From: The Secretariat

October 1, 1987

Consultative Group Meeting

May 18-22, 1987

Montpellier, France

MAIN CONCLUSIONS REACHED AND DECISIONS TAKEN

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) held a mid-term business meeting from May 18-22, 1987 in Montpellier, France. The attached paper contains a summary of the main conclusions reached and decisions taken at the meeting.

The secretariat will make available on request a transcript of the proceedings of the Montpellier meetings on microfiche.

Attachments

Distribution

CGIAR Members
TAC Chairman, Secretariat, and Members
Center Board Chairpersons
Center Directors
Other Participants
Observers
1. A mid-term meeting of the Consultative Group was held at the invitation of the French Government in Montpellier from May 18-22, 1987. A list of participants is contained in Appendix I.

2. On May 18 and 19 the French scientific community, AGROPOLIS, presented a program of seminars and colloquia, including visits to nearby research stations. At the close of the first day of the business meeting the Group was addressed by Messrs. Aurillac and Valade (Ministers of Cooperation, and Research and Higher Education of France, respectively). Their speeches are attached as Appendix II.

Chairmanship of the CGIAR

3. During the Chairman's opening remarks, Mr. S. Shahid Husain announced that his new duties as Vice President of the Latin American Region of the World Bank would require him to relinquish chairmanship of the CGIAR effective June 1st. He announced that the reorganization of the World Bank had made it impossible for the Bank to consult widely with the donors—as was its habit—prior to a succession in the chairmanship. The Bank, therefore, was appointing Dr. W. David Hopper, one of the four Senior Vice Presidents of the Bank, as interim Chairman of the CGIAR. Dr. Hopper, who is well known to the Group, would chair the October 1987 meetings of the Group. During the meeting a presentation of the text of a scroll was made to Mr. Husain by Dr. Nyle Brady.

4. In view of the above, and since Mr. Husain had to return to Washington at the conclusion of the first day of the business meeting, it was agreed that following his departure, the cosponsors would take turns chairing the remainder of the meetings. Mr. Husain's opening speech is contained in Appendix III.

Paper by Drs. E. Schuh and S. Bharghouti - Agenda Item 4

5. Dr. Schuh presented the paper entitled "Meeting the Challenge of Diversification out of Rice Production in Asia: Towards a Research Agenda".

6. The paper emphasized that the gains of the green revolution in rice in Asia would not be consolidated unless the second generation problems of diversification away from rice were solved. It said that to anticipate the needs for such diversification, increased research efforts were needed to identify the comparative advantages of producing vegetables, fruits, livestock and fodder, both nationally and throughout the region as a whole. Not only has new technology to be developed to increase rice
productivity, but new technical research must be carried out on those crops which could replace it. Dr. Schuh concluded his presentation by asking whether the CGIAR system could help to meet this challenge.

7. A lively discussion of the paper brought out three main points:

(a) Diversification will be inhibited by small subsistence farmers' need for food supply security;

(b) Regional balances will play an important role. For example, Malaysia has decided on 65-70% rice self sufficiency. It can purchase the balance cheaply from Thailand using revenue from export crops, which have a comparative advantage;

(c) Concern was expressed that this kind of theme supports those who maintain that there are already sufficient funds going into rice research. On the other hand, some speakers cautioned that since rice is the main fuel of the development engine in Asia, its supply should not be jeopardized by policies and funding geared towards diversification.

8. Some speakers urged that the CGIAR (IRRI in the case of rice in Asia) was in a good position to have a global and regional overview and could therefore be an instrument for policy guidance in this area. Others, however, felt there were increasingly complex policy considerations.

9. In summing up, Dr. Schuh acknowledged the usefulness of the points made. He expressed his belief that a cross commodity regional study would provide a good basis for guidance on policies and planning, and voiced his concern that it would be dangerous for the CGIAR system to treat the issue of diversification of commodities too lightly.

Report by TAC Chairman on 41st Meeting - Agenda Item 5

10. Professor Guy Camus, TAC Chairman, reported on TAC activities since ICW 1986. He expressed the belief that the new working procedures in the form of the three continuing sub-committees (CSC) were making good progress. Each had met at least twice outside normal TAC meetings.

(a) CSC I has developed some general principles and preliminary ideas on how to improve the sharing of responsibilities between the thirteen centers and to reduce any unnecessary overlap in the activities. It has also gathered ideas on the sharing of responsibilities with NARS and collaboration between IARC's and advanced institutions which are most located in the developed countries.

(b) CSC II, after analyzing the importance of trees and shrubs, has proposed the preparation of a comprehensive paper
integrating all aspects of sustainability in production systems. TAC has agreed to this approach and it is hoped that a substantive paper would be ready for ICW 1987.

(c) CSG III has reviewed and made proposals to TAC with regard to mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of CGIAR priorities, assessing the adequacy of current mechanisms, and measuring the impact of CGIAR activities and priority setting on an ongoing basis. TAC has endorsed these proposals and a paper was scheduled for discussion later on the agenda.

11. Professor Camus reported that IFPRI and ISNAR have presented medium-term plans and budgets along the lines of the proposed resource allocation process. These have given TAC an opportunity to gain insight into centers’ perceptions of their programs and activities. It was also apparent that more uniform definitions of the kinds and dimensions of center activities were needed in order to ensure increased transparency of these activities and comparability between centers.

12. An ad hoc working group of TAC members and center representatives met in February 1987 and endorsed TAC’s suggestion for an inter center working group on plant genetic resources. The ad hoc group enumerated many genetic resource issues for consideration by the working group. Center directors have since endorsed this proposal.

13. Professor Camus then reported progress on new initiatives being considered by CGIAR:

(a) Vegetables. TAC feels more work is required to determine on which species a particular CGIAR effort should focus. TAC concurs with a Winrock recommendation that the program be organized as a research network, but feels some inhouse research capacity is desirable. Further information is needed on national program capacities and priorities. TAC expects to present a formal proposal to the CGIAR in May 1988.

(b) Aquaculture. Primary conclusions are that tilapia, carp, and catfish should be priorities with nutrition, genetics, reproduction, and diseases as the main thrusts, supplemented by socioeconomic research. A networking activity across these priority areas, coupled with a small inhouse research capacity was considered the best organizational format. More information on potential collaboration and national program priorities is required before a formal proposal can be presented.

14. Professor Camus reported that the IRRI External Program Review had been completed and that the report as well as the TAC commentary would be
available at ICW 1987. He added that CIMMYT and ICARDA were due for review in early 1988. With regard to the ILCA EPR, final commentary on the report was pending. In the meantime, ILCA has presented a draft strategy paper and TAC has endorsed its general approach. TAC would review the final document in June, and would have a final commentary on the ILCA EPR recommendations for the CGIAR in November 1987.

15. Comments from the floor highlighted the need for coordination with other efforts worldwide on sustainability, and, with centers about to lock into five-year plans, the urgent need for guidelines thereon. Canada recommended an across center workshop on sustainability, urging that it be included on TAC's agenda next June, and suggested that donors might be willing to provide supplementary funding to help run it. Dr. York responded that monitoring centers' programs for sustainability was an issue, and future EPRs would have to focus on it. Collaboration across the system and with non-CGIAR centers would be important. IRDC described an ongoing fisheries research initiative for Africa which would include a meeting in Abidjan in October on aquaculture. TAC's presence at that meeting would ensure coordination of initiatives. Members applauded the speed with which TAC had developed and activated the CSC mechanism which constituted an effective way of addressing a wide range of problems.

Report by the Chairman of the Board Chairpersons - Agenda Item 6

16. Dr. W. Tossell reported on the meeting of the board chairpersons committee, which was held in Rome in March 1987. Dr. Tossell addressed the questions raised in Group meetings during the past two years about the performance and capability of boards. Dr. Tossell noted the evolutionary character of the system and the need for boards to assume the increased responsibilities that are expected of them by strengthening their operations and effectiveness. Dr. Tossell outlined several key needs of boards: an open door policy for communication with the chairperson of the Group and possibly with the cosponsors when they are faced with hard and delicate decisions; assistance from the Group in locating good candidates for boards; good guidelines for boards—a number of which had already been prepared; strong backup from the CGIAR secretariat; a strong committee of board chairpersons—and here Dr. Tossell stated that this group was working very effectively as a self-help system in the area of board improvement; an open and supportive relationship between the group of center directors and the committee of board chairpersons; good communication between TAC and the committee of board chairpersons to bring the board perspective into TAC considerations, and to have good communication with TAC about the timing and arrangements for external reviews.

Report by the Chairman of the Center Directors - Agenda Item 7

17. Dr. Mellor reported that the center directors have been doing some serious thinking about the basic issues confronting the system and how they, as a group, should best organize themselves to address these issues. The directors have taken some measures to increase the efficiency of their
meetings and these include: the establishment of an executive committee made up of the past, present and future chairpersons; delegation of the discussion of some items on the center directors' agenda to a group made up of their deputys; and the commencement of a series of meetings, attended only by the directors themselves, focusing on fundamental issues. In addition, the directors have met, for the first time, with the cosponsors and hope to continue this practice in the future.

18. Center directors are in full agreement with the objective of a major expansion of the system, both in terms of funding and the number of activities supported by it. As a first step, the directors have established a publicity committee to draft a proposal for a global strategy to promote international agricultural research. The resulting draft strategy will subsequently be shared with the donors.

19. The directors are increasingly concerned about the growing complexity of the control mechanisms in the system. Center staff are worried about the demands placed on their time by the new budgeting and monitoring activities. In addition, since the directors are the most demanded spokespersons for their centers, they find themselves spending about six to seven weeks a year on system-wide activities. When this is added to the requirements for travel on center business per se, some directors result in being away from their centers for as much as 60-70% of their time.

20. The directors would like to revert to the basics of science as the driving force in setting priorities and make the national agricultural research systems (NARS) responsible for all their own activities. This would enable the centers to play a changing, adaptive, and complementary role to the NARS.

21. The ensuing discussion focussed on three issues: (1) the role of the centers in strengthening the NARS; (2) the increase in system-wide demands of the directors' time; and (3) the effects of restricted core contributions on the work of the centers.

