEG’s proposed workplan. The workshop brought together evaluation experts from outside the field of agricultural research to discuss various technologies that might be of use in evaluating the CGIAR’s work. The dialogue with external experts is expected to continue.

Mr. Peacock said the IAEG would provide a more detailed report to the Group at ICW96.

Discussion

The Group commended the IAEG for the progress it had made over a relatively short period of time in defining and implementing its work program. The IAEG was praised for its participatory approach to the development of an evaluation system for the CGIAR. As well, a number of Members commented on the excellent workshop held by the IAEG, which resulted in a valuable dialogue between the IAEG and key constituencies in the CGIAR.

Several Members pointed to the vast amount of data being generated by sources outside of the CGIAR, and encouraged the IAEG to establish linkages with these sources wherever possible. The IAEG was urged to build on the relevant information collected in the CGIAR over the years, which was considered substantial.

The need to harmonize the evaluation methodologies used by Centers was emphasized, in order to have consistent practices across the System that offer a sound basis for comparison.

The Group noted that the IAEG studies would relate impact to the CGIAR’s overarching goals of food security, poverty alleviation, and resource conservation. The difficulty of conducting ex post evaluations without appropriate planning ex ante was mentioned. It was pointed out that the impact of CGIAR research on the overarching goals must be projected ex ante in order to effectively conduct ex post evaluations of the success in achieving those goals.

A suggestion was made that the IAEG studies be focused on areas of activity, so that it would be clear what contributions the CGIAR has made, for example, to biodiversity, strengthening NARS, or germplasm enhancement. Another intervention recommended that the studies focus on productivity, rather than on supply.

Several interventions recommended an increased emphasis by the IAEG on strengthening the evaluation capability of Centers over commissioning independent evaluation studies, although both activities were recognized as being of importance.

The IAEG was requested to use the same language when referring to the CGIAR’s overarching goals—poverty alleviation, food security, and protection of the environment—as found in other CGIAR documents, in order to ensure a uniform approach and prevent possible differences in interpretation. Specifically, the IAEG was urged to use the terminology protection of the environment, rather than sustainability of the production system environment.

The interest of Centers in further workshops detailing the technologies discussed in the initial workshop, and how they might be used to strengthen the evaluation studies that the CGIAR carries out, was noted.
The relevance of the IAEG's work to NARS, and the importance of NARS building an evaluation component into the design and execution of their own projects, was mentioned. As well, it was pointed out that the CGIAR would use baseline data provided by NARS in its own analyses.

TAC's interactions with the IAEG on various issues, particularly the development of the project format so that Center project descriptions contain information that is required for effective impact assessment, were noted.

Conclusion

The Group welcomed the reports of the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, the Oversight Committee, and the Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group.

The Group endorsed the decision by the ICLARM board to accept the Egyptian Government's offer of its facility at Abassa. ICLARM was advised to take note of the reservations, in terms of programs and modes of financing, expressed during the Ad Hoc Committee's discussion.

The Group also approved a System Review, to be commissioned and monitored by a committee of stakeholders, and conducted in 1997 by an independent team. It was agreed that the Oversight Committee would assist in the detailed arrangements, and that the Review would be forward looking.

The Group adopted, with minor amendments, a paper on the role, responsibilities, and accountability of Center boards.

The Group approved the appointments of Messrs. Chaparro and Bennett and Ms. Fogelberg to the Oversight Committee.

The Group expressed its full support of the IAEG's planned program, and endorsed its modified terms of reference.

V. FUTURE CGIAR MEETINGS

Plans for 25th Anniversary Commemoration

The Group discussed a draft proposal, prepared by the CGIAR Secretariat, outlining plans for a commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the CGIAR in conjunction with ICW96. The Chairman emphasized that the draft proposal was a working document, based on suggestions received to date, and that planning for the commemoration would continue to be an open, consultative process. Additional suggestions from the Group, he said, would be most welcome.

As currently envisaged, ICW96 would comprise four events—a Day of Commemoration, a Centers Forum, a Global Forum, and a Business Meeting—taking place over the course of one week. This structure would enable the objectives for ICW96 to be successfully met, namely, to commemorate the past, to honor the founders of the Group, to look ahead with a focus on future challenges and opportunities, to give visibility to the Centers, to convene the Global Forum as an integral part of ICW96, and to allocate adequate time for business discussions.