22. Some interest was expressed in knowing how the activities of the centers related to the CGIAR's goal of strengthening NARS. Drs. Mellor and Nickel noted that strengthening NARS has always been at the forefront of the centers' objectives. The centers' training, information, and networking activities are clearly related to this goal. In addition, the system has a separate center (ISNAR) which does nothing but address this question. Mr. Husain suggested that, given the importance of this issue, the report by the chairman of the center directors at ICW 1987 should focus on the centers' efforts to strengthen NARS.

23. With regard to the growing system-wide demands on the directors' time, Mr. Husain suggested that one solution would be to redefine the responsibilities of the board chairpersons and the center directors. Another suggestion from Professor Camus was that the directors could
perhaps make it a rule to send their deputies to some inter-center meetings.

24. There was considerable discussion with regard to the the impact of the increases in the share of restricted core funding over total funding on the work of the centers. Dr. Tossell noted that increases in funding restrictions limit the ability of the centers to make strategic shifts in their programs. Dr. Mellor pointed out that the centers recognize the need to be responsive to the special circumstances of the constituencies which support them. However, in some instances, the restrictions imposed conflict with the needs expressed by the national programs. Also, the restrictions and earmarking lead to budgets less controlled or influenced by TAC, which distorts resource allocation within the system. Dr. Brady urged donors to provide as much unrestricted core funding as possible.

25. In closing this agenda item, Mr. Husain noted that this issue could not be solved during the current meeting but would be on the agendas of TAC, the center board chairpersons and the center directors for some time to come.

Collaboration between International Agricultural Research Centers and Other Scientific Institutions - Agenda Item 8

(1) International consultation on strengthening national agricultural research systems: wheat and rice research and training, volume 1

26. Following discussions on this topic in Ottawa in May 1986, an international consultation was held in Rome in January 1987. Dr. Kesseba of IFAD reported on this meeting. The central theme was the relationship between the international centers and the national agricultural research centers (NARS). During the meeting it was recognized that it would be desirable for strong NARS to take over well-defined programs previously carried out by the IARCs in their regions. Such NARS, with the support of the IARC's and the CGIAR donor community, would then provide help to other weaker NARS having similar problems.

27. Several speakers saw this devolution of activity from IARC's to NARS as a new device for reinforcing the strength of NARS, while at the same time allowing IARC's to move on to new challenges. The mechanisms for this devolution process were not yet clear, but could be elaborated in the course of the first few cases which occur. Rice and wheat were identified as prototypes. It was noted that CIMMYT was moving towards an agreement with three Latin American countries on wheat research which would serve as an initial test and would provide an opportunity to develop implementation mechanisms. Members generally recognized the cost effective potential of a country specializing in an area of research which would at the same time benefit other countries with regions of the same mega-environment. Several speakers, however, emphasized the need for caution, and stressed the need for political support from the Group with regard to the principles of
regional specialization and devolution of IARC activities. Some, including the director general of ISNAR, saw a clear role for ISNAR in developing the principle of and elaborating mechanisms for devolution and its financing. There was consensus on the potential importance of this as an initiative for the system and IFAD was congratulated for its contribution to furthering its progress.

(ii) Scientific Collaboration between European Institutions and International Agricultural Research Centers - Country and Center Reports

28. The discussion was focused around three reports. Mr. Farrar introduced the report of the work of Mr. Rudi Binsack on collaboration between IARCs and the European scientific institutions, Mr. Hulse supplied the views of CASAFA, a committee of ICSU, representing basic scientific unions, and Mr. Mohammed reported on the work of the CSC of TAC on relations of the IARCs with scientific institutions. Comments from the floor provided additional information.

29. In presenting the outcome of the work of Mr. Binsack, Mr. Farrar described the three parts of this report: the compilation of the information supplied respectively by the centers and by the countries on their ongoing and potential collaborative programs, and the synthesis and conclusions from this information.

30. Mr. Farrar had five comments: (1) the major point was the positive impact of these collaborative programs on the centers' output; (2) training aspects were important; (3) national involvement of donor countries had an impact on the awareness of the CG system by the educated public; (4) the latter in turn affected potential funding; and (5) the question remained, was the funding for these collaborative programs in addition to, or competing for, core contributions to the centers? He also pointed out that the response of the centers as to whether there is a need for more attention to this area at the system level or whether it can safely be left to natural interaction, was not unanimous.

31. Mr. Hulse presented suggestions from his basic research constituency which were that priority should be given to (a) research into the plant physiology of physical constraints, (b) diagnostic techniques and pesticide resistance in the domain of plant protection, and (c) hormonal control of fish reproduction in the case of aquaculture.

32. The representative of IDRC described a seminar which was held in Canada in April along the same lines as the European one in Bad Homburg. Mr. Wos expressed a plea that the Eastern countries should participate in these seminars.

33. Summarizing the debate, Mr. Farrar observed that there had been a strong positive reaction to the presentation of this collaborative program approach.
A number of points emerged from the discussion:

(a) the coverage, even in Europe, was not exhaustive; there was a need to extend the survey to the whole set of donor countries;

(b) there were suggestions that the information in the report be kept up to date; while no mechanism was suggested, it was clear that the onus was on the centers themselves to take that initiative;

(c) indications are that offers of collaboration exceed demand and that in order not to affect adversely a center's priorities, the initiative for such a program should remain with the center;

(d) the inclusion of national systems and scientists from developing countries as third parties in triangular collaboration found several advocates. Networking structures could be helpful--in some donor countries groups of scientists are formed around specific issues with the purpose of offering their collaboration to centers;

(e) it was clear in discussion that the size of the European contribution was large but not specifically known. In some cases, the sources were the same as those which normally contribute to the CG centers; in other cases they are separate and presumably additional; and finally

(f) three centers expressed diverging views, especially with regard to the need for centers to be provided with the sort of information contained in Mr. Binsack's report.

In conclusion, it was perceived that:

(a) the study could be extended to cover other donor countries;

(b) the study could be supplemented by an analysis of the funding mechanisms for such collaborative programs; and

(c) there might be value in updating the information contained in the report continuously.

(iii) Promoting Collaboration between CGIAR Centers and Other Research Institutions

Mr. Muhammed, chairman of CSC I, introduced this issue in the context of the flexibility of the centers to adjust programs and priorities to changing circumstances. Collaboration with another institute was seen as a way of achieving flexibility, but he cautioned that this could not be
considered a substitute for effective forward planning, nor for building up
the optimum balance of staff needed to fulfill the center's long-term
plans. He also pointed out that no distinction should be made between
different types of "other institutes", including the "non-CG centers". TAC
had developed the following guidelines for collaboration with other
institutes and sought Group endorsement of them:

(1) they should fall within CGIAR goals and priorities;
(2) the IARC should always submit the proposal;
(3) the center should collaborate only with an institution having
   an acknowledged comparative advantage in the desired area of
   research;
(4) the proposal should be predictably cost effective; and
(5) implementation and progress should be monitored by TAC.

37. These guidelines should be applied to all collaborative programs
and funding priorities should be based entirely on merit.

38. The discussion focussed mainly on the question of IARC
   collaboration with the highly developed European research institutions.
Other questions were raised as to whether TAC members' time would
accommodate this additional responsibility and whether the TAC secretariat
could service them adequately. Some speakers questioned the guideline
relating to who submits the proposal as it was felt that either party ought
to be allowed to do so.

Setting Priorities, Monitoring their Implementation, and Review Processes
in the CGIAR - Agenda Item 9

(1) New Resource Allocation Process

39. Mr. Farrar introduced the topic, noting the long-standing
sentiment for linking the annual program and budget reviews to long-term
planning. Equally, there had been much discussion on the desirability of
also linking them to external reviews. Another factor had been the need to
focus the program and budget reviews on program evaluation and review of
program priorities, thus minimizing discussion of budget detail at the
system level. However, since the donor funds are provided annually without
a separate budgetary review by each donor, these aspects have to be
balanced with the need to have a system-wide mechanism to ensure that donor
funds provided to the centers are used in a cost-effective and appropriate
manner.

40. Mr. Farrar noted that with the approval of the paper on CGIAR
priorities and strategies last year, the way was now clear to implement a
resource allocation process which would respond to these concerns. A paper
on the reallocation process was circulated at ICW 1986. He then invited
the Group to review the principles underlying this new process and the
methodology TAC proposed to use in evaluating the long-term proposals of
the centers with regard to funding requirements.
Dr. McCalla, chairman of the TAC subcommittee on this topic, outlined the TAC methodology and progress to date, emphasizing the utility of this process in implementing CGIAR strategies. ISNAR and IFPRI had discussed their five-year program and funding needs at the March meeting and TAC looked forward to discussing proposals from CIP and ILRAD at its forthcoming meeting in June 1987. He noted that the discussions had been very satisfactory since this was the first time the centers and TAC had had an opportunity to discuss program and funding needs in a longer-term perspective focusing on the totality of a center's programs, including core and special projects.

Several members complimented the effort that had gone into developing these improvements. These changes in turn raised several important concerns. The relationship between external reviews and the proposed review of five-year programs could pose a problem in terms of timing and additional burden on the centers. Some concern was also expressed on whether the outcome of the review would constrain the flexibility needed in managing research. It was not clear how cross-center issues such as the sharing of responsibilities and programs would be addressed, i.e. in the case of rice research. Moving towards a five-year approval also meant that these reviews would have to be more detailed and complete. This also raised the question of who would have the responsibility in the intervening period to monitor and backstop the implementation. It was unclear whether the boards of trustees as a group, if they were assigned the monitoring role, would have the capacity to perform such a role.

Another set of comments related to the financial implications of five-year approvals. For example, how would budgets be adjusted if funding were less than needed, especially if this were to happen while the system was still in transition period between annual and five-year budget reviews. Several members stressed that annual certifications of expenditure would be needed by their constituencies and that they could not approve funds beyond one year. Other members asked for a clarification of the role of the donor of last resort under the new process. There were also some comments made and clarification sought on the CGIAR list of activities. Finally, a center representative expressed reservations about the negative effect on staff by creating two tiers of staff through judgments regarding the essential and non-essential elements of a center's programs. He was also concerned that the new process ran the risk of disrupting established center cycles for internal planning and review.

Dr. McCalla responded on behalf of TAC by affirming that the five-year program and budget reviews and internal/external reviews had to be closely linked and were an important consideration even for the interim sequencing of the five-year program and budget reviews in the transition period. With regard to the apparent loss of flexibility of center managements to respond to new scientific challenges, Dr. McCalla pointed out that the new process would, in fact, enhance center flexibility by not requiring centers to make any submission to TAC for five years, unless
there were significant changes in programs. Cross center concerns would be addressed as part of the overall TAC proposal for monitoring and implementing priorities, to be outlined in the next agenda item. The new process would play an important role in the monitoring package.

45. Another relevant aspect of the new mechanism was how it would deal with financial constraints since if they were taken into consideration from the outset the status quo would be maintained. The plan was to allow centers to prepare plans based on needs and only then raise the question of relative priorities. As to the questions on financial shortfalls, impact on staffing and enhanced monitoring responsibility of the boards, the new process would not affect them any differently than the current system. Donors would receive annual financial submissions from the centers as before, the only difference being that TAC would not examine them unless warranted.

46. Mr. Farrar also responded to members' concerns by pointing out that no system could anticipate major funding shortfalls. If they were minor, as experienced in the past few years, the adjustments would follow current practice. The advantage of the new process was that donors would have a clearer picture of the long-term needs of the centers when considering annual allocations. As to the intentions of the World Bank, they remained the same with the Bank financing, as a donor of last resort, the essential components of the center programs on a system-wide basis.

(ii) TAC's Role in Monitoring and Recommending Priorities

47. Dr. McCalla presented a paper, approved by TAC, on its role in monitoring and recommending priorities for the CGIAR. It addressed three issues:

(a) The continuous setting of priorities and evaluation of CGIAR activities: the paper proposed that by devoting a half a day of TAC's annual agenda to this over four years, CGIAR's priorities could be updated once every five years;

(b) Monitoring the implementation of agreed CGIAR priorities and strategies: the paper emphasized the role of the center boards in this, supplemented by long-term plans, internal program reviews, TAC program and budget reviews, and external reviews. It suggested that current mechanisms for system-wide appraisals were inadequate, although the new resource allocation process and standard budgeting should remedy this. The paper emphasized that there is no real substitute for TAC's collective judgement; and

(c) Measuring the impact of activities supported by the CGIAR: the paper recommended that, because the CGIAR depended both on NARS and national policies for final impact at the farm level, the potential impact would be a very important measure for CGIAR planning.
48. Each issue raised points from the floor. The idea of priority setting unconstrained by financial limitations, was seen as allowing the system the flexibility to react to new needs, rather than being locked into a set of existing activities governed by a static budget. Two members raised the issue of interactions between the food crops of the CGIAR mandates and the cash crops often grown in the same small farmer system. These interactions needed consideration in priority setting. Several members asked if there was sufficient confidence that the boards would monitor the implementation of priorities, and whether TAC could monitor if the boards were doing this or not. It was suggested that TAC might develop an agenda item for the five-year reviews which would monitor the capacity of the board in this regard. Members agreed that system-wide monitoring mechanisms were weak and that more were needed to strengthen existing internal devices. Many members voiced the view that the use of a potential impact criteria was not adequate. Political and popular audiences demanded that a stronger effort be made to document actual impact at farmer level. One member raised the point that regional balance was important in weighing priorities and felt it deserved explicit consideration in the paper. All members complimented TAC on the major effort made and the quality of the proposals in the paper.

49. Dr. McCalla, in responding, attempted to correct an impression that the paper had intended to substitute potential for actual impact. He said that TAC saw both as important. He pointed out, however, that it was the amount of time needed before realizing any impact at farm level which made it necessary to anticipate impact for priority setting purposes. He agreed that the regional balances needed incorporating into the paper. He also agreed that within the priority setting mechanism the wider issues of food and cash crops and farm income had to be addressed. Finally, Dr. McCalla asked Professor Camus to respond to the question of whether TAC could cope with the work-load implied in these processes. Professor Camus said he felt that once the new processes were in place the level of work involved would not be excessive.

(iii) Study of the External Review Processes in the CGIAR

50. Professor Camus introduced this item by noting that TAC and the CGIAR secretariat jointly commissioned Professor Vernon Ruttan to undertake a study of the external review processes in the CGIAR with the objective of determining how the needs of the system currently met by reviews could be addressed more efficiently and effectively. Professor Ruttan's successive drafts and his final report had been reviewed by TAC, the center directors, and the center board chairpersons in 1986 and 1987. At TAC 42, it was agreed that, because of the complexity of the issues and their importance to the CGIAR, it would be desirable to have specific input from the Group before a final paper on review processes was prepared. TAC, therefore, with the concurrence of the CGIAR secretariat, decided that Professor Ruttan's paper should be distributed to the Group at the mid-year meeting, along with some specific questions on which it sought guidance from the Group. The outcome of the process would be a joint TAC-CGIAR secretariat
paper on review processes, prepared in the light of the Group's comments at this meeting and comments from the center directors and board chairpersons at or immediately following the TAC meeting in Nairobi. This paper would be reviewed by the CGIAR at ICW 1987.

51. Professor Ruttan summarized the ten main recommendations of the paper, which were:

1. The center EPRs should focus primarily on strategic rather than operational issues;
2. The EPR review teams should assess whether adequate internal processes are in place to maintain and enhance the quality of center research staff as well as center research programs;
3. The regular EPR and EMR review cycle should be extended from the present 5-6 years to 8-10 years;
4. Provision should be made for interim EPR and EMR reviews when indicators of inadequate research performance, managerial deficiencies, or lack of board policy guidance are present;
5. The center EMRs should assess the effectiveness of the center boards of trustees in providing policy direction and in assuring that the centers are managed to provide both program quality and relevance;
6. The responsibility for EPRs should continue to reside with the TAC, and EMRs with the CGIAR;
7. The staffing and time required for regular cycle and interim EPR and EMR reviews should be adjusted to reflect the preceding review objectives;
8. The TAC should initiate an expanded series of global research policy and strategy reviews;
9. The next system review should focus on issues of system organization, intra-system relations, and the relations between the CGIAR and non-CGIAR centers; and
10. Individual donor reviews should be limited to reviews of the restricted core and special projects.

52. Professor Ruttan also raised a number of issues and concerns on which he made no specific recommendations. First, there was a strong impression among donors that EPRs and EMRs have only had a limited impact on either the restructuring of center programs or correction of managerial deficiencies. Second, there was growing concern over the impact of special projects on center programs. Third, strengthening basic research
capacities of centers would require different staffing patterns from the present. Fourth, the system needed to explore ways of establishing more effective working relationships with the private sector. Fifth, if TAC were to undertake the many complex tasks assigned to it by the Group, it would need to have more adequate scientific capacity in its secretariat.

53. The Group was, in general, supportive of the recommendations made by Professor Ruttan. The discussion led to the formulation of a clear decision by the Group on two issues: the shift of the EPRs towards strategic matters, and the frequency of the reviews.

54. The Group was broadly supportive of Professor Ruttan's first recommendation. Several speakers argued that this recommendation was related to several others and that the desirability of its implementation would depend on, for example, whether the centers would have adequate mechanisms for periodic review of operational matters. Mr. Brady argued that he would support the shift of the EPRs towards strategic issues provided the review teams did not overlook important operational issues that might impede the implementation of an agreed strategy.

55. With regard to frequency of the reviews, the members and the board chairpersons, although supporting a certain flexibility in the timing of external reviews, argued for a shorter time interval than recommended by Professor Ruttan. The internal information needs of donors constituted a five to seven year interval; some donors might begin to institute their own reviews if the external reviews organized by the CGIAR were eight to ten years apart.

56. There was no clear consensus on the merging of the EPRs and the EMRs. Several donors argued that the two external reviews should be merged into one, perhaps led by one person but conducted by two teams, and result in a single report. Others argued that the emergence of the EMRs had enriched the quality of external reviews and that it was too early to merge them into one. Dr. Tossell, speaking on behalf of the board chairpersons, stated that as long as the system had two secretariats with different staff competencies, they saw advantages in having two reviews. Mr. Manning suggested that integration of the two reviews was not an either/or issue and that a flexible approach would be best.

57. A number of other observations were made for inclusion in the TAC-CGIAR paper slated for discussion by the Group at ICW 1987. These included:

- All evaluations and reviews should be an integral part of a center or system's decision-making mechanism, i.e. decisions on priority setting, definition of objectives, allocation of resources, program planning, implementation, and ongoing monitoring.
The issue of who monitors the implementation of the recommendations of an external review should be clearly spelled out.

TAC should develop a set of guidelines for review teams.

The boards have a very important role to play in the review process: whether the boards currently have the capacity to fulfill this role is questionable. The next round of EMRs should pay more attention to center governance and how the boards can assume the role the donors expect them to play.

Special mechanisms for reporting highly sensitive information should not be encouraged.

Report on the Meeting of SPAAR

58. Mr. Fauck, Executive Secretary, SPAAR (Special Program for African Agricultural Research), reported on the May 14-15, 1987 SPAAR meeting. The SPAAR donors had set up five research program working groups at previous meetings, and activities had commenced in all five areas: (1) A handbook on guidelines for developing and strengthening national research structures, written with ISNAR's help, had been approved and was being published in English and French. (2) A research grants program had been set up. (3) A donor information system describing both research work in progress and pipeline projects had been designed and was being implemented. (4) The working group on networks had identified 51 agricultural research networks in Africa and had recommended giving priority to strengthening existing networks rather than establishing new ones. Criteria for defining a proper network had been identified and the working group had developed a proposal for a procedure to finance and fund such networks. (5) The fifth working group had begun evaluating available technology.

59. Mr. Fauck reported that the SPAAR donors had decided at the May meeting to set up a sixth working group—on education and training—aimed at strengthening education and training of scientists and technical specialists, as well as improving the relationship between agronomic research centers and universities. He also announced that the next two SPAAR meetings would be held prior to the next two CGIAR meetings.

60. During the discussion, a delegate requested that the CGIAR secretariat appoint a person to act as liaison with SPAAR. Mr. Farrar responded that Mr. Rives had been given that responsibility.

Financial Matters - Agenda Item 10

61. Mr. Farrar informed members of the Group that a document on the status of financial matters had been distributed. He reported as follows:
FY86 Outcome

62. Core funding for 1986 was US$192 million, which was 13% or $22 million higher than 1985. About two-thirds of this increase was due to the weakening of the US dollar versus other currencies, and about one third was due to increases in donor pledges denominated in their own currencies. Special project funding was expected to be about $45 million, resulting in a total availability of funding of about $237 million.