The Chairman announced his intention to launch the Chairman's Science Awards as part of the 25th anniversary commemoration, to honor special achievement in the following categories:

- outstanding nationally recruited scientist working at a Center, to showcase the contribution of locally recruited scientists to the CGIAR;
- outstanding scientific partnership between CGIAR scientists and NARS scientists, to honor excellence in collaboration; and
- promising young scientist working at a Center, to focus on growth and promise in terms of potential impact.

Conclusion

The proposed program for the commemoration of the CGIAR's 25th anniversary at ICW96 was adopted by the Group, with the understanding that Members could submit additional comments and suggestions to the CGIAR Secretariat.

The Chairman requested the CGIAR Secretariat to prepare a revised proposal for the commemoration, taking into consideration the comments and suggestions received from within the CGIAR System.
The Group reconfirmed the following dates of future CGIAR meetings:

**1996**
- International Centers Week
  - October 28 - November 2
  - Washington, DC, USA

**1997**
- Mid-Term Meeting
  - May 26 - 30
  - Egypt
- International Centers Week
  - October 27 - 31
  - Washington, DC, USA

**1998**
- Mid-Term Meeting
  - May 25 - 29
  - Location to be determined
- International Centers Week
  - October 26 - 30
  - Washington, DC, USA

### VI. OTHER BUSINESS

#### Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization Committee

PARC Chair Per Pinstrup-Andersen reported to the Group on PARC's recent activities, including initiatives in Spain, Germany, the United States, and Canada, and plans to develop strategies for public awareness in a number of other countries, including Japan, over the next several months. He mentioned PARC's joint efforts with the PAA to mount CGIAR exhibits at various international conferences, as well as current discussions with FAO regarding possible public awareness activities at the World Food Summit.

In order to help Centers strengthen their public awareness efforts and capacity, PARC is conducting a review of public awareness capabilities in the System. As well, PARC supports training of Center staff on how to interact with the news media. Current plans for training programs target Center Directors, Center Information Officers, and others.

Mr. Pinstrup-Andersen reported on “Gardening for Food Around the World,” a joint World Bank-Disney exhibit, which opened in April at the Epcot Center in Walt Disney World, Orlando, Florida with CGIAR participation. The CGIAR, the World Bank, and Disney collaborated to transform part of the Epcot site into three displays of smallholder farms from Africa, Asia, and Latin America, showcasing traditional crops and improved farming techniques and varieties.

Critical to the success of the exhibit, Mr. Pinstrup-Andersen said, was the participation of eight interns from CGIAR Centers who manned the exhibit and spoke to thousands of visitors about the importance of agricultural research for the future of humankind. As well, the stories generated by this exhibit have been distributed worldwide, through news agencies such as the BBC World Service, Voice of America, the German Press Agency, the Associated Press, and various newspapers. The experience, he said, was also an excellent training opportunity for the interns, who would return to the Centers when the exhibit closes.

#### Proposal for a Public Awareness Campaign

A proposal for a public awareness strategy to promote the essential role of agricultural research in general and the CGIAR in particular in achieving poverty eradication and sustainable use of natural resources was presented to the Group by Mr. Julian Cribb, a journalist and media consultant from Australia. The proposal was initially discussed by PARC at ICW95, and subsequently further refined and discussed by PARC, the PAA, the CDC, and the CBC. It has received the endorsement of PARC, the PAA, and the CDC.

Mr. Cribb elaborated the four goals of the strategy as follows:

- to raise global awareness of the importance of international agricultural research and of the necessity to increase it;
- to persuade the world’s most influential people to lend public support to the CGIAR and its scientists;

---

5 ICARDA provided two interns. CIFFOR, CIMMYT, CIP, ICRISAT, IITA, and IRRI each provided one intern.
• to increase the attention of the world media on food issues and on the role of international agricultural research; and
• to expand the circle of investors in international agricultural research in both the public and private sectors.

The basis of the strategy, Mr. Cribb said, is not to promote international agricultural research per se, but rather to promote what it stands for, in terms of the issues of greatest importance to the general public, namely, peace and political stability, economic growth and employment, sustainable use of the Earth's resources, better health and nutrition, and, ultimately, the solution to the human population problem, through raising living standards and abolishing poverty.

The strategy envisaged calls for a three-phased approach. First, the commissioning of studies from five of the world's most authoritative institutions, to underline the contributions of international agricultural research to peace, growth, sustainability, health, and population, respectively. Second, seeking a letter of support for the goals of international agricultural research from one hundred of the most influential people in the world, who would serve as the CGIAR's "ambassadors." Third, building a cadre of senior Center scientists to provide expert advice and commentary to the media on current issues related to global food security and the environment.