63. The total amount available for centers' programs was $188 million (the difference representing a contribution to the stabilization mechanism) which implied that the system's pattern of declining operational expenditures in real terms had been reversed. A 1% real growth had been achieved in the research programs.

1987 Prospects

64. 1987 funding (November 1986 exchange rates) remained firm at $191 million—about the same as the estimated outcome for 1986. The dollar value of the contributions had increased since ICW 1986 because of a further decline of the US dollar vis-a-vis other currencies. The CGIAR secretariat estimated that due to exchange gains, 1987 funding would probably reach $199 million. Given this trend and the trend in inflation rates, the CGIAR secretariat expected that centers would be funded at 100% of their approved levels.

1988 and Beyond

65. The current favourable funding picture was extraordinarily vulnerable to a change in the value of the dollar vis-a-vis other currencies or to increases in the rates of inflation (there are signs that inflation rates may be increasing). There was therefore, a significant need for increases in contributions, measured in donors' own currencies, to enable the system at least to remain at the same level in the coming years. Without additional resources the system might be faced with a shock of some proportion.

Task Force on Sub-Saharan Africa - Agenda Item 11

66. Professor Camus presented the activities of the task force since ICW 1986. He stated that with the addition of five Africans, membership of the ten-person committee was now complete. The task force had a mandate that distinguished it from both SPAAR and the standing committee of the center directors for sub-Saharan Africa, although it worked in close cooperation with them. The mandate of the task force was to identify mechanisms for better coordination of efforts of international and national agricultural research in Africa, and he described the three processes initiated thus far:
(1) The mid-altitude maize-based production system in the Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) region was already under way with six or seven centers and six countries involved in a consultation panel headed by Dr. A. Wilson. An action program for collaborative research in which CIMMYT plays the role of coordinator of the centers' efforts will be developed.

(2) A multi-commodity approach throughout the coastal zone of West Africa would be launched shortly with the aim of identifying gaps and duplications in research on cassava and maize in that region. This would involve consultations by country and subsequently the region as a whole. The outcome was expected to be an action program integrating all interested parties in a collaborative research network, including reorganization of existing activities, and designed to fit in with the countries expressed priorities.

(3) At the request of certain East African countries, a one-country approach would aim at diagnosing causes of possible misunderstanding between centers and the national system.

67. Dr. Winkelmann presented the SADCC program in more detail. He indicated that the exploratory phase could lead to a decision being taken on its viability in August.

68. Mr. von der Osten presented the inventory of centers' research activities in Africa which ISNAR had prepared at the request of the standing committee of center directors and with the support of the task force. The information provided by the centers had been summarized and analyzed using a specially-designed software which highlighted the importance of the research effort as well as the critical relationship between the centers.

69. Discussion focussed on the intended objectives of the inventory, the task force processes, and their appropriateness to the problems. The fixed term members were asked to verify the information provided in a number of countries. The following four points emerged from the discussions:

(1) the inventory addressed research by the centers in Africa, not for Africa;

(2) primary importance was given to obtaining from the countries their inventory or research needs and priorities as a basis for future action programs;

(3) a new approach was to have centers post staff in NARS stations to work side by side with the national scientists on adaptive research and technology generation as a way to train them and strengthen the NARS;
the resulting action programs were expected to include proposals for reorganizing and consolidating existing efforts into collaborative research networks.

70. The chairman concluded by saying that the tone of the discussions indicated that the Group would like to see the work of the task force carried forward.

Future Meetings - Agenda Item 12

71. The dates and places of future meetings of the Group have been approved as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>ICW</td>
<td>October 26-30,</td>
<td>Washington D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>mid-year</td>
<td>May 16-20, Berlin, Germany, FDR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICW</td>
<td>October 31-November 4, Washington D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>mid-year</td>
<td>May 29-June 2, Canberra, Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICW</td>
<td>October 30-November 3, Washington D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>mid-year</td>
<td>May 21-25, The Hague, The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICW</td>
<td>October 29-November 2, Washington D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72. Two main issues dominated the discussion. The first, the longer-term organization of the CGIAR meetings as between international centers' week and the mid-term meetings. Some donors favoured the establishment of a committee of donors to discuss the issues, others further work by the CGIAR secretariat. The second and related issue was the scheduling of non-CGIAR center meetings, i.e. whether they should be held only at one of the two meetings of the Group or at both, when, and for how long. Since no consensus was established, the Chairman suggested that for the time being, the non-CGIAR meetings should be split between the two meetings, giving the organizations the option as to their preferred timing. However, the whole question of the non-CGIAR meetings will be examined in the context of the future organization and work of the Group.
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ALLOCATION

de M. Michel AURILLAC, Ministre de la Coopération
aux Journées du
Groupe consultatif pour la recherche agronomique internationale
(G.C.R.A.I.)
du 18 au 22 mai 1987
à Montpellier

Monsieur le Représentant du Groupe consultatif,
Monsieur le Président du Conseil Régional,
Monsieur le Député Maire,
Messieurs les Elus,
Monsieur le Président d’Agropolis,
Messieurs les Présidents et Directeurs d’Instituts,
Mesdames et Messieurs,

Je pense exprimer le sentiment général en disant ma satisfaction de voir rassemblée ici, pendant cette semaine, l’élite mondiale de la recherche agronomique. Avec Montpellier, dont le dynamisme scientifique et universitaire est enracinée dans une très ancienne et très vivante tradition, le groupe consultatif ne pouvait pas trouver meilleur terrain d’accueil pour sa première réunion en
Au nom du Gouvernement français, je tiens à réaffirmer l'importance que la France attache à la recherche agronomique. C'est à coup sûr dans ce domaine que se joue l'avenir de nos agricultures. Et, pour les peuples des pays en développement cet avenir se résume souvent dans cette angoissante question: "Auront-ils de quoi apaiser leur faim?"

Mais, pour douloureuse qu'elle soit sur le plan humain, cette question n'est pas la seule. Elle est liée à beaucoup d'autres et toutes doivent être considérées ensemble, dans leurs imbriques et leurs conséquences réciproques, si nous voulons aborder de manière cohérente les problèmes du développement et nous donner les moyens de les résoudre.

Telle est en tout cas la position de la France et l'un des principes majeurs de sa politique de coopération. Je voudrais vous en rappeler, à l'ouverture de vos travaux, les orientations essentielles.

La France a une politique du développement. Elle y consacre environ 25 milliards de francs et malgré les contraintes financières, elle a décidé d'acquitter son effort pour reprendre la progression vers l'objectif de 0,7 % de son produit national brut. Elle considère en effet que l'équilibre du monde de demain dépend très largement des rapports que noueront les pays industrialisés et les pays en développement.
Mais il ne suffit pas de le dire, il faut avoir le
• courage politique et moral d'en tirer toutes les conséquences
   pour le dialogue Nord-Sud. Loin de moi l'idée de vouloir
donner des leçons à quiconque. Mais si nous ne sommes pas
assez réalistes pour reconnaître les insuffisances ou les
erreurs des actions de coopération que nous avons menées
jusqu'ici, comment serons-nous plus efficaces dans l'avenir ?

L'écart croissant du revenu par habitant, entre
pays riches et pays pauvres, n'autorise certainement personne
à parler d'un échec global de l'aide que les premiers
apportent aux seconds, mais interpelle chacun sur ce qu'il
convient désormais de faire.

Nous en sommes arrivés à un point où la générosité,
c'est très net dans l'opinion française, ne supporte plus
l'inefficacité.

Aussi, la coopération ne peut-elle plus se
satisfaire d'être une aide à la survie des pays en
développement, sous peine d'être accusée de les maintenir
seulement en état de survie.

Une telle vision des choses ne rendrait bien sûr
pas justice aux efforts considérables que fournissent les
pays occidentaux mais il faut clairement percevoir les enjeux
nouveaux, politiques et géo-politiques, économiques et sociaux
de la lutte contre le sous-développement : elle s'impose pour
des raisons humanitaires, mais aussi pour des raisons
d'intérêt mutuel : pays développés et pays en développement
ont besoin les uns des autres et c’est de leur coopération que pourront naître aussi bien une croissance économique équilibrée que des relations internationales dans un monde de paix et de liberté.

Telle est la conception globale que défend la France dans toutes les enceintes où se déroule le dialogue Nord-Sud. Ainsi, l’an dernier à New-york, lorsque l’Assemblée Générale des Nations Unies a alerté la Communauté internationale sur la situation de plus en plus préoccupante de l’Afrique. Ainsi encore, il y a quelques semaines, lors des dernières sessions du Comité Interimaire du FMI et du Comité du Développement de la Banque Mondiale à Washington où la France a avancé des propositions nouvelles en ce qui concerne le traitement de la dette et les produits de base.

Au total, rien ne se fera vraiment sans une ferme volonté commune de prendre en compte et de traiter conjointement les problèmes de l’endettement des cours des matières premières, de la stabilisation monétaire et du commerce international.

La France a cette volonté et les propos tenus dans ce sens par le Premier ministre Jacques Chirac au Président Reagan, lors de son voyage officiel aux États-Unis, en ont témoigné.
Cette approche des rapports Nord-Sud a conduit la France à rénover sa politique de coopération et à en mieux affirmer les priorités.

Une priorité géographique d’abord, en direction de l’Afrique pour ce qui concerne l’essentiel des concours bilatéraux qu’elle fournit. Elle n’est pas exclusive mais traduit un souci de réalisme. Il serait en effet illusoire de penser que la coopération française pourrait continuer d’être efficace si elle était dispersée à travers le monde. C’est donc essentiellement en Afrique que la France prend directement sa part de l’aide que les pays développés fournissent aux pays en développement.

Pourquoi en Afrique ? Parce que c’est le continent où se trouvent les deux tiers des pays les moins avancés et où la crise prend les proportions structurelles les plus graves. Parce que la France entretient avec beaucoup d’États africains des liens historiques, culturels et linguistiques qui ont changé de nature après les indépendances, mais, qui, à la demande même de ces États, n’ont pas cessé de se renforcer. C’est ainsi que nous apportons notre appui à leur développement économique, à leur préoccupation incessante de former, éduquer, soigner les hommes ou, bien sûr, dans le cas qui nous occupe aujourd’hui, de devenir un partenaire à part entière dans le développement de la recherche en particulier dans le domaine agricole.
Assurant à elle seule près du tiers de l’aide totale que reçoit l’Afrique, la France possède ainsi ce que j’oserai appeler une compétence africaine qui lui permet de dialoguer et de coopérer de manière constante avec près de quarante pays, comme en témoignent des manifestations telles que le sommet franco-africain de Lomé, en novembre dernier. Elle est ainsi mieux en mesure de percevoir, dans leur ensemble, les difficultés et les besoins de ce continent.

Le premier de ces besoins, c’est de vivre dans la paix et dans la sécurité, conditions indispensables au développement. C’est pourquoi, la France s’efforce de maintenir l’Afrique hors de l’affrontement entre les blocs et d’aider les États qui le lui demandent, à garantir leur intégrité.

Au delà de la paix et de la sécurité, c’est-à-dire du besoin de pouvoir consacrer toutes ses énergies au développement, le problème le plus aigu aujourd’hui est celui de la crise des structures économiques et financières des États africains. Leur endettement, sans atteindre les montants de celui des pays d’Amérique Latine, pèse de plus en plus lourd, en dépit des courageuses politiques d’ajustement qu’ils ont entreprises. La France considère que l’on ne peut pas attendre que ces efforts d’assainissement aient produit leurs effets pour relancer le développement économique et qu’il faut assurer pleinement la complémentarité entre l’ajustement et la reprise de la croissance.
Dans cet esprit, le Ministère de la Coopération a augmenté dans son budget pour 1987, les concours financiers de 40 % et privilégié la part des dons par rapport à celle des prêts.

Soyons clairs, si l'exportation des matières premières ne leur garantissent pas des revenus stables et suffisants, les pays africains consentiront en vain des efforts d'assainissement. La régulation des marchés a toujours été une revendication que la France a formulee aux côtés des pays en développement. Il existe des mécanismes de garantie au niveau européen que nous aimerions voir s'étendre. Il faut que la prochaine CNUCED fournisse à la communauté internationale toute entière l'occasion d'une réflexion renouvelée et approfondie sur les produits de base.

L'objectif est aussi de permettre aux pays africains de réaliser leur "révolution verte" et de progresser vers la sécurité alimentaire, grâce avant tout au développement de l'agriculture locale.

Des erreurs ont été commises dans le passé. Les pouvoirs publics africains et les aides bilatérales et multilatérales en ont pris la mesure et conduisent désormais des projets mieux adaptés et plus stimulants pour les paysans. En dépit des difficultés climatiques, que la recherche permet maintenant de contourner, et de l'acharnement d'une nature ingrate, il est permis d'être optimiste pour l'avenir.
Cette bataille est d'autant plus importante que du développement de l'agriculture dépend celui d'un tissu industriel local. La coopération française s'est engagée dans la voie d'un appui systématique à la mobilisation de l'épargne locale à la création de petites et moyennes entreprises et au partenariat avec des entreprises françaises.

D'autres besoins existent dont la satisfaction, échappant aux critères immédiats de rentabilité, conditionne la croissance économique et la solidité du tissu social. Je parle ici de la santé, de l'éducation, de la formation des hommes.

Les soins primaires, la médecine préventive, l'amélioration des structures de santé, la lutte contre les maladies virales, les parasitoses et maintenant le SIDA, constituent les principaux points d'action de la coopération française en matière de santé.

En ce qui concerne l'enseignement et la formation, il est naturel que la France se sente investie d'une responsabilité particulière, en raison du lien linguistique qui l'unit à de nombreux pays africains. La culture est l'un des ciments les plus solides entre les peuples et représente l'un des aspects les plus porteurs d'avenir de la coopération française avec l'Afrique qui comptera bientôt la majorité des hommes parlant notre langue.
La Francophonie est ainsi devenue une ambition collective celle d’accéder par le français au progrès scientifique et technique dans le respect de l’identité culturelle de chacun. C’est pourquoi la coopération française apporte son appui aux réseaux et aux centres de recherche francophones, participe à l’élaboration de bases et banques de données et plus largement aux actions visant à organiser et dynamiser l’espace scientifique de recherche francophone.

La francophonie est un appel et non pas un refus; elle est le désir partagé de faire valoir ensemble un héritage commun en lui donnant une dimension nouvelle, celle d’une ouverture sur le monde moderne, renforcer les solidarités, c’est aussi préserver la diversité des cultures.

J’ai dit que la France avait une vocation africaine. j’ai souhaité faire avec vous le tour des défis auxquels le continent se trouve confronté.

C’est dans ce contexte que doit être comprise notre coopération scientifique avec les pays en voie de développement et avec l’Afrique francophone plus particulièrement.
Car ce n'est bien sûr pas par chauvinisme de mauvais aloi que j'ai conclu la présentation des principales orientations de la coopération française sur le caractère francophone de sa politique de recherche. C'est, bien au contraire, parce que la recherche aujourd'hui ne connaît pas de frontières et que, s'il est un terrain naturel d'épanouissement de la coopération internationale, c'est bien celui-là.

Il est clair que si elle ne gardait pas une capacité d'expérimentation dans les pays tropicaux, en étroite collaboration avec ses partenaires, la recherche agronomique topicale française perdrait beaucoup de son efficacité et la valeur qu'on lui connaît. Ce serait alors - permettez-moi cette fois une considération patriotique - une perte pour toute la recherche mondiale.

Cette coopération bénéficie d'abord des acquis scientifiques de l'imposant dispositif mis en place dès avant l'indépendance des États avec lesquels la France coopère, depuis plus de quarante ans :

L'Institut Pasteur pour la médecine, l'ORSTOM pour l'ensemble de ces sciences du développement, Le CIRAD qui regroupe désormais les instituts d'agronomie spécialisés par plante : l'IRHO sur le palmier à huile et l'arachide, le CTFT sur les bois tropicaux, l'IRCA pour l'hévéa, l'IRCT pour le coton, l'IFCC pour le café et le cacao, l'IRFA sur les agrumes et fruits, l'IRAT qui a marqué son excellence sur le riz et enfin, l'IEMVT pour l'élevage.
Ces organismes associés à toutes les institutions françaises (INRA et Universités) s’efforcent de développer une coopération de partenariat scientifique nourrie des solidarités que l’histoire de la communauté de langue consolident.


C’est par l’action de ces instituts, intégrés aux jeunes systèmes nationaux de recherche des États africains que la coopération française aide à promouvoir les structures nationales de recherches et à former des chercheurs africains de haut niveau.

Le renforcement de ces structures nationales de recherche qui constitue une priorité de vos travaux, suppose que nous sachions donner aux capacités scientifiques africaines, partout où elles se constituent leur pleine chance de participer à la communauté scientifique internationale.

Les universités africaines, les grandes écoles d’ingénieurs à vocation régionale ou nationale doivent pouvoir participer à l’effort. C’est pourquoi la coopération française met en place le projet CAMPUS : Comité français
pour la coopération avec l'Afrique et Madagascar pour la promotion universitaire et scientifique, afin de mettre au niveau international des meilleures structures de recherche africaines, en finançant, sur programmes de recherche conjoints, leurs échanges avec des équipes françaises.

Déjà émergent dans les pays en développement un nombre grandissant de chercheurs, formés à l'étranger, mais aussi et de plus en plus formés dans les universités et les institutions nationales. Cette évolution permet à la coopération de se fonder sur des relations nouvelles centrées sur le partenariat scientifique. Des chercheurs français, travaillant aussi bien en France que sur le terrain, associés aux jeunes équipes des pays en développement : telle est la voie de l'avenir pour aider, sur une base contractuelle et dans l'intérêt mutuel, nos partenaires à s'engager dans la compétition scientifique internationale.
La création récente à Abidjan d’une conférence des directeurs de la recherche agronomique franco-africaine illustre cette évolution ; elle signifie qu’une concertation permanente entre partenaires scientifiques français et africains permet de définir en commun les priorités de la recherche agronomique, d’échanger des résultats, des matériels végétaux, comme des chercheurs. Nous éviterons ainsi d’imposer nos modèles de développement de la recherche et nous pourrons concilier l’universalité de la recherche et la diversité des systèmes nationaux.

Mais il faut aussi envisager, avec l’aide du CIRAD et avec la participation de l’ORSTOM, une internationalisation de notre effort bilatéral dans le cadre de ce que l’on appelle le bi-multi. Entendons par là le regroupement sur des projets bilatéraux déjà existants ou à venir, de financements de diverses origines. C’est à cette condition que l’on verra sortir de la terre africaine, là où la recherche tropicale est à la fois la plus nécessaire et la plus naturelle, de véritables cités internationales de la recherche, des Agropolis comme celle de Montpellier.

L’effort porte donc autant sur un engagement des scientifiques français que sur la mobilisation de moyens financiers.
Ceux-ci, il faut bien l’admettre, sont un réel problème pour des sociétés rurales en développement qui ne peuvent pas financer leur appareil de recherche comme le font les pays du Nord, en prenant compte les enjeux industriels et militaires. La recherche pour eux vise d’abord des projets précis et concrets qui permettent de faire reculer les containtes de la dépendance alimentaire et de l’insuffisante sanitaire.

De leur côté, les bailleurs de fonds aimeraient mieux ne financer que des scientifiques qui trouvent mais nous savons bien que la recherche est par définition aléatoire et que ses résultats et ses progrès ne peuvent être mesurés seulement à l’aune de la rentabilité économique. Il s’agit d’un effort de financement sur le long terme, sans profit immédiat, mais d’un effort indispensable.

Ainsi, lorsque la France soutient fermement la recherche agronomique tropicale, il va de soi qu’elle ne cherche pas à assurer ses marchés, mais à résoudre avec ses partenaires les défis de l’aridité, de la sécheresse, de la pauvreté des sols et des aléas climatiques; elle veut développer les capacités de l’agriculture des pays africains afin que ses partenaires sortent de l’incertitude qui fait d’une année la saison noire de la pénurie et de l’autre la saison absurde du gaspillage d’excédents qu’on ne sait ni conserver ni regulariser.
Les mesures prises par le Gouvernement français pour renforcer sa coopération en matière de recherche agronomique tropicale ne signifient pas que la France veut agir seule ou se limiter à une coopération bilatérale classique.