Additionally, the proposal calls for the development of a clearly defined public image for the CGIAR, based on a copyrighted brand name, which provides a single image and strong sense of identity for international agricultural research to the general public.

Discussion

Several interventions were made in support of a deliberate and professional public awareness effort to increase the resources available to the CGIAR System. As well, several Members expressed a willingness to make a contribution toward the implementation of the proposal for a public awareness campaign, should it be accepted by the Group.

The proposed campaign's strategy to generate increased support for the CGIAR through a broader focus on international agricultural research in general was praised.

It was pointed out by several Members that public awareness approaches must be adapted to the various constituencies being targeted, given that different parts of the world may not respond to the same message, and messages that are appropriate in one part of the world may not necessarily be appropriate in another.

A recommendation was made that a competition be held for a brand name for the CGIAR. The analogy of the World Bank as the brand name for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was used to illustrate the need for the CGIAR to have a name which is easily recognizable by the public.

Questions were raised as to how the proposed public awareness campaign would be targeted so that it would effectively influence decisionmakers, and how the proposed campaign could be used by Members in their efforts to promote the CGIAR within their own institutions.

Conclusion

The Chairman highlighted the main points of the discussion, and indicated that there was a general consensus among the Group that the CGIAR should be moving in the directions recommended by PARC. PARC was requested to further refine the budget and timing of the proposed public awareness campaign, for consideration by the Finance Committee, before a determination is made by the Group on how to evolve a more systematic approach to public awareness. As well, the broad CGIAR community was encouraged to submit suggestions of possible brand names.

VII. CHAIRMAN'S SUMMATION

Introduction

We have come to the end of another MTM and, in doing so, have positioned ourselves to seek new avenues of effort and achievement in the next quarter century of the CGIAR. The past few days have fluctuated between exhilaration and despair. We have wanted to soar toward 1997 and beyond, but were pulled back by the unfinished business of 1996. We have been able to overcome the worst of the crisis. Our collective commitment has prevailed.
An end-of-meeting report will provide you with a preliminary account of all decisions reached at MTM96. The fuller *Summary of Proceedings and Decisions* will be published by the Secretariat shortly. Let me, therefore, take you through just the highlights of our discourse, reaffirming our common agreement on how we should face the future.

**The 1996 Research Agenda**

At MTM95, the Group fully endorsed a Research Agenda for 1996, on the basis of recommendations from TAC. Also at MTM95, the Group adopted a figure of some $300 million as the amount required to implement the Agreed Agenda. By ICW95, around two-thirds of this amount had already been pledged. That was a much higher rate of pledging than experienced before, within the same time frame. Clearly, everything was in place for full funding and early disbursements. These hopes were not matched by subsequent actions. At MTM96, we learned of a shortfall, estimated by optimists at 6 percent of the total and by pessimists at 10 percent or more.

How did the promise of 1995 turn into the fears of 1996? The explanation lies primarily in the fact that, while the Agreed Agenda was underfunded by some $20 million, the non-agenda budget was some $47 million. In the immortal words of Yogi Berra, "This is *deja vu* all over again."

This is not a time for blame. This is a time to acknowledge that the birth pangs of a new order are never painless. It is a time to acknowledge that moving from the old to the new is not done in one fell swoop—or in a series of endless steps. In the last three days, the entire CGIAR family came together, not just to ensure the integrity of the Agenda, but also the integrity of the Centers most hard hit. Watching people working throughout the night and, in fact, until just a few moments before our session opened today, it was obvious that what we are about is shared caring and commitment.

Our special thanks to Denmark for its generosity, to Japan, to others who all pulled their weight, to the Finance Committee, TAC, the Secretariat, and the Centers, who have found a way out of the crisis. With some 40 percent of what was outside the Agenda reclassified, leaving another $27 million still outside, it is clear that most of the Agreed Agenda will be funded, and that changes at the margin do not invalidate the thrust of our work. The $300 million is reached and the full funding of the World Bank in 1996 is fully justified. No World Bank funds will be returned in 1996. This outcome is encouraging. Some Centers will still feel pain, but their absolute minimum requirements have been met.