Les enjeux de la recherche agronomique sont aujourd'hui d'une telle ampleur qu'aucun donateur ne peut y faire face individuellement. Ces enjeux imposent une mobilisation coordonnée de l'ensemble des moyens techniques et financiers de la communauté internationale.

A partir de ses propres capacités de recherche, la France est donc tout à fait désireuse de travailler en étroite collaboration avec les autres aides qu'elles soient bilatérales ou multilatérales.

Je pense bien sûr d'abord à la communauté européenne, au système des Nations Unies et notamment le PNU; et la FAO, aux banques de développement et bien sûr au GCRAI.

Dans le même temps, il convient de souligner que le système multilatéral, depuis le début des années 1980 accorde plus d'importance aux besoins de l'Afrique. Ainsi, les objectifs prioritaires de la politique française de coopération et des institutions multilatérales trouvent une pleine convergence.

En témoigne l'action du groupe d'intervention au sein du GCRAI qui est destiné à rapprocher les systèmes nationaux africains de recherche et les centres internationaux de recherche agronomique (CIRA): de même le
programme spécial pour l'Afrique (SPAAR) constitue un organe de concertation efficace pour les donateurs intervenant en Afrique subsaharienne, auxquels nous souhaitons que soient de plus en plus associés les responsables africains.

Pour participer pleinement à cet effort collectif, l'appareil scientifique français s'est mobilisé ces dernières années afin de proposer des réponses concertées et de prendre en charge une partie des travaux de coordination au sein des réseaux du SPAAR ou des programmes du groupe d'intervention. C'est ainsi que la France a été amenée à cofinancer le colloque de Cotonou sur la recherche agricole en Afrique de l'Ouest et Centrale et à proposer un projet de recherche en Afrique de l'Ouest destiné à renforcer les systèmes nationaux sur des thèmes prioritaires comme le maïs et le manioc. Grâce au GCRAI, cette initiative devrait déboucher, à terme, sur des opérations de cofinancement avec plusieurs donateurs. Elle constitue un exemple de coordination bi-multilatérale qu'il convient, à mon avis, de multiplier. Cette réunion du GCRAI est une enceinte tout à fait adaptée pour approfondir ce genre de propositions et faire progresser concrètement la coopération internationale.

La France entend donc continuer à appuyer pleinement les travaux du groupe consultatif qui doivent permettre de renforcer les convergences entre les aides bilatérales et multilatérales; elle maintiendra sa participation financière et poursuivra son effort.
Il est essentiel d'organiser au niveau international et national la mobilisation et la coordination des équipes de recherche. La formule des réseaux peut permettre de renforcer, non seulement la coopération des pays industrialisés avec les pays en développement, mais la solidarité des pays en développement entre eux. Leurs organisations sub-régionales qui disposent de leurs propres installations et parfois de réseaux structurés doivent être appuyées. Car c'est ensemble seulement que nous parviendrons, en intensifiant les échanges entre les systèmes nationaux de recherche des pays en développement, en coordonnant nos potentiels scientifiques et nos capacités financières, à mettre la recherche au service du développement. Nous mobiliserons ainsi l'énorme force d'invention et de découverte des grandes puissances industrielles, qu'accroissent encore les biotechnologies, sur les enjeux scientifiques du développement.

Les actions de coopération bilatérale et les moyens des institutions internationales et multilatérales trouvent leur pleine convergence lorsqu'il faut conserver la fertilité des sols, reconstituer les ressources ligneuses les plus vitales, éliminer le striga qui compromet la résolte de mil, conserver les haricots attaqués par les bruches, faire pousser du maïs en zone aride, en finir avec la pourriture brune du cacao dont les tonnages assureront la rentée de devises, diversifier la production fruitière, sélectionner du bétail trypano résistant.
Est-ce à dire que la recherche a réponse à tout ?

Avec du temps et des moyens, les chercheurs ont prouvé qu’ils pouvaient beaucoup. Mais, quelles que soient les variétés culturales qu’ils inventent, ce n’est pas d’eux que dépend la garantie d’un revenu minimal décent pour les paysans, indépendamment des variations des coûts et des stocks du marché international. Et les responsables des politiques agricoles auraient tort de s’en remettre à la recherche du soin de faire pousser en Afrique un riz dont le prix du kilogramme pourra concurrencer la production asiatique importée, en pensant résoudre ainsi les problèmes des riziculteurs africains.

Les acteurs de la recherche agronomique ne sont pas responsables des erreurs de l’économie ni des fautes de la politique. Pour autant, ils ne doivent pas ignorer le contexte économique dans lequel leurs travaux se développent et ils ont à se poser des questions simples mais fondamentales : de quelles céréales, de quels tubercules se nourriront les sociétés du deuxième millénaire ?

Pour les uns et les autres, la responsabilité est lourde car on peut se demander, lorsque les avancées de la recherche agronomique multiplient les concurrences et que les progrès de la productivité accroissent les excédents, comment on en assurera la régulation au niveau mondial.

Voilà ce que les responsables des politiques d’aide
au développement attendent des chercheurs. Car, sans leurs découvertes, ils savent qu'ils ne pourront pas améliorer la vie des paysans ni les empêcher de fuir vers les villes surpeuplées pour un exode sans espoir. C'est à la recherche de trouver des solutions agronomiques qui donneront au paysan d'Afrique, non pas seulement un kilo de riz de plus mais un kilo de riz cuit, comme le disait un agronome sénégalais.

Ce sont là des objectifs ambitieux qui revêtent pour l'humanité toute entière une importance vitale. Je souhaite donc aux travaux de votre groupe une pleine efficacité, en étant certain que vous saurez faire avancer sur la voie du progrès la coopération agronomique internationale.
PROJET DE DISCOURS

DE M. JACQUES VALADE

Ministre délégué chargé de la Recherche
et de l'Enseignement Supérieur

le mercredi 20 Mai 1987

REUNION ANNUELLE DU GROUPE CONSULTATIF

DE LA RECHERCHE AGRONOMIQUE INTERNATIONALE (G.C.R.A.I.)
Monsieur le Président

Je voudrais tout d'abord vous dire et j'aurais voulu pouvoir le faire dès l'ouverture de votre session de travail, mais je devais participer au Conseil des Ministres ce matin. Je suis très heureux que le Groupe Consultatif pour la Recherche Agricole Internationale ait de nouveau décidé de tenir sa réunion annuelle des pays donateurs en France et à Montpellier et très heureux de vous y accueillir au nom du Gouvernement français.
En effet, votre présence renouvelée en France me paraît tout à la fois marquer l'intérêt que vous portez à la recherche agronomique française et donc compte tenu de la composition de votre Groupe une nouvelle reconnaissance de la qualité et de l'importance et cette recherche, mais aussi l'intérêt que nous-mêmes portons à vos travaux et notre souci de dégager des formes de coopération d'intérêt mutuel permettant de faire face aux besoins immenses auxquels les pays en développement sont confrontés.

Je voudrais tout d'abord vous rappeler quelques lignes directrices de la politique de recherche française.

La France, vous ne l'ignorez pas, consacre une part importante de ses ressources aux activités de recherche. Elle se situe, à cet égard, aux tous premiers rangs mondiaux.

Mais, de tous les pays dont l'effort de recherche est comparable ou même supérieur au sien, la France présente cette particularité notable d'affecter aux recherches intéressant de manière spécifique les pays en développement des moyens d'une ampleur considérable.

Ces moyens en effet atteignent pratiquement le même
niveau, en valeur absolue, que celui constaté aux États-Unis d'Amérique, ou pour l'ensemble de nos partenaires européens.

C'est là la traduction concrète de la priorité qu'attache le Gouvernement français à l'action en faveur des pays en développement, priorité que j'entends aujourd'hui solennellement réaffirmer, dans cette Agropolis dont la réalisation manifeste hautement, pour le présent et pour l'avenir, notre souci de développer et de moderniser sans cesse les instruments dont la France a su se doter dans ce domaine.

Parmi les thèmes majeurs auxquels s'attache la recherche en coopération avec les pays en développement en fonction des besoins et des demandes de ces derniers, il est évident que la recherche agronomique tropicale occupe une place éminente et, d'une certaine façon, essentielle.

Ce domaine de recherche bénéficie, dans notre pays, de l'expérience accumulée au cours d'une histoire déjà centenaire.

Cette longue tradition, dont hérite notamment l'ensemble d'institutions de programmes et d'équipes ici rassemblés, à Montpellier, se place sous le double signe du service aux pays de la
zone tropicale et du progrès général de la recherche agronomique.

En effet, la recherche agronomique tropicale française ne contribue pas seulement à l'amélioration des variétés et des méthodes culturales dont disposent les agriculteurs des pays en développement. Elle est aussi un atout fondamental de la recherche agronomique nationale et apporte son concours au développement de l'ensemble des sciences et des technologies agricoles, sans en excepter les branches propres aux agricultures tempérées.

Si la recherche agronomique tropicale française a d'abord été concentrée sur les cultures industrielles ou d'exportation (caoutchouc, coton, café, cacao...) notamment avec la constitution des organismes précurseurs du Centre de Coopération Internationale de Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (CIRAD), elle s'est progressivement diversifiée pour développer la recherche sur le système de production agricole, les cultures vivrières et l'élevage qui sont placés maintenant en première priorité par les pays en développement dans leur souci de l'autosuffisance alimentaire.

Beaucoup d'efforts ont été accomplis par tous les acteurs français, en liaison étroite avec les systèmes nationaux de recherche de pays dans lequel ils interviennent, systèmes nationaux
dont ils ont d’ailleurs dans bien des cas favorisés la création et le développement.

Vous connaissez ces principaux acteurs dont les interventions sont fréquemment réalisées en association : le CIRAD dont le budget est de l’ordre de 130 millions de dollars et dont l’avance technologique lui permet de disposer de ressources propres pour près de 40 % de son budget.

L’ORSTOM, organisme de recherche dont les interventions sont beaucoup plus larges que la recherche agronomique tropicale mais qui y consacre près de 35 millions de dollars.

L’INRA, qui s’intéresse à l’ensemble de l’agriculture et dont le budget dans le domaine tropical atteint plus de 25 millions de dollars.

Les Centres universitaires, le CNRS, le Muséum..., l’ensemble de ces autres intervenants représentant un budget de plus de 40 millions de dollars.