**Toward 1997**

TAC's presentation of priorities and strategies was the backdrop to our consideration and adoption of the 1997 Research Agenda. TAC takes a poverty oriented approach, seeking to pull together productivity related activities and natural resource management programs that contribute to poverty alleviation. TAC has followed the dictum of our good and dear friend M. S. Swaminathan that good policies are "pro-poor, pro-women, and pro-environment."

TAC's proposals provide the framework for the 1997 Research Agenda and for a programmatic overview of medium-term planning by the Centers. TAC has given us a solid product, in which conclusions are based on sophisticated analysis and the process is characterized by transparency. The real issue now is how effectively the principles articulated by TAC and endorsed here can be implemented. The first test will be the 1997 Agenda. We are, above all, a Group that concerns itself with exploration and learning. So we must learn the lessons of 1996 as we move to confront the opportunities of 1997.

The TAC-approved 1997 Agenda has been adopted and with a notional budget target of $300 million. I have proposed that we adopt a different mental outlook toward the 1997 Agenda, making arrangements to ensure that a system of positive incentives encourages flexibility and entrepreneurship. My proposals were described in detail in my opening statement. Additional suggestions have been made by some of you, and the Finance Committee has been reflecting these views and is moving us steadily toward a new approach with greater clarity and enhanced institutional strength.

Let me emphasize that these proposed changes, fully articulated and discussed here, do *not* threaten the System and *do* encourage faddish funding. The agreed priorities will continue to guide us. The Agreed Agenda will remain paramount. The proposed changes do encourage entrepreneurship, flexibility, transparency, and accountability. They *do* encourage decentralization. They *do* vest the main responsibility for resource mobilization in the Centers.
I expect, as well, that through the system of competitive grants I have proposed, we will continue to unleash the best in us—and we will specially recognize the best when we celebrate our 25th anniversary at ICW96, and find ways of encouraging our scientific talent, especially young scientists and those in developing countries, who really represent the future.

ICW96

We move on now to ICW96. Details of the planned 25th anniversary program are spelt out in the Secretariat’s note, which you have all received. We will honor the founders of the CGIAR and stalwarts on whose works the reputation of the CGIAR is based. As an incentive to young scientists, we will launch the Chairman’s Science Awards. They will honor special achievements in these categories:

- outstanding nationally recruited scientist working at a Center;
- outstanding partnership between Center and NARS scientists; and
- promising young scientist working at a Center.

And most important, perhaps, we will integrate a Global Forum within ICW96. In our preparations for the Global Forum, we will recognize the regional fora and regional organizations. The NGO voice will be well presented in these preparations and at ICW96 and related events. The private sector dialogue will be similarly pursued and enhanced.

While we celebrate our strengths and past achievements, we confront our shortcomings and dedicate ourselves to reaching out to the work of others, to learn and to improve, but above all to seek the complementarities, finding the common ground and forging the new partnerships to which we all aspire. Thus, our commemoration will not only celebrate the achievements of the past, but also the challenges of the present and the promise of the future.

Conclusion

This has been a heavy and hectic MTM, but we have emerged from it reinvigorated and rededicated. As I said in my opening statement, the tasks of renewal are never complete. We must move, and move again, to secure the gains of the present for the benefit of the future.

As we look back on the past few days, five conclusions jump at us. Keep them in mind; they say more about us than even we might realize.

First, this is today a more open, transparent, and accountable System than ever before.

Second, our relationship with a range of partners runs deep and wide. NARS, NGOs, the private sector, and more, are in creative discourse with us. Our willingness to launch a System review and to establish an Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group are symbols of our openness.

Third, our concern for the weak and the vulnerable in the human family is paramount. This was at the heart of TAC’s approach, and the Group commended TAC both for the transparency of its process and for honestly pointing out that there is a point at which analysis ends and judgment begins.

Fourth, great strides have been made not only in what we do, but how we do it.

Fifth, we are not just a collection of 16 Centers and 52 Members. We are truly a system in which the whole is more than the sum of the parts. At this time of crisis, we all pulled together, pulling ourselves out of despair and toward hope.

The combined efforts of many contributed to the successful conclusion of this MTM. I thank you all in full measure: Members, observers, partnership committees, friends, Centers, the National Organizing Committee, interpreters, hotel staff, and colleagues from the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats. Your vitality is matched only by our commitment.