Soit un budget au total de quelque 230 millions de dollars, ce qui est tout à fait comparable au budget de treize
centres du GCRAI.

En raison même de l'importance qu'elle attache à la recherche agronomique tropicale, et consciente de l'ampleur des besoins à satisfaire, la communauté scientifique française ne pouvait qu'accueillir avec attention et sympathie la création du groupe consultatif de la recherche agronomique internationale.

Et ce d'autant plus que les concepts ayant guidé la démarche des fondateurs des instituts internationaux apparaissent très proches de ceux sur lesquels a été construite la recherche agronomique française.

Cependant, malgré cette réelle communauté d'intention, les relations nouées entre les organismes français et le GCRAI sont demeurées longtemps embryonnaires, il est vrai que leurs zones d'intervention principales ne se recouvraient pas complètement puisque les organismes français intervenaient avant tout dans les pays auxquels nous sommes plus particulièrement liés par l'histoire.

Mais depuis quelques années un processus de dialogue et de participation, toujours plus intense, s'est engagé entre la recherche française et le système international de recherche.
Je n'en veux pour preuve, outre l'augmentation significative de la contribution financière française au GCRAI, le nombre et la qualité des chercheurs français mis à la disposition des Centres internationaux de recherche (CIRA), la réalisation de programmes conjoints, les accords de coopération passés avec certains des CIRA.

La réunion à Montpellier du GCRAI marque bien, et je m'en félicite, le chemin parcourut depuis une décennie environ, grâce à l'action persévérante de tous.

Je souhaite, pour ma part, que nous accentuions les progrès ainsi réalisés, en développant et en renforçant encore les liens de coopération entre les CIRA et les institutions françaises, naturellement dans la mesure où et à la condition que les résultats se révèlent bénéfiques pour les pays en développement, ce dont je suis persuadé.

Il va de soi que ces échanges, qui doivent être profitables aux pays en développement, ne peuvent se concevoir que dans le respect mutuel de nos originalités respectives. Vous connaissez, à cet égard, notre attachement profond à la communauté
francophone, et nos relations étroites avec les pays européens.

Surtout il me semble désormais nécessaire de dépasser ce face à face, d'ailleurs fructueux, entre vos institutions et les nôtres, pour associer résolument à cette coopération les systèmes nationaux de recherche que les pays en développement ont récemment commencé de mettre sur pied.

En effet, l'intervention de ces structures nationales ne peut que faciliter grandement l'adéquation des recherches aux besoins réels des agriculteurs, que seule une connaissance ancienne et approfondie des réalités locales permet d'apprécier parfaitement.

Je souhaite donc que nous puissions, à l'avenir, expérimenter des formules d'actions associant instituts internationaux, organismes français et institutions locales, permettant de mener tous en commun, sur le terrain, des programmes de recherche dont les résultats soient le plus immédiatement possible utilisables par les agriculteurs des pays intéressés.

À ma connaissance, il n'existe pas encore de programmes opérationnels répondant complètement à ces critères. Tout au plus,
je note des projets en cours d'élaboration. J'espère qu'ils pourront se concrétiser rapidement, en veillant à bien répondre aux attentes de nos pays partenaires.

Je voudrais en terminant vous féliciter d'avoir retenu Montpellier pour cadre de vos travaux et souhaiter qu'il leur soit particulièrement favorable.

Je sais que vous avez pu visiter certains laboratoires. Je regrette que vous n'ayez pas pu les visiter tous car ils constituent au sein d'Agropolis un ensemble remarquable - et j'adresse mes félicitations aux responsables locaux et en particulier au Professeur MALASSIS - ainsi bien sûr qu'aux dirigeants nationaux des organismes pour la qualité de cette réalisation.

Aussi je souhaite que vous puissiez y revenir afin d'approfondir, dans ce complexe ouvert à la recherche agronomique internationale, les relations que vous aurez pu y nouer - et je note que l'INIBAP a déjà retenu Montpellier pour siège de ces travaux de coordination du programme bananier plantain.

Je souhaite aussi bien sûr que malgré votre programme très chargé, vous puissiez trouver le temps de visiter Montpellier et ses
environ, car c'est une ville au riche passé de recherche et de formation, une des plus anciennes universités d'Europe qui se tourne vers l'avenir. Mais ne prenez pas mes propos pour un encouragement à l'école buissonnière - ce qui serait mal venu d'ailleurs de la part d'un Ministre chargé de l'Enseignement Supérieur.
Three years ago I addressed this Group for the first time at our meeting at the FAO in Rome. When I look back to our concerns at that time, I realize how much we have achieved and how much still needs to be done. By its very nature, any dynamic institution fashions challenges as it attains previously established goals.

In May 1984, the famine in Ethiopia and elsewhere in the Sahel provided incontrovertible justification for our existence as a system. Today, while we know that Ethiopia's agony is a regular facet of an ever shorter agro-climatic cycle, we often need to explain our relevance in a world where unmarketable surpluses in developed countries exceed their capacity to stockpile and the developing countries' capacity to import. We addressed this issue head on, as part of the new format for our meetings, when John Mellor showed us last November how higher agricultural productivity in developing countries has increased purchasing power - both in rural and urban areas, with a consequent sustained increase in demand for grain exports from industrialized countries. Another conclusion, demonstrated prominently by India and Korea, is that new agricultural technologies can initiate broad-based economic development.

At ICW 1984 the Impact Study team, ably led by Dr. Jock Anderson, focussed our attention on the significant contribution of the agricultural centres in building national capabilities for agricultural research, as well as on our better known impressive record of impact on hunger and poverty through the high yielding varieties of rice and wheat. I was happy to learn that a summary of that excellent study is being readied for publication and, hopefully, will be available by International Centres Week. While we need to keep current the measurement of our impact, this study sharpened our analytical tools for so doing, as well as providing us with the solid evidence to back our faith in this CGIAR system of ours.

In Rome, we expressed concern about the need for a system-wide strategy, which in turn required a more focussed statement of our priorities and, consequently, an assessment by each centre of the validity of its mandate. Two years later, our Ottawa meeting concentrated on the comprehensive system-wide strategy study prepared by TAC. Subsequently, TAC has organized itself into three standing committees to prepare detailed proposals and position papers on the main topics identified at Ottawa for continuing review by the Group. These are:

1) the role of the CGIAR centres in the global context;
2) sustainability of production systems; and
3) implementation of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies.
Prof. Camus will be reporting to us on the work of these committees during this meeting. However, I want now to acknowledge the constructive and prompt reaction by the TAC Chairman to the system's needs for changes in TAC's working methods. Such responsiveness assures us that our maturing system remains, nevertheless, flexible. TAC's new structure ensures that strategy considerations will be an integral part of our ongoing deliberations.

Many of the 13 centres have responded positively to TAC's initiative by themselves initiating an internal dialogue and self examination, culminating in the production of a strategy paper for their centre. I am particularly happy to report that as a result of a harmonious debate between board members, the director general and staff, aided by a few wise men in the system, ILCA has already submitted a draft strategy paper to TAC which has received a preliminary favourable reaction. That this centre, whose future has been in doubt on occasions - even as recently as last year, should have recouped as quickly as it has, is a tribute to the vitality and creative introspection of our system.

Let us not forget, however, that the Impact and Priorities studies were two of three inter-related studies recommended by the second review of the system. Combined with the third, loosely denominated "budgeting", these studies were designed to review the impact of the CGIAR's work, consider future priorities for research after taking stock of the past, and revise the resource allocation methodology to implement the new directions of our work. The methodology for resource allocation which we have begun to apply, arose out of the finance and budget study which was presented to you over the past two years, principally by Rich Clifford, guided by an Advisory panel and ably supported by the financial team in the CGIAR secretariat. The new medium-term resource allocation process will define those activities over a five-year period which form the essential "base" of the centre's activities; thus, by definition, also providing donors with a firm planning base for financing of centres' core activities. The process is well launched: IFPRI and ISNAR discussed their proposals with TAC this past March, and CIP, IBPGR and ILRAD will do so during the TAC's June meetings; by June 1988 this medium term allocation process will have replaced the current annual program and review process.

Let me pause to comment on how truly remarkable this CGIAR system of ours really is! This reorientation of priorities, the verbalization of complex and sometimes self-immolating strategies, the definition of a core base of activities by each centre, and the implementation process to ensure the internal and external coherence of these instruments, is the result of discussion, persuasion and, in the final analysis, consensus. We do not operate here by fiat. Perhaps even more remarkably we have achieved this evolution in our methods, our perspectives and even, to some extent, in our philosophy without using the instrument of a full review of the system.

Before we move away from this review of achievements during the last three years, I want to return to the point at which I began - Africa. During the Rome meeting I said "While elsewhere the challenge is to maintain the positive trend in per capita production of food, in Africa the challenge is to reverse a situation of zero or negative growth." The same stark reality remains today: underlying long-term trends in Africa indicate that population growth is projected to outstrip per capita food production. We are all
familiar with the Malthusian trap and know that the ultimate limiting factor on increased production is human time. We, therefore, fully appreciate that new agricultural technologies create more food, but just as important they increase productivity and thereby release small farmers' energies and resources for increased cash crop production. Higher incomes in rural areas not only can become the platform for accelerated economic growth but may also, indirectly, help to reduce population growth rates too.

We have taken several initiatives to make more efficient the use of donor resources and particularly those of the CGIAR donors in Africa. The Impact study reported donor concerns about the profusion and sometimes overlap of CGIAR centre work programmes. In this and the wider context we have begun two initiatives. As a separate but related activity under the World Bank's leadership, donors have created a Special Programme for African Agricultural Research (SPAAR) which provides a forum for aid coordination and for the identification of high priority projects to facilitate agricultural research in Africa. In parallel the CGIAR created a Special Task Force on Sub-Saharan Africa to address research needs in these areas, while, at the same time, the Directors General collectively developed mechanisms for coordinating centre research in Africa in consultation with the Special Task Force. SPAAR and the CGIAR Task Forces should ensure the most cost-efficient use of donors funds for African Research needs. I am optimistic that these initiatives will provide a demonstration effect for cooperation in other aspects of the development process that are financed by donors in Africa and, possibly, elsewhere.