If some of you still feel the pain of transition, remember that we are working to ease the much greater pain of those whose betterment lies in our endeavors. So let us leave MTM96 rededicated to meeting the challenge of creating hope where none now exists, of creating plenty for those demeaned by poverty, and of creating a new order in which the human family and Mother Earth are in total harmony. In those endeavors lie our contribution to human progress—and to the ultimate fulfillment of a twenty-five year old vision.

Thank you, my friends. Now, on to ICW96.
Section VI
Annexes
Annex I
The MTM96 Agenda

MONDAY, MAY 20, 1996

Inauguration of New CIFOR Headquarters
Indonesia Day

TUESDAY, MAY 21, 1996

Speech by President Suharto of Indonesia at the State Palace, to formally open MTM96

Response by the CGIAR Chairman

Opening Session
i. Chairman's Opening Statement
ii. Chairman's Announcements
iii. Adoption of the Agenda (Document MTM/96/01/Rev.1)
iv. Slide Presentation: "The Renewed CGIAR Looks Ahead"

Broadening Partnerships
i. Linkages with NARS: Report from the Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum (Document MTM/96/05)
ii. Linkages with NGOs: NGO Committee Report and Work Program
iii. Linkages with the Private Sector: Private Sector Committee Report and Work Program

CGIAR Research Strategy (Document SDR/TAC:IAI/96/6.1)
i. Introduction by the TAC Chair

WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 1996

CGIAR Research Strategy continued
ii. Discussion of Recent Studies in Parallel Sessions
   a. Parallel Session I:
      - Soil and Water Aspects of Natural Resource Management Research (Documents SDR/TAC:IAI/96/2.1 and SDR/TAC:IAI/96/9)
      - Inter-Center Review of Root and Tuber Crops (Document SDR/TAC:IAI/95/25.1)
      - Strategic Study of Postharvest Technology (Document SDR/TAC:IAI/96/5)
   b. Parallel Session II:
      - Perspectives on Policy and Management Research in the CGIAR (Documents SDR/TAC:IAI/96/4.1 and SDR/TAC:IAI/95/26.1)
      - Strategic Study of Institution Strengthening Research and Service (Document SDR/TAC:IAI/95/12.1)

PARC Proposal for a Public Awareness Campaign

CGIAR Research Strategy continued
iii. CGIAR Priorities and Strategies: TAC Recommendations and Discussion
iv. Discussion of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies in Parallel Sessions
   a. Parallel Session III:
      - TAC Recommendations on Allocations to CGIAR Activities and Systemwide Programs
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b. Parallel Session IV:
   - TAC Recommendations on Allocations to Commodities and Production Sectors

c. Parallel Session V:
   - Complementarities between CGIAR and NARS Priorities

v. Discussion of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies in Plenary

**CGIAR Financing Arrangements**

**CGIAR Collaboration with Eastern Europe and Countries of the Former Soviet Union: Report of the CGIAR Task Force on Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union**

**THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1996**

**CGIAR Research Strategy continued**

vi. Reports from Parallel Sessions and Discussion

**CGIAR 1997 Research Agenda**

i. 1997 Research Agenda (Document SDR/TAC: IAR/96/8)

ii. 1997 Funding Requirements (Document MTM/96/10)

**Meetings of CGIAR Committees**

i. **Ad Hoc Committee on CGIAR Governance**
   - Progress Report on ICLARM
   - Guidelines on the Role, Responsibilities, and Accountability of Center Boards (Document MTM/96/06)

ii. Oversight Committee

iii. Finance Committee

**Reports from Ad Hoc and Standing Committees**

i. **Ad Hoc Committee on CGIAR Governance**

ii. Finance Committee

iii. Technical Advisory Committee

iv. Genetic Resources Policy Committee (Documents MTM/96/07, MTM/96/08, and MTM/96/09)

v. Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group

**FRIDAY, MAY 24, 1996**

**Reports from Ad Hoc and Standing Committees continued**

ii. Finance Committee continued

iv. Genetic Resources Policy Committee continued

vi. Oversight Committee

**Future CGIAR Meetings**

i. Plans for CGIAR 25th Anniversary Commemoration

ii. Confirmation of Future Meeting Dates

**Other Business**

i. PARC Report

ii. Report on World Bank-Disney Project

iii. Slide Presentation: “Gardening for Food Around the World”

**Closing Session**

i. Chairman’s Summation
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Joachim Voss  
Research Manager  
John Graham  
Regional Program Officer

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)  
Abdelmajid Slama  
Director  
Technical Advisory Division  
Shantanu Mathur  
Technical Advisor  
B. Müller-Haye  
Consultant  
John Russell  
Consultant
Italy
Gioacchino Carabba
Expert in Agriculture
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Japan
Kunio Nakamura
Assistant Director
Multilateral Cooperation Division
Economic Cooperation Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Nobuhiko Kaho
Assistant Director
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
Nobuyoshi Maeno
Deputy Director General
JIRCAS
Masahito Sato
Head
International Relations Section
JIRCAS

Kenya
Cyrus Ndiritu
Director
Kenyan Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)
Jacob A. Odondi
Assistant Director of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture

Luxembourg
Georges Heinen
Government Advisor
Ministry of Finance

The Netherlands
Hans Slot
Research Programme
Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Development Cooperation
Marjolijn F. van Deelen
Project officer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Cornelis L. J. van der Meer
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management, and Fisheries

Norway
Marta Faerevaag Huelle
Executive Officer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ruth Haug
Associate Professor
Section Head, Food Security, and Biotechnology
Norwegian Center for International Agricultural Development (NORAGRIC)

The Philippines
William D. Dar
Executive Director
Philippines Council for Agriculture, Forestry, and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD)

Rockefeller Foundation
Robert W. Herdt
Director for Agricultural Sciences
John C. O'Toole
Senior Scientist

Spain
Eloy Ramos
Deputy Director General
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Agrarias y Alimentarias (INIA)

Sweden
Carl-Gustaf Thornström
Head of Section
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

Switzerland
Paul A. Egger
Head
Agricultural Service
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
Jurg S. Benz
Deputy Head
SDC

United Kingdom
Ian Haines
Deputy Chief Natural Resources Adviser
Overseas Development Administration (ODA)
Robert Carlisle
Natural Resources and Research Department
ODA
Roger W. Smith
Chairman
Burotrop
ODA

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**
Timothy S. Rothermel
Director
Division for Global and Interregional Programmes
Chinwe M. Dike
Project Management Officer
C. Jan Kamp
Resident Representative
Fritz H. Loebus
Deputy Resident Representative
Rusdi Rasjid
Program Manager

**United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)**
Carlos Zulberti
Chief
Corporate Planning Accountability Service

**United States**
John V. Lewis
Director
Office of Agriculture and Food Security
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support, and Research
U. S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
William F. Sugrue
Director
Office of Environment and Natural Resources
USAID
Robert Bertram
CGIAR Program Coordinator
Office of Agriculture and Food Security
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support, and Research
USAID
Dana Dalrymple
Research Adviser
Office of Agriculture and Food Security
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support, and Research
USAID

**World Bank**
Michel J. Petit
Director
Agricultural Research and Extension Group, Environmentally Sustainable Development (ESDAR)
Russell Freed
Adviser
ESDAR
Uma Lele
Adviser
ESDAR
Henri Rouille d'Orfeuil
Adviser
ESDAR

**Representing Africa (Ghana and Zimbabwe)**
Japhet Christian Norman
Deputy Director General
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR)
Accra, Ghana
Ntombana Regina Gata
Director
Research and Specialist Services
Ministry of Agriculture
Harare, Zimbabwe

**Representing Asia and the Pacific (Malaysia and Nepal)**
Saharan Haji Anang
Deputy Director General
Malaysian Agricultural Research and Development Institute (MARDI)
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Jagadish Chandra Gautam
Executive Director
Nepal Agricultural Research Council (NARC)
Kathmandu, Nepal

**Representing Europe (The Czech Republic and Estonia)**
Josef Vlk
Head of Department
Czech Agrarian Chamber
The Czech Republic
Toivo Palm
Head of Department
Estonian Ministry of Agriculture
Tallinn, Estonia
Representing Latin America and The Caribbean (Chile and El Salvador)
Gonzalo Andres Jordan
Executive Director
Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias (INIA)
Santiago, Chile
Francisco R. Arias
Executive Director
Center of Agricultural Technology (CENTA)
Ministry of Agriculture
San Andres, El Salvador

Representing the Middle East and North Africa (Egypt and Iran)
Ali Ahoonmanesh
Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Education and Extension
Ministry of Agriculture
Teheran, Iran

ADVISORY BODIES AND PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEES
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Donald L. Winkelmann
Chair
Sir Ralph Riley
Member
Lucia de Vaccaro
Member

TAC Secretariat
Shellemiah Okoth Keya
Executive Secretary
Guido Gryseels
Deputy Executive Secretary