Earlier, I mentioned my pleasure that ILCA had, in a relatively short time, undertaken a thoughtful appraisal of its future strategy in Africa. In the same vein I cannot hide my relief and equally great pleasure at the tremendous strides that have been taken by WARDA since our meeting just one year ago. You have received written reports from the secretariat on progress at WARDA. The highlights since our last meeting are that the Governing Council, under the able leadership of Minister Sagna, the Minister of Rural Development of Senegal, has accepted and implemented the Group's recommendations about the centre's governance and structure; member countries' contributions have been sufficient to wipe out WARDA's outstanding debts; a new Board of Trustees has been appointed and approved by the Group and the (now) Council of Ministers with autonomy and functions similar to those of the other boards of trustees of the CGIAR system; a new Director General will be selected by the board at its June meeting, at which point a director of research will be recruited internationally; and finally, a site selection study to identify an appropriate location for WARDA's main research station and headquarter's complex has been begun by scientists from the Netherlands and the IDRC. While many people throughout the system have contributed substantially to the extraordinary improvement in WARDA's situation, I should like to recognize in particular the major contribution of the IDRC to every aspect of this improvement. I also wish to acknowledge the generosity of the Netherlands in providing funds for transition costs which has allowed WARDA to introduce highly effective technical assistance and to carry out critical studies. We must also thank the member states of WARDA for their comprehension of our requirements and the speed with which they have implemented their agreements. WARDA itself has one unsung hero - I refer to Mr. Alieu Jagne, Acting Executive Secretary of WARDA, whose sound management, integrity and tenacity kept WARDA alive through its darkest days. He and the
Chairman of the STC - Dr. Moctar Toure - deserve our special thanks for steering their centre through very difficult waters in the recent past.

A final development in which we can take satisfaction is the recent signature of an agreement by Mr. Peacock, the chairman of the IBPGR, and the Deputy Director General of the FAO, Mr. Declan Walton, which sets for two years the parameters for effective management of the IBPGR within the FAO. I want to recognize the major contribution of Chris Bonte-Friedheim in helping us to reach this agreement. I am confident that with this excellent start the mutually beneficial relationship between the IBPGR and the FAO will continue indefinitely.

By any definition, the achievements of the last three years are substantial. The one recurring theme is our growing awareness of ourselves as part of a global system. We have stopped thinking of the thirteen centres as operating in isolation from other international agricultural research centres and from the development agencies. Quite obviously, the independence and autonomy of the CGIAR centres must be preserved at all costs and the centres must never be seen as the handmaidens of the development agencies. However, the interaction of the CGIAR with other components of a global research system is now recognized and we have asked TAC to define the rules of the game. Our agenda today examines several of those interactions.

We will probably all have somewhat different views of how the CGIAR will look in the 21st century, but we would probably agree about basics. An effective global system will ensure that demand for research solutions to agricultural production problems originate with the farmer and reach back into the system as far as necessary for eventual transmission of solutions back to the farmer.

Such a system requires strong national research organizations and extension services, good communication between the national and international research organizations - with efficient collaboration between the CGIAR and the non-CGIAR centres in integrated farming systems management - and strong links between the CGIAR centres and science and industry in the developed world and in donor agencies in that world. In my view, centres will move up or downstream and will determine the proportion of their resources that are allocated between applied and strategic research on the one hand and basic research, almost on a case by case basis, depending on the research challenge and on the capacity of the national research system to handle the applied research.

A system such as the one I describe can only flourish within a structure of governance and management that is both wise and flexible. The twin topics of sound governance by boards and efficient management by directors general, has absorbed a great deal of our time in recent meetings. The management reviews have helped us to focus on major issues and during this meeting we will hear Vern Ruttan speak about ways in which we can improve our review processes. A basic problem with our system arises from the demands that we make on those persons whom we ask to serve. How can we resolve the dilemma of the time constraints of TAC and board members, of leaders of external reviews, and of the multiple responsibilities we attribute to the directors general? I do not have an answer I am just raising the question.
This very question has arisen and we discussed it at our last meeting, with regard to the new TAC chairman. I cannot emphasize enough the importance that we should give to the selection of this our most important scientific advisor. As many of you know I was not able to complete the interviews before this meeting, but will be doing so next month together with the cosponsors. We have a short list of very fine candidates and I am sure that any one of them would do an excellent job. We promise to notify you of our selection by the end of July. This is not Guy Camus' last meeting but I want to thank him personally now for his commitment, his ability to bring his TAC members to a consensus, his understanding of the system, his wise counsel, his responsiveness to the needs of the various communities that TAC serves and - his friendship - which I value greatly.

Among the many issues that the new chairman will have to resolve are: the role of science and technology in preserving the environment; the relationship of the CGIAR centres to the non-CGIAR centres and, particularly, the extent to which the CGIAR system should be involved with tree crops, aquaculture and vegetables. The system will also have to be constantly aware of the need to lower the costs of doing business without affecting its efficiency or productivity. In the aftermath of the major breakthroughs that have already been made in a number of commodities, there is a danger of dissipation of effort. In a system of scientific excellence, is there now perhaps a danger of excessive focus on methodology and inputs rather on the end product -increasing food production? Are the centres - and the donors and development agencies- focussing enough on the need to strengthen national agricultural research entities and extension services? The objective is a noble one in itself, but stronger national systems would avoid the danger of the international centres diluting their resources by focussing too much on location-specific problems. That danger is likely to be exacerbated as more and more marginal lands are brought into production, as land scarcity becomes more acute.

I will share with you one of my major concerns about the system and that is whether we can expect to continue to receive adequate funding for the challenges that lie ahead. We must maintain or raise agricultural production per capita above the population growth rate in the world as a whole. That challenge is a major one. Historically, the system has been funded very generously from the foreign aid budgets of the donor community. Today we live in an environment in which raising some $200 million for the centres' core programmes is not an easy task. That we have been able to do so, speaks volumes for the reputation of the system, the regard in which it is held, and the dedicated efforts of all those involved in ensuring that the system's funding targets are achieved.

I think we can reasonably suppose that for the foreseeable future we can and should assume that the bulk of our funding will be provided from Government sources. However, I also think the system should not overlook non-governmental sources of funding, particularly over the longer term. I refer to foundations, humanitarian institutions and interest groups, corporations, and the general public. I raise such prospects for various reasons. Firstly, and most importantly, it is possible that the bulk of all global funding for agricultural research will in future come increasingly from non-governmental sources. We seem to be at a historical watershed in many developed countries, where governments seem to be questioning the old formula that the public sector should fund basic research, with the private
sector financing applied research. In the event that they continue to recognize their responsibility to fund research, they will probably prefer to support medical, environmental, and social research. We should be aware of such trends, and, if possible, be ahead of them in our thinking and our planning.

I do not see such changes as a threat to the CGIAR system. Nor am I pessimistic about longer-term funding prospects, if we are innovative, imaginative and have the drive to undertake the necessary development work. Given such attributes I am confident that we can arrive at a CGIAR that is funded and supported by a much wider range of sources, both Government and non-government, than now. Not only would there be increased security in having a diversity of funding sources, but it would also result in an international research system to which many more individuals and institutions had a loyalty and a responsibility. Such developments cannot and probably should not happen quickly. The various options must in any case be carefully investigated and analyzed beforehand. And while I am speaking of funding, I cannot over emphasize the need to expand the contributions of the developing countries. To me and to everyone else concerned with the system this would be a key index of the utility they see of the system and the importance they attach to it. The participation of developing countries in management and science has to be complemented by financial participation.

As many of you will now either know or have surmised, this will be my last meeting as Chairman of the CGIAR. I cannot hide from you my own sense of deep sadness at being separated from a system for which I have such a very high regard. The three years as Chairman of the CGIAR have been exceptionally satisfying ones and I hope I may have contributed in some small way to its strengthening. I carry a new vision of the world to my next assignment in the World Bank, which is as Vice President of the Latin American region. In that capacity I shall at least be able to retain my contacts with CIAT, CIMMYT and CIP.

The reason for my abrupt departure relates to the current restructuring of the World Bank and the speed with which that change is occurring. In these circumstances I have had no option but to take up my new duties - which are quite onerous - on the 1st of June. Normally when the Chairmanship of the CGIAR is about to change, the Group has been consulted widely and with plenty of advance warning. In this case, therefore, the Bank has decided to appoint an interim chairman of the Group from one of its four senior vice presidents. The person is well known to most of you and he is: David Hopper. Very soon, the Bank will begin a process of consultation with the donors to the CGIAR about the long-term chairmanship. In the meantime, David Hopper will succeed me and will chair the next meeting of the Group in October in Washington. I assure you, however, that I shall ensure that final decisions are made about the TAC chairman in July, so that we are not faced with any delay in appointing a successor to Guy Camus.

Lastly, but most importantly, I want to thank the French government, the regional commission for Languedoc-Roussillon, the city of Montpellier and, above all, AGROPOLIS, for the excellent arrangements made for our meetings and for the generous hospitality and warmth with which the CGIAR has been received here. I cannot adequately express my gratitude for your welcome, nor apologize adequately for not being present for the full week of the CGIAR meetings. I particularly want to thank Prof. Malassis, President of
AGROPOLIS, for hosting us so admirably and I should single out Mr. Billiemaz as the chief organizer of our meetings and also of the absolutely wonderful evening we were given last night.

I will not take up any more of your time. This will be the only day that I can be present at the Montpellier meeting. I have asked the Cosponsors each to chair the meetings for a half day from tomorrow morning on and they have graciously agreed. I shall have time to say my individual goodbyes during this evening's reception.

Before we take up our agenda, I want to welcome the following new fixed-term representatives:

Messrs. N.E. Mumba - Zambia  
Mohamed Ebrahim Ahsan - Bangladesh  
Rafael Pinto Montenegro - Venezuela  
Nazmi Demir - Turkey, and  
Augustyn Wos - Poland.

Among the donors, I would like to welcome:

Mr. Henry from CANADA; Mr. Venezian from FAO; Mr. Inoue of JAPAN; Messrs. Thornstrom and Melin of SWEDEN; and from FRANCE, Mr. Salmon-Legagneur and Madame Pujolle.

Thank you all for your attention.

Can we now please turn to the agenda as shown in document no: CG/87/03i) which lists the provisional agenda for this meeting. In the absence of objections, we shall approve it and begin our meeting.

Approved.

The meeting will begin with a presentation by Ed Schuh of a paper dealing with diversification of agriculture in Asia.