Impact Assessment and Evaluation Group (IAEG)
W. James Peacock
Chair
Eugenia T. Muchnik
Member
E. Tim Healy
Operations Manager

NGO Committee
Ambassador Robert Blake
Co-Chair
Miguel Altieri
Member
Kamla Chowdhry
Member
Bernd V. Dreesmann
Member
Jeffrey A. McNeely
Member
Didier Pillot
Member
Ranil Senanayake
Member

Private Sector Committee
Sam Dryden
Member
Claudio Barriga
Representing Alejandro Rodriguez, Co-Chair

CGIAR SECRETARIAT
Alexander von der Osten
Executive Secretary
Ernest Corea
Senior Information Officer
William Grundy
Conferences Officer
Ingrid Hagen
Conference Assistant
Frona Hall
Conferences Officer
Manuel Lantin
Science Adviser
Gordon B. MacNett
Senior Finance Officer
Heidi Marinaccio-Opet
Consultant
Selçuk Özgediz
Management Adviser
Ravi Tadvalkar
Principal Finance Officer
Heinrich von Loesch
Information Adviser
INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)
Robert D. Havener
Chair
Grant M. Scobie
Director General
Jacqueline Ashby
Director for Research, Natural Resources

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Bo Bengtsson
Chair
Jeffrey Sayer
Director General
R. Neil Byron
Assistant Director General
D. Dykstra
Deputy Director General, Research
N. MacDonald
Deputy Director General, Administration
J. Turnbull
Chief Scientist

Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT)
Timothy G. Reeves
Director General
Prabhu Pingali
Director
Economics Program

Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP)
Martha ter Kuile
Chair
Hubert G. Zandstra
Director General
Peter Gregory
Deputy Director General
Edward W. Sulzberger
Senior Adviser

International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)
Alfred Bronnimann
Chair
Adel El-Beltagy
Director General

International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM)
John L. Dillon
Chair
Meryl J. Williams
Director General
Marion Fuchs-Carsch
Director, External Relations
Modadugu V. Gupta
Director, International Relations
Maria Angelina Agulto
Assistant, External Relations

International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF)
Pedro A. Sanchez
Director General
R. Bruce Scott
Deputy Director General
Michael Klass
Director of Finance and Administration
Dennis P. Garrity
Regional Coordinator
David E. Thomas
Senior Policy Analyst
Thomas P. Tomich
Senior Natural Resource Economist

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)
Hans J. von Maydell
Chair
James G. Ryan
Director General
Jugu John Abraham
Head, Donor Relations

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Per Pinstrup-Andersen
Director General

International Irrigation Management Institute (IIMI)
Leslie D. Swindale
Chair
David W. Seckler
Director General
Randolph Barker
Director, National and Special Programs
Sharmini Blok
Assistant Officer
Donor Relations and Project Development

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
Pierre L. Dubreuil
Chair
Lukas Brader
Director General
Jennifer Cramer
Assistant to Director General

International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
Neville P. Clarke
Chair
Hank Fitzhugh
Director General
Ralph von Kaufmann
Director for External Relations

International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)
Wanda Collins
Chair
Geoffrey C. Hawtin
Director General
Kenneth Riley
Regional Director, Asia, the Pacific, and Oceania
Basil Been
Chair
COGENT Steering Committee
Pons Batugal
COGENT Coordinator
Emile Frison
Director
International Network for the Improvement of Banana and Plantain (INIBAP)
Ramón Valmayor
Regional Coordinator
INIBAP

International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)
George H. L. Rothschild
Director General
Paul Teng
Officer (Senior)

International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR)
Howard Elliott
Deputy Director General

West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA)
Just Faaland
Chair
Eugene R. Terry
Director General

OBSEVERS
Morocco
Abdelaziz Arifi
Director
Institut National de Recherche Agronomique (INRA)

New Zealand
Mary H. A. Bryant
Senior Policy Officer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

South Africa
M. C. Walters
Director
Plant Protection Research Institute
Agriculture Research Council

Sri Lanka
Nimal Ranaweera
Additional Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, and Forestry

NARS PARTNERS
Suree Bhumibhamon
Faculty of Forestry (KUFF)
University of Kasetsart
Thailand
Mahmud Ayed Duwayri
Vice President
Jordan University of Science and Technology
Jordan
Rafael D. Guerrero III
Executive Director
Philippine Council for Aquatic and Marine Research and Development (PCAMRD)
The Philippines
Jaimé Tola Cevallos  
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Agropecuarios (INIAP)  
Ecuador

Aline Mary Kemerwa  
Two Wings Agroforestry Network  
Uganda

 Ndiga Mbaye  
Conference des Responsables de Recherche Agricole en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre (COR4F)  
Senegal

Geoffrey C. Mrema  
Executive Secretary  
Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa (ASARECA)  
Uganda

Joseph Mukiibi  
Director General  
National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO)  
Uganda

B. J. Ndunguru  
Director  
Southern Africa Center for Cooperation in Agricultural Research and Training (SACCAR)  
Botswana

NON-CGIAR CENTER PARTICIPANTS

Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center (AVRDC)  
Samson C. S. Tsou  
Director General  
Paul M. H. Sun  
Vice Chairman

Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI)  
Samsundar Parasram  
Director  
Research and Program

International Board for Soil Research and Management (IBSRAM)  
Eric T. Craswell  
Director General

Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Programme (TSBF)  
Michael J. Swift  
Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

George Allen  
Consultant  
Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization Committee (PARC)

Julian Cribb  
Member  
Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization Committee (PARC)

Nikhil Dehejia  
Program Coordinator  
Committee on Agricultural Sustainability for Developing Countries

Michel de Nure de Lamothe  
Director General  
Centre de Cooperation Internationale et Recherche Agronomique pour le Development (CIRAD)

Hilary Sims Feldstein  
Program Leader  
CGIAR Gender Program

Mike Foale  
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO)

Kellie Gutman  
Audio/Visual Consultant

Richard Gutman  
Audio/Visual Consultant

Tiffin Harris  
Chair  
Public Awareness Association (PAA)

Klaus Lampe  
Consultant

Abdul Karim Lodhi  
World Bank Executive Director
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**Annex IV**

The Agenda of the Preparatory Meeting for the Global Forum

**MAY 17, 1996**

**Opening Session**
1. Welcome Remarks: Abdelmajid Slama, IFAD
2. Introductory Remarks of Meeting Chair: William D. Dar, Asia-Pacific (APAARI)

**Session I: NARS Perspectives Emerging from Regional Fora**
1. Remarks of Session Chair: Abdelaziz Arifi, WANA (AARINENA)
2. West Asia and North Africa (WANA) Region: AARINENA presentation followed by discussion
3. Pan Africa Region: ASARECA, SACCAR, CORAF/INSAH presentation followed by discussion
4. Asia and the Pacific Region: APAARI presentation followed by discussion
5. Latin America and Caribbean Region: PROCIs and CARDI presentation followed by discussion
6. Comments by NARS Stakeholders: universities, NGOs, private sector, representatives of forestry and fisheries
7. General Discussion and Comments from Other Participants

**Session II (a): Research Strategies and Priorities**
1. Remarks of Session Chair: Joseph K. Mukiibi, Pan Africa (ASARECA)
2. Presentation on the CGIAR’s Research Strategies and Priorities: Donald Winkelmann, TAC Chair
3. Comments from Representatives of Regional Fora
4. Observations on the Priority Setting Process
5. General Discussion and Comments from Other Participants

**Session II (b): Panel - Conclusions of Fora on NARS-CGIAR Collaboration**
1. Remarks of Session Chair: B. J. Ndunguru, Pan Africa (SACCAR)
2. Conclusions of Panel Members
3. General Discussion and Comments from Other Participants

**MAY 18, 1996**

**Session III (a): Global Partnerships**
1. Remarks of Session Chair: Jaime Tola-Cevallos, Latin America and Caribbean
2. Remarks by the CGIAR Chair: Ismail Serageldin
3. General Discussion and Comments by Participants

**Session III (b): Panel - Future of Regional Fora and Organizations**
1. Remarks of Session Chair: Fernando Chaparro, Latin America and Caribbean
2. Panel Presentations:
   a. Purposes and Organization of Future Regional Fora and Organizations
   b. Operational Concerns of Regional Fora and Organizations
   c. General Discussion and Comments by Participants

**Session IV: Agenda for the Global Forum and Conclusions**
1. Remarks of Meeting Chair: William D. Dar
2. Presentation: Tentative Agenda and Plans for the Global Forum
3. Remarks by Abdelmajid Slama (IFAD) and Michel Petit (World Bank)
4. General Discussion and Comments by Participants
5. Closing Summation of the Consensus Reached: William D. Dar